

John Floyd

From: Philip Fortuna <phil-4tuna@kalama.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 8:28 AM
To: 'Susan Junnikkala'; P.N.Harbison@gmail.com; Lynn54@gmail.com; 'Joy Greenberg'; 'Susan Dennis Langham'; 'Craig Frkovich'; 'Dan Ohall'; 'Adam Smee'; kasmussen@kalama.com; John Floyd
Subject: RE: P.C. Meeting information

Hello to All,

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend this week's Planning Commission meeting, but thanks to Susan sending along the materials so quickly by e-mail, I was able to review them and have the chance to pass along some comments. Given the nature of the meeting, I have tried to limit my comments to questions as to whether the criteria for approval have been met rather than my personal opinion of the proposal.

I noted what seemed to be an inconsistency in some of the numbers used in the supporting materials. In the staff report, page 2, the table indicates that there will be 38 single family lots and 27 townhouses for a total of 65 lots (and I presume 65 units with one family per townhouse as seems to be the norm in the US suburbs). The traffic report on page 2 in Table 1 indicates that there will be 33 single family houses and 33 multi-family houses for a total of 66 units. Putting aside the fact that the total number of units do not agree, the mix varies substantially which would suggest that the traffic impacts of the site configurations suggested in the staff report would differ substantially from those given in the traffic report. Parenthetically, I would also note that the traffic report assumes that there will be FEWER trips generated by a multi family dwelling than from a single family dwelling which seems counter intuitive (9.44 vs. 7.32 trips per dwelling unit per day). I am sure that there is a good reason for this seemingly odd result, but I would be cautious about signing off on this study until this was explained and until the discrepancy with the staff report numbers was straightened out.

The mix of housing brings up another question. On page 12 of the staff report, amidst a discussion of the Comp plan, Land Development Policy 4 is mentioned. This Policy deals with encouraging diverse residential development and specifically mentions multi-family housing. Earlier on page 2, the staff report indicates that the density of the proposed sub-division would be less than is possible under current zoning (R-3). In light of the Commissions recent discussion about multi-family housing and the data we saw concerning the shortage of multi-family housing in the community as well as the relative lack of eligible multi-family zones near the CBD, I question whether the proposed sub-division does support Land Development Policy 4. I know that the details will change and the exact nature of the housing will be defined later, but on the surface it looks like the units will essentially all be single family (the larger detached single family lots and the smaller townhouse lots). Since the parcel is zoned R-3, I do not see how it meets the goals of Land Development Policy 4 which means that it may not meet criteria for approval 2 and 3 as laid out on page 3 of the staff report.

Page 8 of the staff report mentions parks and specifically KMC 16.10.130. The summary on page 8 notes that the Planning Commission is required to review the need for park development and may require the developer to dedicate land for park development and construct improvements as a condition of approval. The preliminary plat does NOT include such a dedication of land for park development. Rather it proposes setting aside 4 acres for critical areas protection and passive open space. In my view these do not serve the same function as a dedicated park and thus in my view the proposal likely does NOT currently meet the standard for approval. Therefore, I would suggest we look at requiring the developer to dedicate land for park development as a condition of approval.

Finally, on page 10 of the staff report, the Geotechnical report is mentioned. While the report does not find any issues, the site is a rocky hillslope with grades greater than 30% in places. The report was completed in 1998, apparently for a

different proposal. The KMC requires such reports to have been prepared in the last 5 years. The staff proposes requiring a new or updated geotechnical report as a condition of approval. I am disturbed that the developer submitted a 20 year old report when the code clearly calls for a much newer report and is asking us to approve on the basis that the approval criteria have been met. With a 20 year old report (likely for a different proposed use of the land), I do not see how we can say that all the criteria have been met. With such steep grades and likely improvements in geotechnical technology over the last 2 decades, I think the lack of a current report is not a minor matter and barring updated information at the meeting, I might propose considering a continuation of the hearing to a future date to obtain this additional information.

Hopefully, my comments were on point and directed towards the criteria for approval as laid out by the staff.

I am sorry I cannot be at the meeting to share my observations in person.

Best wishes for a successful meeting,

Phil Fortuna

From: Susan Junnikkala <bldgclerk@kalama.com>

Sent: Friday, November 9, 2018 4:46 PM

To: Phil <phil-4tuna@kalama.com>; P.N.Harbison@gmail.com; Lynn54@gmail.com; Joy Greenberg <joy@etengofflaw.com>; Susan Dennis Langham <masdl2011@gmail.com>; Craig Frkovich <craigf@kalama.com>; Dan Ohall <d-ohall@scattercreek.com>; Adam Smee <asmee@kalama.com>; kras mussen@kalama.com; 'John Floyd' <jfloyd@mcknze.com>

Subject: P.C. Meeting information

Importance: High

Hello to all, attached is the information for the upcoming meeting this Wednesday the 14th. There is a lot of information for this meeting and if any of you have questions please call, come in or email.

I am going to send this infor in two emails.

Thank you

Susan Junnikkala 😊