



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS  
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

**AGENDA  
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, June 2, 2016

2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
Public Service Center  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Training Room

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>TIME</u>		<u>FACILITATOR</u>
	<u>Start</u>	<u>Duration</u>	
1. Administrative Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB's website</li> <li>• Review/Adopt minutes</li> <li>• Review upcoming events</li> <li>• DEAB member announcements</li> </ul>	2:30	15 min	Hardy
2. Plat Extensions/Site Plan Approval	2:45	20 min	Snell
3. Impact Fee/Payment Delay	3:05	20 min	Howsley
4. Shoreline Exemptions	3:25	20 min	Hardy/Ellinger
5. BLA's/Preliminary Land Use Approval	3:45	20 min	Ellinger
6. Public Comment	4:05	20 min	All

**Next DEAB Meeting:**

**Thursday, July 7, 2015**  
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
Public Service Center  
6th Floor, Training Room

**Agenda:**  
TBD



### **BOCC Work Sessions and Hearings**

BOCC Work Session – every Wednesday at 9 a.m. \*

BOCC Hearing – every Tuesday at 10 a.m. \*\*

BOCC Work Session – Cowlitz Tribe / Parametrix Presentation Water reclamation Plant (WRP) followed by Vadose Zone Injection Wells – Monday, June 6, 9:30 a.m.

BOCC Work Session – Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant – Tuesday, June 7, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Work Session – Community Development on Fire and Life Safety Inspection Program for Business Occupancies – Wednesday, June 8, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Hearing – Road Vacation, Portion of Axel Peterson Rd – Tuesday, June 14, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Hearing – CTRAN Board Meeting – Tuesday, June 14, 5:30 p.m.

BOCC Hearing – Bi-Annual Code – Tuesday, June 28, 9:00 a.m.

### **PC Work Sessions and Hearings**

PC Public Hearing – 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update – Thursday, June 2, 6:30 p.m.

There are no Planning Commission Work Sessions or Public Hearings scheduled for the month of July, 2016

*Note: Work sessions are frequently rescheduled. Check with the BOCC's office to confirm date/time of scheduled meetings.*

*PC – Planning Commission*

*BOCC – Board of Clark County Commissioners*

\* Unless cancelled, which some are if there are no topics

\*\* Except first Tuesday when the hearing is typically in the evening

**Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting**  
**May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016**  
**2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.**  
**Public Service Center**

Board members in attendance: Steve Bacon, Don Hardy, Ott Gaither, Eric Golemo, James Howsley, and Mike Odren.

Board members not in attendance: Andrew Gunther, Terry Wollam, and Jeff Wriston

County staff: Greg Shafer, Marty Snell, Carol Brown, Susan Ellinger, Ali Safayi, Peter Silliman and Leslie Ernesti

Public: None

**Administrative Actions**

- DEAB meeting is recorded and posted to the county's website.
- Review/Adopt Minutes: Minutes from April 2016 were adopted with minor corrections.
- Review of Upcoming Events by Shafer:
- BOCC Work Session – every Wednesday at 9 a.m. (Unless cancelled, which some are if there are no topics)
  - BOCC Hearing – every Tuesday at 10 a.m. (Except first Tuesday when the hearing is typically at 6 p.m.)
    - BOCC Hearing – Community Service Housing Urban Development Action Plans - Tuesday, May 10, 10:00 a.m.
    - BOCC Work Session – Bi-Annual Code – Wednesday, May 11, 9:00 a.m.
    - BOCC Work Session – 2015 International Codes – Wednesday, May 25, 10:30 a.m.
  - Planning Commission Work Sessions and Hearings
    - PC Work Session – Comp Plan Update and Park Impact Fees – Thursday, May 5, 5:30 p.m.
    - Joint Public Hearing BOCC and PC - Comprehensive Plan Updates - Thursday, May 19, 6:00 p.m.
    - 2nd Joint Public Hearing BOCC and PC - Comprehensive Plan Updates - Thursday, May 24, 6:00 p.m.

**DEAB member announcements**

- Odren stated it appears when the biannual code amendments went to the PC on April 21<sup>st</sup> staff added items in regards to the Highway 99 overlay. It was DEAB's understanding that those were only to be clarifications. Later Bazala confirmed these items were in fact in the DEAB packet.

- Hardy asks Snell to explain the Community Service Housing Urban Development Action Plans hearing scheduled May 10<sup>th</sup>. Snell replies it is probably the HUD plan. Shafer suggests Vanessa Gaston could be helpful, Snell adds it was previously Pete Monroe.
- Hardy asks if Park Impact Fees should be discussed. Golemo responds the city submitted a memo regarding growth rate and they don't want to revisit it for the next few years. He suggested resubmitting their letter. Gaither suggests using the word "update" in place of "correct" and Golemo agreed.
  - Golemo added it would be a mess to revisit the growth plan at this point. Rather than be in violation of the Code Management Act, Golemo suggests adopting the plan and committing to revisit and updating with the new data shortly after adoption, noting it will be a several year effort. Golemo filed a motion to update our letter with that language and resubmit to the Planning Commission and the Board. Howsley seconds, motion is passed.
- Hardy states it would be helpful to have a greater focus on affordable housing in the Comp Plan. Hardy questions if there should be incentives/waivers for builders to build multifamily housing.
  - Ott asks if Hardy sees that as a function of the board; technically DEAB is an advisory board not a policy making board.
  - Discussion follows on affordable housing topic, decision to move to next topic.

