

Carey Certo

From: Robert Maul
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 10:39 AM
To: Brian Smith
Cc: Yvette Sennewald; Alan Peters; Carey Certo
Subject: RE: CUP24-1001 additional comments

Thanks, Brian.

We will add this to the record.

From: Brian Smith <BSmith@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Thursday, March 6, 2025 10:28 AM
To: Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Yvette Sennewald <YSennewald@cityofcamas.us>; Alan Peters <APeters@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: RE: CUP24-1001 additional comments

Robert,

The Building and Fire code requirements Mr. Vitek is referring to below will be reviewed for compliance under the City's Building Permit Plan Review and Fire Life Safety Permit Plan Review process.

Additionally, below is an excerpt from my preapp comments for PA24-08 for the Camas High School Tennis Court Cover.

- *The structure will be reviewed under the most current building codes as adopted by the State of Washington. Specifically, the requirements of IBC 3102 that regulate the proposed type of structure.*
- *The plans will need to be prepared by a State of Washington licensed architect. (Which will include a full life safety and code compliance analysis.)*
- *Structural drawings and calculations will be required and shall be prepared and stamped by a professional engineer licensed by the State of Washington.*

Brian Smith, CBO, ACO

Building Official

Desk 360-817-7243

www.cityofcamas.us | bsmith@cityofcamas.us

The City of Camas has gone digital! Apply for permits online through our new Civic Access Portal at www.cityofcamas.us/permits.

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Brian Smith <BSmith@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: Yvette Sennewald <YSennewald@cityofcamas.us>; Alan Peters <APeters@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: FW: CUP24-1001 additional comments

fyi

-----Original Message-----

From: Yvette Sennewald <YSennewald@cityofcamas.us>

Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:22 AM

To: Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers <jcarothers@cityofcamas.us>; Anita Ashton <AAshton@cityofcamas.us>; Steven McAtee <smcatee@mackaysposito.com>; James Cramer <jcramer@mackaysposito.com>

Subject: FW: CUP24-1001 additional comments

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Clark Vitek <clark@thevitek.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2025 11:19 AM

To: Yvette Sennewald <YSennewald@cityofcamas.us>

Subject: Re: CUP24-1001 additional comments

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.

Yvette

To illustrate the concern below, attached is the code review submitted with our preliminary site plan application in 2013 (Quamash - now Evergreen Tennis).

I understand this is at the development director's discretion to require architectural review by a qualified architect. But, if sometimes required for type 1 or 2 decisions, it would seem especially important on a conditional use type III application. The reason is that the public needs to fully understand what is actually being proposed in terms of use and occupancy, and it makes no sense to put forward a plan for public comment and scheduled hearing including a proposed structure that may not be capable of compliance with the building code in regard to planned occupancy and use. The applicant may find they need to change the size or shape, or construction type, or limit to 6 months seasonal use for the year. Seasonal use is common for "bubble" structures to be classified as "temporary" IBC structures. Or, arch review may reveal that they may need more restrooms and another larger building to accommodate the conditional use. So, these details matter for a type III application, and therefore the applicant should be required to submit an architectural review clearly describing the planned paths for compliance with IBC for their the 50,000+ square foot structure, just as was required in 2013 for our structures of less than half that size and on a Type 2 decision (reference PA13-18, page 4 "A code analysis and plans shall be prepared by an architect licensed by the State of Washington").

Thanks,

Clark Vitek

On 2/27/25 12:49, Clark Vitek wrote:

> Yvette

>

> In addition to comments already provided regarding applicant's traffic

> impact statement I would like to add the following comments to the

> record

- >
- > In the project narrative, the applicant did not provide sufficient
- > technical information to address expected building and fire code
- > compliance of the proposed air supported structure.
- >
- > Typically, the City would require a statement in the narrative to
- > address expected building and fire code compliance for a proposed new
- > (in this case 56,000 square foot) structure.
- >
- > The narrative should have addressed the following specific IBC topics:
- >
- > (chapter references are to the IBC)
- >
- > Building Occupancy Classification- Chapter 3 including anticipated
- > Occupant Load (from chapter 3), egress components width, exit and exit
- > doorways, exit access travel distance
- >
- > Allowable Heights and Areas - Chapter 5, including consideration for
- > occupancy type and occupant load, construction type, automated fire
- > protection systems (or not)
- >
- > Type of Construction - Chapter 6
- >
- > Plumbing Systems - Chapter 29 (based on occupant load from Chapter 3)
- >
- > The above are related concerns to the traffic impact statement because
- > the application is vague with regard to the the actual hours of
- > proposed conditional use and the occupancy type and anticipated
- > occupant load of the structure during times of proposed conditional
- > use. The traffic impact statement suggests the structure will only be
- > used after 6 PM for example, but elsewhere in the narrative it is
- > suggested that the structure will be used at times not in use by the
- > school. The applicant's proposal and willingness to add 41 parking
- > spaces is not consistent with the statement that the structure will
- > only be used at times not in use by the school, because at these times
- > the school's existing parking lot would be almost 100% empty.
- >
- > Lacking any consistent details on the proposed hours and occupancy of
- > the proposed conditional use, it is impossible to expect the public
- > has been sufficiently informed about this project to comment at public
- > hearing later this month.
- >
- > The applicant should be required to submit a proper architectural
- > review of the proposed structure addressing all IBC, occupancy,
- > occupant load, plumbing and/or fire code requirements, signed by a
- > registered architect in the state of Washington.
- >
- > This design review should be made available for public review and
- > comment along with any revised traffic impact statement for a period
- > sufficient for public review prior to hearing.
- >
- >

> Sincerely,
>
> Clark Vitek
>
>
>
>