

Public Comments 2/16/2023 regarding McIntosh Subdivision SUB22-04

Greg K. Anderson, residence in Camas adjacent to the west of the proposed subdivision.

We have several concerns:

- A. The most significant concern is storm water management. Currently our property receives storm water runoff from the now vacant field as our location is of lower elevation. When we built our home, we were required to place a 5' wide drainage system the entire width of the back property line to capture and convey this runoff to our stormwater facility.
 - a. Even with the drainage system, a sizeable amount of runoff was accumulating on our property below the drainage area. To remedy this issue, two French drains were installed and connected to the gutter/downspouts system. These drains have flowing water many months of the year.
 - b. During large storm events, sizeable amounts of runoff enter the yard in what I will call sheets of water. The force of the runoff has scoured the dirt around the fenceposts and deposits sizeable amounts of debris and silt into the drainage system. The drainage system then needs to be cleared and the fence reinforced.
 - c. **Our concerns are:**
 - i. The proposed subdivision stormwater preliminary plan includes a system that connects 6 or more lots together. Each lot would connect the roof drains and foundation drains into an infiltration trench (unknown details about this as of this comment, see conditions of approval #35 through 40) AND additional impervious surfaces. This increased in water will be traveling along the subdivision's west property line. The infiltration trench begins uphill from our property adding storm flow toward our home than currently. We do not want more water entering our property.
 - ii. Once the subdivision is declared "final acceptance" by the city, the property owners will be able to add additional impervious surfaces, change the flow of the storm water with fill dirt or other means with no opportunity for us to intercede.
 - iii. Also, ongoing maintenance of the storm water trench system may be neglected, modified, or even fail to perform as designed, leaving us little recourse.
 - iv. Our asks are:
 1. That the infiltration idea for the lots be changed to a sealed pipe system to move the water from the roof and foundation runoff to the facility in tract B, not through an infiltration trench.
 2. Maintenance and functional preservation of the storm water conveyance system I'm discussing adjacent to our home be clearly stated for future owners, see Conditions of Approval #65 c and #77 and Final Plat Note 11.
 3. Or, that some other solution be provided that does not increase our risk of storm water flow for the life of the subdivision except for acts of God.

4. During construction of the subdivision, and of any adjacent homes while they are being built and landscaped, that measures are taken to insure erosion sediments does not leave their property and enter ours. This contradicts Conditions of Approval #14 and 73.
- B. Tree preservation:
- a. We have a sizeable pine tree near our rear property line and we would like precautions taken to insure it's safety during any construction.

- C. Staff Report Finding #3 on page 12 near the bottom of the page states:

Finding: Staff finds that as there is over 400-feet (approximately 980-feet) of sight distance looking west, staff would support shifting the proposed future public access road intersection (NW Halifax Street) further to the west to increase the intersection sight distance looking east. Shifting the proposed public access road intersection further to the west would also allow the applicant to potentially preserve the existing significant fir tree that will be impacted with the currently proposed location of the future public access road (NW Halifax Street).

I don't find a Condition of Approval for this Finding and yet it appears to be a significant finding for safety and tree preservation for tree #1 as listed in the tree report.

- D. Staff Report Finding #5 states:

Finding: Aside from lots requesting a variance, staff finds the proposed lot sizes can conform to the requirements of the R-10 zone as conditioned.

- a. Proposed Plat Notes#5 says Maximum building lot coverage for this subdivision is 40%.
 - b. I don't see any justification for the Plat note, nor can I support increased density on the building lots (referencing my comments regarding stormwater). For reference, please see CMC 18.45.020 the maximum building lot coverage is 35% for R-10 zone.
- E. Per CMC: 18.55.110 - Application—Required information is:
- a. "H. Signage for Type III applications and short subdivisions: Prior to an application being deemed complete and Type III applications are scheduled for public bearing, the applicant shall post one four-foot by eight-foot sign per road frontage, unless a different size (not to be less than six square feet) is approved by the director...." and "The sign shall be clearly visible from adjoining rights-of-way..."
 - b. As of February 13, 2023, no sign is visible from NW 5th Avenue or NW Fremont Street.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions staff knows how to contact us.



Greg K. Anderson



Colete Anderson