#### Tidemark Replacement/Phase I Roll-Out

Snell introduced Carol Brown, Community Development Business Technology Manager.

Brown gave an overview of the current status, phasing, challenges, and trainings for the Tidemark Replacement Project. The current system is sixteen years old, outdated and no longer supported by the vendor. Computronix of Edmonton, Canada, was chosen to partner with the county for the new system. It is a commercial off-the-shelf product with requested enhancements approved by an executive steering committee. They kicked off in February 2015 and have gone through the analysis phase.

- Pilot project/Phase 1 is a controlled, soft roll out by the end of the month that includes; New Home Construction permits (LEAN 3.0), Teller, Mobile Product for Inspectors, Limited Public Portal access.
- Phase 2 is scheduled for the end of 2016 and includes; all residential, commercial building and fire permits.
- Phase 3 – Planning and Land Use, Engineering, Environmental and Public Works - Slated to Go Live one year from now.
- Phase 4 – Community Planning, Pet Licensing, Animal Control/Code Enforcement, Fireworks, Burning and misc. begins one year from now
- Phase 5 – Electronic Plan Review - Slated for second half of 2017
  - Gaither asked Brown if a project must start and end within one system. Brown replied this is still in discussion with the vendor. Tidemark will likely stay live through the integration.

They are planning the migration and there are pros, cons and extreme challenges to both options.

- Brown ended with a Public Portal Demonstration of the new system

### Corner Lots/Driveway Spacing and Sight Distance

- Golemo thanked the DEAB Subcommittee members. The committee looked at corner driveway locations, uncontrolled intersections, the Stop Sign policy and recommended sight distances.
- The current code doesn't provide for three car garages on corner lots, and there are inconsistencies in interpretations and enforcement. The committee came up with the following new distances and options to provide more flexibility on corner lot driveways:
  - Decrease the minimum from 50' to 40' from the curb line; this was previously measured from the property line.
    - Hardy asked if these are only residential streets and Golemo replied yes, only residential, local access.
  - By decreasing from 50' to 40' there still might be sight distance issues. Can go down to 40' as long as structure and parked cars in driveway are outside the sight distance triangle.
  - Can still use 20' driveway; added another option of 25' shared driveway. This allows for 20' five feet off the property line. This will add flexibility, and makes no difference on the impact as long as it's a new development and a shared driveway has been specified.
- Uncontrolled intersections; Current policy is 80' unobstructed sight distance on corner lots. Recommendation is to add 60' option if development is utilizing traffic control measures and would require a slower speed. Suggest receiving an incentive.
- Stop sign policy; the committee recommends additional stop signs as safety should trump convenience. They further recommend:
  - Stop Signs on lower volume legs to help establish through streets at 4-way intersections.
  - Stop signs at "T" intersections on the offset leg.
  - Stop signs be considered on side legs of intersections with equal volume legs but where the majority of the side streets have stop control and where the driver expectation is that the side streets stop.
- Gaither stated he is in favor of these changes and motioned that DEAB recommend they be forward to Transportation.
- Hardy asked for any other discussion, seconds the motion. Motion passed.

### PC Changes to Biannuals

Jan Bazala – The Biannuals went to the planning commission on 4/21/16. There were minor changes suggested at the 4/7/16 work session that were integrated. Review of Handout #4A, "Summary of PC Changes to Biannuals":

- Item #19 clarifies that road taper specifications are not included in the County's standard plans.

- Item #20 – At hearing voted not to change the language regarding archeological submittals. Will take to the Board, there is conflicting language as to whether DAHP has to respond or not.
- Item #21 – Conditional Uses – Clarify the process to expand conditional use. Planning Commission asked if there was an avenue for a grandfathered site to expand without getting new CUP. Added language for conditions that allow expanding or modifying Type I Plan Review. Type II would require a conditional use permit.
  - Odren asked what the benefit is to having an established church that doesn't have a current CUP to go through the process of getting one.
  - Bazala replied it's not just relegated to churches, there are other non-conforming uses that might have impacts.
  - Snell added that neighbors might care, i.e. wrecking yard expansion.
- Item #22 – Clarify that garden apartments are subject to multifamily design requirements. Voted not to change the existing conflicting text including an existing typo.
  - Gaither asked for the definition of a garden apartment. Bazala replied they have a central courtyard with gardens.
- Item #25 – Retaining Walls - Rescheduled for 6/16/16 hearing. Kevin Brown, a neighbor with an ongoing dispute, testified. Brown's testimony is included in the DEAB packet. There will be a quick work session prior to the hearing. Golemo asked that DEAB be kept updated on the hearing and suggested they might want to have someone attend.
- Item #29 – Overlay Standards – Process wireless communication facilities as Conditional Uses in the Highway 99 Overlay area. Applies to all areas of Highway 99 cell towers. This would take away the special exemption.

