

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

616 NE 4th Avenue
 Camas, WA 98607
www.ci.camass.wa.us

September 7, 2022

Pacific Lifestyle Homes
 Attn: Ryan Stygar
 Sent via email: ryans@buildplh.com

RE: Application Completeness Review for Planning Case SUB22-05: Monte Verde Subdivision

Dear Mr. Stygar,

Thank you for your application submittal for the Monte Verde Subdivision (SUB22-05). I am the case planner assigned to this project. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that the application submitted on August 11, 2022, has been deemed incomplete in accordance with Camas Municipal Code (CMC) Section 18.55.130 and there are items that need to be addressed in order to move forward with the review process. Once the items below are submitted, staff will review the information to verify whether the application can be deemed complete. As a reminder, staff is not authorized to waive any requirement of the City Code. Any omission or failure by staff to recite applicable code requirements shall not constitute a waiver by the City of any standard or requirement.

Items necessary for completeness:

- 17.01.050.B2: Tracts to be dedicated to any public or private purpose shall be distinguished from lots intended for general development with notes stating their purpose and any limitations. Preliminary Plat shows Tracts A-F, some with unclear boundaries. Please provide narrative for proposed Tracts that includes purpose, square footage, and an illustration that shows defined boundaries.
- 17.01.050.B3: Building Envelopes. Lot 1 building envelopes are unclear. Please revise preliminary plat to include buildable area and show required setbacks.
- 17.01.050.B4: Land Inventory. Preliminary and final plats shall include the following:
 - d. Total infrastructure acreage (includes proposed storm ponds)
 - e. Total Tract Area
- 17.11.030.B6:
 - b. Owners of adjacent land and the names of any adjacent subdivisions. *Only one subdivision name references but missing adjacent property owners.*
 - d. Names, locations, widths, and dimension of existing and proposed public street rights-of-way and easements and private access easements, parks and other open spaces, reservations, and utilities. *Missing dimensions and callouts for existing right-of-way.*
 - k. Location of any proposed dedications. *Proposed dedications are not called out, dimensions are not noted.*
 - n. Description, location and size of existing and proposed utilities, storm drainage facilities and roads to service the lots. *Sizes of existing and proposed utilities are not shown.*
- 17.11.030.B10: Clark County assessor's maps which show the location of each property within three hundred feet of the subdivision. Properties shown on preliminary plat appear to be less

than 300-feet.

- 17.11.030.B12: Complete and submit a transportation impact study to determine the adequacy of the transportation system to serve a proposed development and to mitigate impacts of the proposal on the surrounding transportation system
 - Per City of Vancouver preliminary review of the TIA, COV is requesting additional trip distribution information. The applicant is to provide an addendum to the TIA, showing the total number of new PM peak hour trips that will be distributed to the following proportionate share intersections, and calculate the expected fees:

Project Location	Unit Cost per Trip
192 nd Ave & SR-14 ramps	\$2,000 per PM peak hour trip
192 nd Ave & SE 34 th St	\$150 per PM peak hour trip

- Per CMC 18.55.110:
 - H. A development sign is required for a Type III subdivision application.

Comments related to Pre-Application Meeting Notes (PA22-05):

Planning

- Preliminary Plat:
 2. Density calculation is based on development/net acreage which is defined as the total land use development exclusive of open space and critical areas. *Please provide table showing breakdown of development/net area and proposed Tracts.*
 4. Building setback requirements found in CMC 18.09.040-Table 2, includes requirement for setbacks to be drawn on the plat. Per Note 2, "Garage setback is five feet behind the front of the dwelling." *Preliminary plat does not show garage setback.*
 8. Each dwelling unit within a new development shall be landscaped with at least one tree per CMC 17.19.030.F. *Preliminary plat does not show trees on Lots 13 and 26.*
 12. The location and height of any retaining walls shall be shown on the grading plan. Retaining wall height requirements are found in CMC 18.17.060. *While the preliminary grading plan shows location of three 2-foot retaining walls, the preliminary plat only calls out two. If there will be a retaining wall adjacent to Lot #19, please ensure that is reflected on the preliminary plat as well.*
- Critical Areas Report:
 - Clark County GIS mapping identifies wetlands on the subject property however; the Critical Areas Report indicates wetlands were found approximately 300 feet south of the project site. Staff will route the Critical Areas Report to the Army Corp of Engineers for a jurisdictional determination and concurrence. Any comments from them will be forwarded on to you.
 - The report submitted includes a Mitigation Plan, however it does not mention mitigation sequencing in accordance with CMC16.51.170. The Mitigation Plan is also missing required information regarding CMC16.51.180 – Mitigation plan requirements. The report should be revised to reflect the requirements as noted in these two sections of the Camas Municipal Code.
 - The site assessment also identified several Oregon White Oaks, and a mitigation plan was included in the Critical Areas Report however; preliminary comments have been received from Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) and further information is needed to determine whether or not the mitigation plan is

adequate for the proposed removal and loss of Oregon White Oaks on the project site. If necessary, a meeting with WDFW staff can be arranged to discuss their comments further. The initial comments are as follows:

- The mitigation plan proposes to replace three mature Oregon white oak trees with six 2-inch seedlings. Oregon white oaks are slow growing, and the proposal will lead to a net loss of habitat for years. WDFW is currently updating Best Management Practices for Oregon white oak mitigation and will not only be requesting mitigation for the physical loss of habitat but for the temporal loss as well.
- Additional information is needed to better assess the required mitigation, including, but not limited to, canopy size (sq. ft.), condition of crown, acorn production, galls, cavities, dead branches, fungi, etc.
- Page 6 of the Critical Area Report states that Oak #27 is a hazard tree based on, “proposed construction, grading requirements where it is located, and the condition of the tree”. The interpretation is that this will become a hazard tree only after the construction takes place and is not a hazard tree at this time. Dead/dying oak trees provide valuable habitat to wildlife and because of that, this oak tree does not meet the PHS definition.
- If possible, the removed OWO trees, including the snag, should be left on site as habitat features on the landscape. On-site mitigation is the preferred option, but off-site mitigation options can be explored as well.

If you have any questions related to this project, please feel free to contact me by email: YSennewald@cityofcamas.us or by phone: (360) 817-7269.

Respectfully,



Yvette Sennewald
Senior Planner