

Madeline Sutherland

From: alicia . <alicia@justagirlinecamas.com>
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 10:11 PM
To: Community Development Email; Bonnie Carter; Tim Hein; Greg Anderson; Leslie Lewallen; Marilyn Boerke; Shannon Roberts; Madeline Sutherland; Don Chaney; Steve Hogan; Ken Miles
Subject: Comments for Camas Heights Subdivision

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.

May 1, 2020

Judge Turner,

Hello Judge Turner, we find ourselves here again discussing a new development for our City of Camas still without an arborist or urban forester representing our city. It is hard for me to not be frustrated at this situation but I press on in these hearings and out in my community for the trees.

This over 700 page document is very overwhelming to sift thru and I will make my main points as best as I can to speak to key points.

The developer speaks repeatedly to The Growth Management Act. This is definitely something our city has had much conversation about since our state adopted the plan in 1990. The Growth Management Act does not state to rid all housing sites of important wetlands and trees. I would like to counter this and note that the City of Camas also has a Comprehensive Plan 2035 that had extensive input and research put into it from community members, council members, planning committees and steering committees. I am attaching a link to this plan at the bottom of the page and ask that you look at page 12 at the statutory goals identified in the GMA as (RCW 36.70A) The numbers below stand out strongly to me when assessing the proposal from this developer.

Number 8-11 and 13

8. Natural resource industries. Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses.

9. Open space and recreation. Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities.

10. Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.

11. Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

12. Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

13. Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures, that have historical or archaeological significance.

The developer does not follow the Camas Comprehensive Plan in protecting existing trees on site to the greatest extent practicable. There are ten Oregon White Oaks on site and nine of them are over 20 inch DBH. The developer proposed to purchase habitat credits to mitigate for the removal of ALL these trees. After the city requested the developer

mitigate these trees and keep the the developer responded that it would save two. TWO. In my mind this is unacceptable. There is no reason all of these trees cannot be saved and additional ones as well.

I believe having the developer keep additional trees is a must and not being able to destroy the wetland there is also a must. The developer works to counter all the damage that will be done to wetlands and trees will be compensated with wetland/habitat credits. The habitat credits they propose for removing the Oregon White Oaks are nothing compared to taking down these old and rare trees in the northwest and removing natural wetlands.

I would like to also propose that an arborist provided by the City of Camas work with the arborist the developer has contracted so there is representation for both parties.

The developer proposes removing 2022.5 tree units of 2049.5. Surely this percentage is unacceptable and I would like to see a few hundred if not more tree units saved at this development.

I see no reason why tracts e,f,g and d could not maintain the trees at the back of the lots and the homes could still be built. Homeowners love established trees and when there is nothing there they usually plant fast growing trees for shade, privacy and beauty as soon as they purchase a home. These trees that are already established add value to home lots.

The list goes on of what I would like the developer to maintain and do to build a community that has natural habitat around it. I'm asking you to please require that the developer keep more trees on this property and not destroy the wetland that is there. I understand we need new homes, I do. However we are also are facing a global climate crisis and trees are essential for our future. It would take years, decades, to plant new trees that will do what these mature, healthy trees are currently doing. Hopefully there is some middle ground on this. Thank you for your time and energy on reviewing this case.

For the trees,
Alicia King
Alicia@justagirlincamas.com
360.903.8039

https://www.cityofcamas.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/community_development/page/5841/compplan2016.pdf

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)