### **Public comment**

There was no public comment

Shafer states June DEAB agenda is open. Agenda items proposed:

- Final Plat Extensions – Suggested by Golemo, led by Snell
- Gaither asks to add site plans
- Delaying impact fees - Howsley notes September coming and need late payment section done. He and Snell are working on it.
- Hardy and Ellinger - Shoreline Exemptions
- Boundary Line Adjustments/Preliminary Land Use Approval – Ellinger will talk to Snell

Meeting adjourned 4:20 pm

Meeting minutes prepared by: Leslie Ernesti

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer



## DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD

---

### **BYLAWS**

#### SECTION 1: PURPOSE

The Board of Clark County Commissioners (now, Board of County Councilors, BOCC) established the Development and Engineering Advisory Board. The purpose of the advisory board is to serve as a standing advisory committee to Community Development, Environmental Services, Public Works, the County Manager, and the BOCC. The Development and Engineering Advisory Board will be a procedural step in reviewing new policy and code revisions, provide input on process improvements, and review specific development issues.

#### SECTION 2: DUTIES

The Development and Engineering Advisory Board has the following duties and responsibilities, as directed by the County Manager, including, but not limited to:

- A) The advisory board shall review and evaluate on an ongoing basis consistency in development plan submittal review.
- B) The advisory board shall assist to standardize and accelerate the development review processes performed by Community Development, Environmental Services, and Public Works.
- C) The advisory board shall advise the County Manager on adequate staffing levels, staff expertise, resources, and customer service attitudes.
- D) The advisory board shall facilitate collaborative partnering between the public and private sectors.
- E) The advisory board shall review and comment as requested by the County Manager, the BOCC and/or senior staff on project specific development issues.
- F) The advisory board shall coordinate its activities with other agencies and boards involved with development review and regulation to avoid duplication and provide the best service possible.
- G) The advisory board shall not be responsible for the day-to-day operations of county development functions and shall refer those matters to appropriate staff members. The current phone number and mailing address are as follows:

Development and Engineering Advisory Board  
c/o Clark County Public Works – Development Engineering  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810  
(360) 397-6118

### SECTION 3: MEMBERSHIP

The Development and Engineering Advisory Board consists of ~~ten~~<sup>nine</sup> members. Members are appointed by the County Manager. Appointments shall attempt to include the following affiliations and categories, as provided below. Such representation shall be:

- A) Three members who are a private-sector planner or consulting licensed professional engineer who work or live in Clark County;
- B) One member who is a public sector planner or licensed professional engineer who works or lives in Clark County;
- C) One member who is a construction contractor who works or lives in Clark County;
- D) One member who is a land developer who works or lives in Clark County;
- ~~E)~~ E) One member who is a representative of the Building Industry Association of Clark County.
- ~~F)~~ F) One member who is associated with Commercial or Industrial development.
- ~~G)~~ G) Two at-large members professionally associated with development work.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Right: 0", Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 1.08"

In addition to these members, the Directors of Community Development, Environmental Services, and Public Works shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the advisory board.

### SECTION 4: TERMS OF THE OFFICE

All members shall be appointed or reappointed to three-year terms. More than one consecutive term may be served.

SECTION 5: APPOINTMENTS AND VACANCIES

For the two at-large positions, the advisory board shall recommend applicants to the County Manager for appointment. The advisory board shall make these recommendations based on the background of current members and the advisory board's priorities for upcoming years. The goal is to have membership on the advisory board represent a balance of development interests.

For all other positions, the County Manager shall appoint members after soliciting letters of interest for the advisory board.

When vacancies occur, the County Manager shall appoint someone to fill the unexpired term. This includes vacancies caused by a change in status of a member under the selection criteria set forth above during the course of their term.

Vacancies may be declared when any member misses three consecutive regular meetings or when any member misses the equivalent of one-quarter of the scheduled meetings within a 12-month period. Reasonable effort will be made to determine the member's continued interest before the vacancy is declared.

This section will in no way abrogate the authority of the County Manager to reappoint a member to finish their original term of appointment.

SECTION 6: OFFICERS

The advisory board shall elect annually one of its voting members to serve as chair and one member to serve as vice-chair; other officers shall be elected as the board deems appropriate.

Election of officers shall be held at the first regular Board meeting of the calendar year. All terms of elected office shall be one year. More than one consecutive term may be served.

SECTION 7: MEETINGS

The advisory board will hold regular meetings, open to the public, and will give advanced public notice of these meetings by notice on the Clark County web site and via e-mail when requested. Until otherwise determined by the advisory board, the regular board meetings will be held as follows:

Day: First Thursday of each month  
Time: 2:30-4:30 p.m.  
Place: Clark County Public Service Building  
1300 Franklin Street  
Vancouver, WA 98666

A majority of the currently appointed board members shall constitute a quorum.

The advisory board shall keep written record of meetings, resolutions, recommendations, findings, etc., which shall be a public record. The county shall provide staff to take minutes.

In the absence of the chair and vice-chair (in the event a vice-chair has been elected), an acting chair shall be appointed by the board members present.

