

Carey Certo

From: Jeffrey Hunt <jeff@farcolor.com>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 7:07 PM
To: Community Development Email
Cc: City Clerk; City Council Members (GRP)
Subject: Subject: Public Comment — June 9, 2026 Hearing Examiner — Oliver Terrace Subdivision, SUB25-1010

WARNING: This message originated outside the City of Camas Mail system. **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the content. If you recognize the sender as a city employee and you see this message this email is a phishing email. If you are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.

Subject: Public Comment — June 9, 2026 Hearing Examiner — Oliver Terrace Subdivision, SUB25-1010

From: Jeffrey Hunt
 Berkeley, California
 Born and raised in Camas

To: communitydevelopment@cityofcamas.us
 CC: cityclerk@cityofcamas.us; council@cityofcamas.us

Please include the following comments in the official public record for the June 9, 2026 Hearing Examiner meeting regarding Oliver Terrace Subdivision, SUB25-1010. I am copying the City Clerk and City Council so that the broader public-process concern is also directly available to City decision-makers. If this proposal is later considered by City Council, Planning Commission, or under a related agenda item, I respectfully request that these comments also be included or cross-referenced in that public record.

Dear Hearing Examiner, Mayor Hogan, Members of the Camas City Council, and City Staff,

I am submitting these comments for the public record regarding the Oliver Terrace Subdivision, SUB25-1010.

I want to begin by saying that I appreciate the work of City staff, consultants, the applicant, agency reviewers, the Hearing Examiner, and members of the public who have contributed to this record. I understand that land-use review is complicated, and I also understand that many of the people involved are working within established procedures and code requirements.

My purpose in submitting this letter is to help document a public-process concern that I believe is important, not only for this application, but for the larger North Shore and Fern Prairie development pattern now unfolding.

The central question is simple:

How can the Hearing Examiner, City staff, City Council, Planning Commission, and the public make informed decisions if the full development context is not clearly visible in one place?

The Oliver Terrace application is publicly described as a 12-lot single-family subdivision. At that surface level, it may appear to be a relatively small application. But the hearing record includes approximately 35 exhibits and shows a much broader and more complicated context: Phase I and Phase II, MX-NS zoning, future development areas, open-space and critical-area tracts, wetlands, stream buffers, stormwater facilities, tree removal, trail planning, future North Shore Boulevard context, and larger North Shore development implications.

That larger picture matters.

The public should not have to reconstruct the actual project from dozens of technical exhibits, partial maps, consultant reports, agency comments, staff letters, and plan sheets. A clear consolidated public map and summary should be available before preliminary plat approval.

This is especially important because this project does not exist in isolation. It is part of a much larger pattern of development pressure in and around North Shore, Legacy Lands, the airport area, the urban growth boundary, and Fern Prairie. I have attempted to understand that broader pattern myself, but much of what I have been able to piece together has come from separate documents, meeting materials, partial maps, and even screen captures from public meetings. That should not be necessary for the public to understand the direction of growth in this area.

I know this property personally. I know the raised rocky terrace — which my brother and I called “Tarzan Rock” when we were little kids — the forested slope, the wet areas, and the general landform. Some of this land is constrained by slope, rock, wetlands, water, and other natural conditions. Because of that, I believe the City should be especially clear about what is being described as “open space.” The public deserves to know whether the proposed open-space tract represents buildable land being preserved as a public benefit, or primarily constrained land being used to support density transfer and development elsewhere on the parcel.

Those are very different things, and the distinction should be clear in the record.

I am also concerned that the environmental and technical record does not appear to describe the project consistently. The public notice describes a 12-lot subdivision. The SEPA checklist describes a 14-lot, two-phase project. Several technical reports refer to 11 new homes or lots. I am not raising this as a minor clerical issue. I am asking a substantive public-record question: what exact project version was reviewed under SEPA, and does the SEPA determination apply to the same project now before the Hearing Examiner?

If the answer is straightforward, it should be clearly stated before approval.

The WDFW comments also deserve direct public attention. WDFW identified the riparian area as its primary concern and recommended a larger buffer for Stream A than originally proposed. If the applicant has now agreed to a 100-foot minimum buffer, that should be clearly mapped, made binding, and shown in relation to the proposed lots, roads, utilities, stormwater facilities, grading limits, tree removal, snags, Oregon white oaks, wetland buffers, and future development areas.

I also want to add firsthand historical knowledge of this stream and drainage area. I spent many hours there when I was young, and I remember small fish and crawdads in that waterway, as well as pollywogs and salamanders in the connected drainage. I am not claiming that this proves current fish presence today, but it does show why the stream and wetland system should not be treated as a minor ditch or incidental seasonal drainage without careful public explanation. If Stream A is being classified as seasonal and non-fish-bearing, the basis for that classification should be clearly explained in the record, especially in light of WDFW's concern that the riparian buffer is inadequate for ecological function.

The same principle applies to the Oregon white oaks, priority snags, tree retention, and merchantable timber. Statements that certain trees, oaks, snags, buffers, or timber are not intended to be impacted are helpful, but intent is not the same as an enforceable condition. Intentions can change. Ownership can change. Future phases can change development pressure. If the City is relying on these commitments, they should be converted into binding conditions of approval, shown clearly on the plat, and made durable after ownership transfer.

Stormwater is also central to this application. It should not be treated as only a later engineering detail on this site. The record includes a Category I wetland, offsite wetlands, a stream, reduced buffers, steep slopes, shallow bedrock, grading, detention, dispersion, and wetland-protection requirements. The public should be able to see the corrected stormwater approach in relation to the critical areas before preliminary plat approval, not only after the fact.

The trail and public-access context also needs to be shown clearly. The City's own parks and open-space planning identifies North Shore trail connectivity as part of the public framework. If this subdivision affects the future T-27 trail, North Shore Boulevard, or public-access connections, that relationship should be disclosed now, not deferred to later engineering review.

The hearing notice states that it is preferable for written comments to be received at least five working days before the public hearing, in order to be available with the online agenda and materials. I understand that written comments may still be submitted no later than noon on the day of the hearing to be handed to the Hearing Examiner by staff. If I am misunderstanding the timeline, I welcome correction. However, from a public-participation standpoint, the timeframe appears very short for a record of this size and complexity. That is another reason I believe the record should remain open or the hearing should be continued long enough for the public to review a clear consolidated presentation.

My request is straightforward and constructive.

Before preliminary plat approval, I respectfully ask the Hearing Examiner to require the City to provide one clear public-facing exhibit and summary showing the full project context, including:

The current lot count and phasing; existing and proposed zoning boundaries; the MX-NS/future development area; the North Shore Boulevard relationship; the trail relationship; open-space and critical-area tracts; Wetland A; Stream A; standard and reduced buffers; WDFW's recommended buffers; stormwater facilities; sewer crossings; grading limits; tree removals; Oregon white oaks; priority snags; and all binding conditions of approval.

This is not an anti-development request. It is a request for clear documentation, transparent public process, and informed decision-making.

If the City and applicant can explain the project clearly, then that explanation should be made available before approval. If the full picture cannot be shown in one clear public map and summary, then the record is not ready for decision.

I respectfully ask that the preliminary plat not be approved until the full North Shore context is clearly reviewable by the Hearing Examiner, City decision-makers, and the public.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Hunt

