

## Madeline Sutherland

---

**From:** Emilia Brasier <ecarleyroe@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 9:27 PM  
**To:** Community Development Email  
**Subject:** Lennar proposed development, Camas Heights

**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 are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.**

Please add to public comment and consideration by the hearing Examiner.

I am writing in concern of the removal of Garry Oak trees, also known as Oregon White Oaks.

The first issue I would like to raise is that the developer is using the GMA (Growth management act) as a basis for needing to expand the number of units so they can provide affordable housing units. However sustainability is another area of the GMA that they are choosing to place at a much lower importance even though the act does NOT place these at a different level of importance. Sustainability is equal to affordable housing in the GMA and Camas and Lennar should be weighing it equally.

Lennar is using affordable housing to justify both burying a spring and cutting the majority of the white oaks down in order to achieve more lots. I ask will these units even be affordable housing?

If a person is making 15 dollars an hour and is the sole income for their house they will bring in about 31,000 dollars a year. This would mean they can afford a house costing just over 42,600 dollars. If this was a dual income household with both making the same amount they could afford a house of about 216,000. Will any of these units be selling in these two price ranges? If not it is disingenuous of Lennar to use the GMA to support affordable housing that they will not in fact be providing. Will these units be near a bus line and grocery, doctors, and jobs? If not, are they truly affordable if someone must own a car and have all the expenses that go along with a car to live there? I am also left to wonder if a buried spring is likely to provide years of headache and expense creating an even less affordable scenario, I know people in the near-by area have already been complaining of difficulty with the water. With all of this taken into account I think their plan should be rejected.

Additionally, in regards to the 8 white oak trees to be cut down,

"Garry oak woodland is listed as a Priority Habitat by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife because of a steep decline in extent and the high value as habitat for more than 200 wildlife species." (Reference WA Native Plant society) This should make it a higher priority for the sustainability section of the GMA.

These trees can take hundreds of years to mature and are uniquely adapted to living in the Pacific Northwest as they are naturally disease resistant, fire resistant, and drought resistant.

Additionally trees add value to property as well as making it a healthier environment to live in. A study in Germany of 10,000 residents, "showed that living within 100 metres of a tree – of any species – was associated with lower use of

antidepressants." (<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/04/city-trees-reduce-stress-and-anxiety/#:~:text=Trees%20have%20been%20scientifically%20proven%20to%20improve%20mental%20health.&Street%20trees%20can%20help%20reduce,number%20of%20stress%2Drelated%20conditions.:~:text=Trees%20have%20been%20scientifically%20proven%20to%20improve%20mental%20health.&Street%20trees%20can%20help%20reduce,numbe r%20of%20stress%2Drelated%20conditions.>)

I would suggest that rather than cutting these trees down, they be utilized to create a nature space that is sure to drive up home prices and there for add value for the devloper as well as residents in the future. "Building lots with substantial mature tree cover were 18% higher in value on average" (<https://www.theparkcatalog.com/blog/parks-homes-values/#:~:text=Several%20studies%20have%20found%20that,dollars%20in%20the%20owner's%20pocket.>) This would be a better buisness decision for Lennar.

Additionally ground cover is the best way to prevent erosion and help storm/ground water management and these trees are well established ground cover that are healthy and doing well in this area.

I understand Lennar plans to replace these trees with young trees. Young small trees demand a lot of care to be sure they mature to larger trees and just planting lots of small white oaks as proposed does not equal mature thriving trees. Deer are a real problem for small trees and they require tending until mature. Who will be responsible for this to assure they come to maturity? These trees also have significant canopy size that will not be replaced for around 500 years if baby white oaks are placed and require considerable space for that size which does not appear to be accounted for in the Lennar plan.

I think Ken Miles' statement encompasses many good points that you don't need me to reiterate directly but I affirm his statements.

Emilia Brasier

4132 NE Hayes St, Camas, WA 98607