#### SECTION 8: AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

The provisions set forth herein (except those established by statute and county resolution) may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the advisory board members. Any amendments shall be voted on at a regular meeting and all members shall receive a minimum of 10 days prior notice.

#### SECTION 9: PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

All meetings of the Board shall be conducted using Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised as a nonbinding guide.

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Don Hardy, President  
Clark County Development and Engineering Advisory Board

FROM: Steve Madsen, General Counsel  
Aho Construction I, Inc.

RE: Clark County PUD Ordinance

DATE: May 12, 2016

Aho Construction I, Inc., respectfully requests that the Clark County Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) add "Revisions to CCC 40.520.080 (PUD Ordinance)" to its current annual work plan. The brief synopsis below will illustrate a number of issues related to the County's application of its PUD Ordinance:

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project was originally proposed for 232 single family detached residences at NE 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 135<sup>th</sup> Street in the Vancouver UGA. The project consists of two adjacent parcels, the first being approximately 34 acres and zoned R1-6 and the second being approximately 7 acres zoned R-30.

### PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Prior to application submittal, Aho inquired with the County as to whether the R1-6 and R30 zones could be blended together in the PUD such that minimum average densities would be maintained, albeit using single-family, detached homes not otherwise allowed in the R30 zone. On December 16, 2016, Jan Bazala sent an e-mail to Aho indicating that this was an acceptable application of the PUD ordinance. Based on Mr. Bazala's authorization, project engineers began the design process.

On January 27, 2016, County planner Terri Brooks issued an affirmative staff report for the project. The report, however, contained the following caveat: "[T]his decision is in no way meant to establish precedence and is not indicative of our interpretation of CCC40.520.080 moving forward" (pages 6-7 of the staff report). There was no further explanation or comment regarding this obvious equivocation.

On February 11, 2016, a public hearing was held before the Hearings Examiner. During the hearing, counsel for the applicant raised the issue highlighted in the staff report regarding Jan Bazala's approval of the PUD design alteration. There was a brief exchange between counsel and the Hearings Examiner regarding the meaning of that language. Counsel indicated he was prepared to submit briefing in support of Mr. Bazala's approval. The hearings examiner responded, "If you want to submit a clarifying note of some sort that's fine... I don't know that it's necessary." In fact, it was this specific issue that gave rise to the denial of the structural design modification approved in the Staff Report.

On March 1, 2016, the Hearings Examiner issued his decision denying the portion of the application which allowed for detached residences in the R30 zone. Specifically, and contrary to the oral comments made by the Hearings Examiner at the public hearing, the Final Order states, "[C]ompliance shall be reflected on the final plat, including the prohibition against detached single-family homes on land zoned R-30 (Phase 1), unless the developer obtains a rezone on this part of the site." The Hearings Examiner went on to note that Mr. Bazala could not legally bind the County to what, in his opinion, was an illegal decision.

On March 15, 2016, Aho submitted a Motion for Reconsideration arguing that the detached SFR's should be allowed throughout the PUD or, alternatively, that the R30 portion of the zone could be moved around within the PUD.

On March 28, 2016, County Planner Terri Brooks issued a supplemental staff report arguing that detached SFR's should not be allowed in the R30 zone, even in the case of a PUD.

On April 1, 2016, County prosecutor Chris Horne issued a supplemental statement in support of the PUD as proposed.

On April 13, the Hearings Examiner issued his decision on reconsideration prohibiting detached SFR's in the R30 zone, but allowing the zone to be moved throughout the PUD.

On post-decision review, Aho is requesting that the County allow most of the R30 zone to be used as parks and/or private recreational facilities as an allowed use under county code. Twelve townhomes will be included in the PUD to absorb the leftover R30 acreage resulting in a gross total of about 266 units.

#### ANALYSIS

As the above chronology sets forth, there appears to be substantial ambiguity among staff as to how Clark County's PUD ordinance is to be applied. In this case, in particular, the abutment of the R1-6 to the R30 zones create an incongruous mix of high and low density zones. In retrospect, an R12, R18 or R22 rezone would have accomplished the same purpose as the originally proposed PUD. However, because the R1-6 and R30 zones exist within different comprehensive plan designations (medium density and high density respectively), a rezone in this case would also have required a comprehensive plan amendment which is not practical in the current political environment.

The key questions here are: 1) What level of design flexibility is currently allowed within the PUD ordinance across multiple (and possibly conflicting) and 2) What changes to the PUD code are necessary, if any, to achieve both flexibility of design and certainty in the approval process?

Aho argues that the PUD ordinance should be a vehicle for flexibility in cases where rigid application of either the comprehensive plan or the existing zoning ordinance result in absurd outcomes such as twelve townhomes in the center of a 250-lot detached SFR development. We respectfully request that DEAB add revisions to the PUD ordinance to its current annual work plan.

