

# Staff Report

October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Council Meeting

28<sup>th</sup> Street Annexation – 10% Notice of Intent Presenter: Robert Maul, Interim Community Development Director Time Estimate: 30 minutes

Phone	Email
360.817.1568	rmaul@cityofcamas.us

**BACKGROUND:** An annexation application has been submitted to the City to annex approximately 19.18 acres into the city limits of Camas.

**SUMMARY:** Jordan Ramis PC submitted a 10% notice of intent to the City of Camas on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 on behalf of the property owners within the proposed annexation area. The annexation area is comprised of four parcels that total approximately 19.18 acres of land located south of NE 28<sup>th</sup> Street across from Green Mountain Estates and Green Mountain Planned Residential Development (see Figure 1). The annexation area is within the Camas Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Property owners of the four parcels have signed the notice of intent to annex. The initiating parties represent 100% of valuation (\$3,528,833) of land owners in the proposed area. Three of the four parcels abut the existing city limit boundary to the north at the public right of way along NE 28<sup>th</sup> Street. The notice is valid and satisfies the requirements of RCW 35A.14.120.

The adopted comprehensive plan designation for the subject area is currently Single-Family Medium, which allows for zoning designations of R-7.5. R-10, and R-12. The current zoning for the subject area is Clark County R-12, Urban High Density, with an Urban Holding Overlay. The park land to the south is zoned Public Facilities and also carries an Urban Holding Overlay. Across the Street within the city limits the zoning designation is R-6 (6,000 square foot lots).



## **City Boundary:**

When drawing annexation boundaries the goal is to have orderly patterns that allow for the ability provide services, continuity and allow for potential growth patterns that make sense. As proposed the four parcels have gaps to the west, east in in the middle. Planning staff has discussed this potential layout with city Parks, Public Works, and the Police department and as proposed this annexation creates a number of service challenges for utilities, emergency response, addressing and future public property ownership and maintenance challenges.

In exploring different layouts of possible boundary expansions the scenarios begin to quickly affect and potentially impact a number of private property owners (approximately 36) as well as Clark County parks facilities. Given the potential size and impact of this annexation staff would recommend not pursing this petition, but rather look to annex through other legal means such as an interlocal agreement with Clark County, and more importantly to have direct communication with all affected property owners before engaging in a full effot. Given the amount of work associated with such a task this would be something that should be tied to a future work plan for the next biennium.



#### Figure 2: Camas City Limits

#### **Process:**

As per RCW 35.13.125, the City Council is required to meet with the initiating parties and will discuss the following:

1. Whether the City will accept, reject, or geographically modify the proposed annexation;

- 2. Whether it will require the simultaneous adoption of a proposed zoning regulation, if such a proposal has been prepared and filed (as provided for in RCW 35A.14.330, and RCW 35A.14.340); and
- 3. Whether it will require the assumption of all or any portion of existing City indebtedness by the area to be annexed.

If the Council were to accept the proposed annexation (with or without modifications) the next step in the process is for the initiating party to collect signatures from property owners representing at least 60% of the assessed value of the area to be annexed. During that time staff will also schedule hearings with the Planning Commission to develop a recommended zoning designation for the 60% hearing. If a valid petition is submitted, then the City Council may hold a public hearing to consider the request.

## **EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS:**

What are the desired results and outcomes for this agenda item? To accept, reject or modify the annexation process for the application.

What's the data? What does the data tell us? N/A

How have communities been engaged? Are there opportunities to expand engagement? The annexation process will include public notices and opportunities for engagement.

Who will benefit from, or be burdened by this agenda item? N/A

What are the strategies to mitigate any unintended consequences? N/A

Does this agenda item have a differential impact on underserved populations, people living with disabilities, and/or communities of color? Please provide available data to illustrate this impact. N/A

Will this agenda item improve ADA accessibilities for people with disabilities? N/A

What potential hurdles exists in implementing this proposal (include both operational and political)? N/A

How will you ensure accountabilities, communicate, and evaluate results? N/A

How does this item support a comprehensive plan goal, policy or other adopted resolution? The properties are within the City's Urban Growth Boundary and support the elements of the comprehensive plan.

**BUDGET IMPACT:** Unknown at this time. Staff will bring forward more specifics at future meetings.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Reject the notice of intent to annex.

Page | 4

# <u>Options:</u>

Option	Results
• <i>Reject the Notice of Intent</i>	The annexation process ends and the subject property would remain in unincorporated Clark County.
• Accept the Notice as submitted	The initiating parties would draft a petition and begin gathering signatures.
• Accept the Notice but modify the boundaries.	The initiating parties would draft a revised petition and begin gathering signatures.