2. Applications for Approval of Final Site Plan/Final Construction Plan.
  - a. Initial Review. Initial review shall be completed within twenty-one (21) calendar days of a counter-complete submittal. During the initial review, the plans shall be reviewed for completeness and correctness and the responsible official shall identify errors, omissions or inaccuracies in the application. The submittal shall also be reviewed by county staff for compliance with additional requirements including, but not limited to, wetland review, required dedications, and approval letters from other agencies. County staff shall notify the applicant or the applicant's representative when the reviewed submittal materials are available to be picked up and, unless waived by the responsible official, shall schedule a meeting with the applicant or the applicant's representative to review county staff's comments.
    - (1) If, after the initial review, the responsible official concludes that the application complies with the requirements of the code the responsible official shall issue a decision pursuant to Section 40.510.010(C)(2)(d).
    - (2) If, after the initial review, the responsible official concludes that the application does not comply, the applicant shall amend the application and submit the amended application to the county for a second review.
  - b. Second Review. The second review shall be completed within fourteen (14) calendar days of the submittal of corrected plans. County staff shall notify the applicant or the applicant's representative when the reviewed submittal materials are available.
    - (1) If, after the second review, the responsible official concludes that the application complies with the requirements of the code, the responsible official shall issue a decision pursuant to Section 40.510.010(C)(2)(d).
    - (2) If, after the second review, the responsible official concludes that the application does not comply, the applicant shall amend the application and submit the amended application to the county for a third review.
  - c. Third Review. The third review shall be completed within seven (7) calendar days of the submittal of corrected plans. Upon completion of the third review, the responsible official shall issue a decision pursuant to Section 40.510.010(C)(2)(d).
  - d. Within five (5) calendar days of the completion of the county's review, the responsible official shall approve or deny the application; provided:

**Applicant’s Narrative**

1. Please give us a description of your project.

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

2. Does your project fall into one of these exemptions? (Mark all that apply)

- New single family home or accessory structure
- Replacement single family home or accessory structure
- Addition to single-family home or accessory structure
- Project with a total cost that will not exceed \$6,416.  
*The total cost or fair market value of the development shall include the fair market value of any donated, contributed, or found labor, equipment or materials.*
- Normal repair and maintenance of legally established structures/development  
*The features of the repaired structure or development, including but not limited to its size, shape, configuration, location, and external appearance, must be comparable to the original structure or development, and the repair must not cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or environment.*

Please describe how the project meets this requirement:

---



---



---



---

- Construction of a dock for a single or multi-family residence for private, non-commercial use only – limit for cost
- None of the above (please use the standard/non-residential exemption form)

3. Proposal includes the following structures:

N/A

Structure	Existing size in square feet (if applicable)	New size in square feet (if applicable)	Distance to ordinary high water mark (OHWM)	Height of structure from ground to peak	Type of siding/roofing materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Single family home					
<input type="checkbox"/> Garage with _____ bays					
<input type="checkbox"/> Shop					
<input type="checkbox"/> Deck					
<input type="checkbox"/> Fence	N/A				
<input type="checkbox"/> Other please describe:					

4. Completely describe any proposed clearing or grading included in the project. Include such items as:

- a. The amount of material (gravel, rock, etc.) to be removed or placed
- b. The type and size of equipment that will be used to carry out the project
- c. How the grading and clearing of native vegetation was minimized in the shoreline area

- No clearing within the shoreline area is proposed
- No grading within the shoreline area is proposed

---



---



---



---



---



---

5. Will the project involve removal of any trees that are 20 or more years old?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

- 6. Has a state or county forest practice permit been issued within the last 6 years for the subject parcel?
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't Know
  
- 7. Has the site previously been graded to a depth of more than eight inches?
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't Know

**PLEASE NOTE: Depending on the details of your proposal, additional information may be required, such as:**

- Additional details of the proposed project
- Additional information on grading or grading plan
- Information on impacts to wetlands or habitat

DRAFT



# Shoreline Exemption Staff Report

## For Residential/Common Exemptions Use Type I Review

Shoreline designation of property:

- Aquatic
- Natural
- Urban Conservancy
- Medium Intensity
- High Intensity
- Residential
- Resource Lands

Use is:

- P - Permitted
- C - Conditional
- X - Excluded
- N/A-Not applicable
- UNL-Unlimited

Distance to OHWM:

Minimum setback for all structures/development: \_\_\_\_\_ feet

- All development proposed meets minimum setback

Archeological study: *(see Condition 4)*

- Archeological study submitted and no additional study recommended
- Not required because the proposal is found to have low potential impacts because it involves:
  - No ground disturbance
  - Only normal maintenance and repair of existing structures and facilities
  - Lands that have been substantially disturbed to a depth of more than eight (8) inches. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
- Areas that have been adequately surveyed in the past with no discovery of resources.

Revised 12/4/14



Community Development  
 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington  
 Phone: (360) 397-2375 Fax: (360) 397-2011  
[www.clark.wa.gov/development](http://www.clark.wa.gov/development)



For an alternate format,  
 contact the Clark County  
 ADA Compliance Office.  
 Phone: (360)397-2322  
 Relay: 711 or (800) 833-6384  
 E-mail: [ADA@clark.wa.gov](mailto:ADA@clark.wa.gov)

Critical areas that exist on site:

- CARA
- Flood hazard area
- Geologic hazard area (within 100 feet)
- Habitat conservation area
- Wetland

Critical area impacts:

- Applicant proposes impact to critical areas. All impacts are minimized and fully mitigated as conditioned. See staff report for XXX2016-000XX.

Consistency with applicable shoreline criteria (40.460.510-590) Add to table if needed

Applicable	Brief Comments	Condition of Approval
	Proposed use does not preclude or displace other water dependent/related uses that could be proposed by property owner.	1
	Clearing of native vegetation, grading and impervious surfaces are minimized in proposed design.	1,2
	Uses meet minimum setbacks, no need for stabilization	1
	Hazardous materials shall be disposed of and other steps be taken to protect the ecological integrity of the shoreline area	3
	No in-water work/in-stream structures proposed	
	Parking, storage and non-water dependent uses located landward of water oriented uses	
	Uses near shoreline are screened without blocking visual access to water	
	Fencing, walls, etc designed to not impact wildlife movement	
	Utilities located within roadway and driveway corridors and rights-of-way wherever feasible	
	Proposed building materials minimize reflected light	4
	No public access proposed or required	
	No net loss of ecological function	

Consistency with applicable use-specific criteria (40-460.600-) Add to table if needed  
*Criteria that are duplicative with those in 40460.510-590 are not listed here*

Applic-able	Proposed Use	Brief Comments	Condition of Approval
	Agriculture		
	Aquaculture		
	Boating uses		
	Residential		
	Boundary line adj.	Proposed lot layout does not create need for structural flood hazard/stabilization measures	
		Loss of shoreline ecological function will be avoided	
		Proposal will not create non-conforming lot arrangement	
	Residential expansion	Legal residential structure one-time expansion, no more than 25% of habitable floor area of existing structure	
		Proposal meets height limitation	
		All development is land-ward of existing	
		No net loss demonstrated	
	Damaged Structure	Damage by demolition, fire, flood or other disaster (damage is less than 75% of replacement cost)	
		Reconstruction will not cause adverse effects to adjacent properties or shoreline	
		Proposal maintains original footprint	
		Proposed structure in original location for farther land-ward of OHWM	
		Within 12 months of damage	
		Construction must begin within one year of approval – modify condition	4
	Signs		
	Transportation		
	Utility		

**Standard Conditions**

1. All developments authorized by this permit shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted plans. The applicant shall only impact areas on the provided plans during construction of this project. Any substantial revisions or deviations from this plan must be submitted to Clark County for review and approval prior to engagement of those activities. Any clearing or disturbance beyond that indicated on the plans and narrative provided would require additional habitat and shoreline review by County staff and may include additional permit and mitigation requirements.
2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of associated case, as follows: (list HAB, WET, etc. cases)
3. Hazardous materials shall be disposed of and other steps shall be taken to protect the ecological integrity of the shoreline area in accordance with the policies and regulations of this Program as amended and all other applicable federal, state, and local statutes, regulations, codes, and ordinances. Best Management Practices of Construction Pollution Prevention shall be a part of any proposed activity onsite as mandated by Clark County Code and the Department of Ecology's Stormwater Regulations.
4. Should archaeological materials (e.g. bones, shell, stone tools, beads, ceramics, old bottles, hearths, etc.) be observed during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity should stop and the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (360-586-3065), the County planning office, and the affected Tribe(s) should be contacted immediately. If any human remains are observed, all work should cease and the immediate area secured. Local law enforcement, the county medical examiner (360-397-8405), State Physical Anthropologist, Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (360-586-3534), the County planning office, and the affected Tribe(s) should be contacted immediately. Compliance with all applicable laws pertaining to archaeological resources (RCW 27.53, 27.44 and WAC 25-48) and human remains (RCW 68.50) is required. Failure to comply with this requirement could constitute a Class C Felony.
5. Building Design.
  - a. Building surfaces on or adjacent to the water shall employ materials that minimize reflected light.
  - b. Interior and exterior structure lighting shall be designed, shielded and operated to:
    - i. Avoid illuminating nearby properties or public areas;
    - ii. Prevent glare on adjacent properties, public areas or roadways;
    - iii. Prevent land and water traffic hazards; and
    - iv. Reduce night sky effects to avoid impacts to fish and wildlife.
  - c. Accessory uses, including parking, shall be located as far landward as possible while still serving their intended purposes.
6. Construction shall be commenced, or where no construction is involved, the use or activity shall be commenced within two (2) years of the effective date of a shoreline permit; provided, a single extension may be granted for a period not to exceed one (1) year based on

reasonable factors, if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date and notice of the proposed extension is given to parties of record and the Department of Ecology.

7. Except as provided by WAC 173-27-090(1), authorization to conduct development activities shall terminate five (5) years after the effective date of a shoreline permit; provided, that local government may authorize a single extension for a period not to exceed one (1) year based on reasonable factors, if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date and notice of the proposed extension is given to parties of record and the department.
8. Authorization to complete the project terminates five (5) years after the effective date of this shoreline review; provided, that a single extension for a period not to exceed one (1) year based on reasonable factors can be granted if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date.

**Attachments:**

- Proposed Site Plan
- DAHP letter

---

A copy of the approved preliminary plan and Clark County Code are available for review at:

**Department of Community Development**  
**1300 Franklin Street**  
**P.O. Box 9810**  
**Vancouver, WA 98666-9810**  
**Phone: (360) 397-2375; Fax: (360) 397-2011**

A copy of the Clark County Code is also available on our Web Page at:  
<http://www.co.clark.wa.us>

The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Exemption has been approved (SHL2016-00001) by the Shoreline Management Review Committee on XX, 2016.

---

Heath Henderson, PE  
Public Works Director/County Engineer, SMRC Chair

---

Bill Bjerke, Parks and Recreation

---

Marty Snell, Community Development Director

---

Environmental Services Director

<b>SHORELINE PERMIT APPEAL PROCESS</b>
--

Any party of record to the project may appeal any aspect of the decision to the Superior Court within fourteen (14) days of the final decision.

I am requesting an EXEMPTION from obtaining a Shoreline Management Substantial Development Permit under SCC 30.44.120 for the project described as follows:

**Applicant’s Narrative**

1. Please give us a description of your project.

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

2. Shoreline Exemption Criteria

Please mark the exemption that applies to the project you are proposing. Please see CCC40.460.230.B for a full description of each exemption.

	Mark any that apply	Exemption Category
1.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cost less than \$6,416
2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Maintenance or repair of existing structure
3.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bulkhead for single family residence
4.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Emergency construction
5.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural construction
6.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Navigational aids
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Single-family residence or outbuilding
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dock for single or multi-family
9.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Irrigation systems
10.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Surveying
11.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural drainage
12.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Certification from the governor
13.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Site exploration
14.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weed control
15.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Watershed restoration
16.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Improvement to fish/wildlife habitat
17.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fish habitat enhancement
18.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazardous Waste Cleanup
19.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Forest practices

3. Please describe how the project meets the exemption:

---



---



---



---



---



---

4. Please fill out the table below for any existing/proposed buildings

N/A

Building	Existing size in square feet (if applicable)	New size in square feet (if applicable)	Distance to ordinary high water mark (OHWM)	Height of structure from ground to peak	Type of siding/roofing materials

5. Completely describe any proposed clearing or grading included in the project. Include such items as:

- a. The amount of material (gravel, rock, etc.) to be removed or placed
- b. The type and size of equipment that will be used to carry out the project
- c. How the grading and clearing of native vegetation was minimized in the shoreline area

- No clearing within the shoreline area is proposed
- No grading within the shoreline area is proposed

---



---



---



---



---



---

6. Please give a brief description of how the project meets any applicable use-specific criteria (CCC40.460.630)

Applicable	Proposed Use	Brief Comments
	Agriculture	
	Aquaculture	
	Boating uses	
	Commercial uses	
	Forest Practices	
	Industrial uses	
	Mining	
	Parking	
	Recreational uses	
	Residential	
	Signs	
	Transportation	
	Utility	

6. Will the project involve removal of any trees that are 20 or more years old?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

7. Has a state or county forest practice permit been issued within the last 6 years for the subject parcel?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

8. Has the site previously been graded to a depth of more than eight inches?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

**PLEASE NOTE: Depending on the details of your proposal, additional information may be required, such as:**

- Additional details of the proposed project
- Additional information on grading or grading plan
- Information on impacts to wetlands or habitat



# Shoreline Exemption Staff Report

## For Non-Residential/Standard Exemptions Use Type II Review

Shoreline designation of property:

- Aquatic
- Natural
- Urban Conservancy
- Medium Intensity
- High Intensity
- Residential
- Resource Lands

Use is:

- P - Permitted
- C - Conditional
- X - Excluded
- N/A-Not applicable
- UNL-Unlimited

Distance to OHWM:

Minimum setback for all structures/development: \_\_\_\_\_ feet

- All development proposed meets minimum setback

Archeological study: *(see Condition 4)*

- Archeological study submitted and no additional study recommended
- Not required because the proposal is found to have low potential impacts because it involves:
  - No ground disturbance
  - Only normal maintenance and repair of existing structures and facilities
  - Lands that have been substantially disturbed to a depth of more than eight (8) inches. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
- Areas that have been adequately surveyed in the past with no discovery of resources.

Revised 12/4/14



Community Development  
 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington  
 Phone: (360) 397-2375 Fax: (360) 397-2011  
[www.clark.wa.gov/development](http://www.clark.wa.gov/development)



For an alternate format,  
 contact the Clark County  
 ADA Compliance Office.  
 Phone: (360)397-2322  
 Relay: 711 or (800) 833-6384  
 E-mail: ADA@clark.wa.gov

Critical areas that exist on site:

- CARA
- Flood hazard area
- Geologic hazard area (within 100 feet)
- Habitat conservation area
- Wetland

Critical area impacts:

- Applicant proposes impact to critical areas. All impacts are minimized and fully mitigated as conditioned. See staff report for XXX2016-000XX.

Consistency with applicable shoreline criteria (40.460.510-590) Add to table if needed

Applicable	Brief Comments	Condition of Approval
	Proposed use does not preclude or displace other water dependent/related uses that could be proposed by property owner.	1
	Clearing of native vegetation, grading and impervious surfaces are minimized in proposed design.	1,2
	Uses meet minimum setbacks, no need for stabilization	1
	Hazardous materials shall be disposed of and other steps be taken to protect the ecological integrity of the shoreline area	3
	No in-water work/in-stream structures proposed	
	Parking, storage and non-water dependent uses located landward of water oriented uses	
	Uses near shoreline are screened without blocking visual access to water	
	Fencing, walls, etc designed to not impact wildlife movement	
	Utilities located within roadway and driveway corridors and rights-of-way wherever feasible	
	Proposed building materials minimize reflected light	4
	No public access proposed or required	
	No net loss of ecological function	

Consistency with applicable use-specific criteria (40-460.600-) Add to table if needed  
*Criteria that are duplicative with those in 40460.510-590 are not listed here*

Applicable	Proposed Use	Brief Comments	Condition of Approval
	Agriculture	N/A	
	Aquaculture	N/A	
	Boating uses	N/A	
	Commercial uses	N/A	
	Forest Practices	N/A	
	Industrial uses	N/A	
	Mining	N/A	
	Parking	N/A	
	Recreational uses	N/A	
	Residential	N/A	
	Signs	N/A	
X	Transportation	No additional comments, see applicant's response	N/A
	Utility	N/A	

## Standard Conditions

1. All developments authorized by this permit shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted plans. The applicant shall only impact areas on the provided plans during construction of this project. Any substantial revisions or deviations from this plan must be submitted to Clark County for review and approval prior to engagement of those activities. Any clearing or disturbance beyond that indicated on the plans and narrative provided would require additional habitat and shoreline review by County staff and may include additional permit and mitigation requirements.
2. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of associated case, as follows: (list HAB, WET, etc. cases)
3. Hazardous materials shall be disposed of and other steps shall be taken to protect the ecological integrity of the shoreline area in accordance with the policies and regulations of this Program as amended and all other applicable federal, state, and local statutes, regulations, codes, and ordinances. Best Management Practices of Construction Pollution Prevention shall be a part of any proposed activity onsite as mandated by Clark County Code and the Department of Ecology's Stormwater Regulations.
4. Should archaeological materials (e.g. bones, shell, stone tools, beads, ceramics, old bottles, hearths, etc.) be observed during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity should stop and the State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (360-586-3065), the County planning office, and the affected Tribe(s) should be contacted immediately. If any human remains are observed, all work should cease and the immediate area secured. Local law enforcement, the county medical examiner (360-397-8405), State Physical Anthropologist, Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (360-586-3534), the County planning office, and the affected Tribe(s) should be contacted immediately. Compliance with all applicable laws pertaining to archaeological resources (RCW 27.53, 27.44 and WAC 25-48) and human remains (RCW 68.50) is required. Failure to comply with this requirement could constitute a Class C Felony.
5. Building Design.
  - a. Building surfaces on or adjacent to the water shall employ materials that minimize reflected light.
  - b. Interior and exterior structure lighting shall be designed, shielded and operated to:
    - i. Avoid illuminating nearby properties or public areas;
    - ii. Prevent glare on adjacent properties, public areas or roadways;
    - iii. Prevent land and water traffic hazards; and
    - iv. Reduce night sky effects to avoid impacts to fish and wildlife.
  - c. Accessory uses, including parking, shall be located as far landward as possible while still serving their intended purposes.
6. Construction shall be commenced, or where no construction is involved, the use or activity shall be commenced within two (2) years of the effective date of a shoreline permit; provided, a single extension may be granted for a period not to exceed one (1) year based on

reasonable factors, if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date and notice of the proposed extension is given to parties of record and the Department of Ecology.

7. Except as provided by WAC 173-27-090(1), authorization to conduct development activities shall terminate five (5) years after the effective date of a shoreline permit; provided, that local government may authorize a single extension for a period not to exceed one (1) year based on reasonable factors, if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date and notice of the proposed extension is given to parties of record and the department.
8. Authorization to complete the project terminates five (5) years after the effective date of this shoreline review; provided, that a single extension for a period not to exceed one (1) year based on reasonable factors can be granted if a request for extension has been filed before the expiration date.

**Attachments:**

- Proposed Site Plan
- DAHP letter

---

A copy of the approved preliminary plan and Clark County Code are available for review at:

**Department of Community Development**  
**1300 Franklin Street**  
**P.O. Box 9810**  
**Vancouver, WA 98666-9810**  
**Phone: (360) 397-2375; Fax: (360) 397-2011**

A copy of the Clark County Code is also available on our Web Page at:  
<http://www.co.clark.wa.us>

The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit Exemption has been approved (SHL2016-00001) by the Shoreline Management Review Committee on XX, 2016.

---

Heath Henderson, PE  
Public Works Director/County Engineer, SMRC Chair

---

Bill Bjerke, Parks and Recreation

---

Marty Snell, Community Development Director

---

Environmental Services Director

<b>SHORELINE PERMIT APPEAL PROCESS</b>
--

Any party of record to the project may appeal any aspect of the decision to the Superior Court within fourteen (14) days of the final decision.

I am requesting an EXEMPTION from obtaining a Shoreline Management Substantial Development Permit under SCC 30.44.120 for the project described as follows: