



KITTTITAS COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

411 N. Ruby St., Suite 2, Ellensburg, WA 98926

CDS@CO.KITTTITAS.WA.US

Office (509) 962-7506

Fax (509) 962-7682

"Building Partnerships – Building Communities"

May 24, 2012

Central Cascades Land Company, Inc.
Attn: Ms. Anne Watanabe
Vice President, Acquisitions and Development
P.O. Box 687
Roslyn, WA 98941

RE: May 21, 2012 Letter Regarding No. 5 Canyon PUD and Long Plat (RZ—09-00001) and Black Gold PUD (RZ-08-00007) and SP-08-00028

Ms. Watanabe;

Thank you for your letter on May 21, 2012 regarding No. 5 Canyon PUD and accompanying long plat and Black Gold PUD and accompanying SP-08-00028 submitted in 2009. There are several issues within your letter I wish to address.

First, you are correct that the No. 5 Canyon PUD does not indicate "reserved for future development" upon the map submitted with the PUD application. I intended to only use that to emphasize in my letter that both of the applications, No. 5 Canyon included, do not show enough information for the County to consider it a Master Plan of the PUD. The "sufficient detail" that is necessary to be considered a Master Plan for a PUD is a determination by administration officials of the County. There are several criteria within the Code that directs administration to determine that neither Black Gold PUD nor No. 5 Canyon PUD provides maps of "sufficient detail" to be considered a "Master Site Plan" maps.

One of the primary indicators of the "sufficiency" of a Master Site Plan map is "location" as indicated within the existing Code and as suggested by your letter. Within your letter you suggest the proposal indicates, "the location and size of open space and park area, the location and size of neighborhood service areas, and the location, type and density of residential structures for each phase." The map does not, for purposes of approving the PUD in stages, provide this information. I understand the difference between a preliminary plan and a final plan, and that the plan does not have to be "engineered" to detail in preliminary analysis. But the "pattern of development" has not been indicated upon the preliminary site plan to meet the "sufficient" standard suggested within KCC 17.36.030 (5)(j).

Other Master Plans as PUDs that I have reviewed in the past do show the location of buildings or lots so that preliminary analysis can be made regarding transportation movement within the eventual development, adequate proposed access to parks and open spaces, the potential placement of neighborhood centers needed to serve the eventual community and, in many cases, the lot configuration to determine potential for the land to accommodate the number of residents planned for. I have identified within the map submitted with the No. 5 Canyon PUD application the timelines for phases, approximate location of phases, approximate location of parks and open spaces, topography of the land, and potential number of residents in each phase, as you have indicated within your letter. I have not noted a "probable development pattern" showing potential community movement, nor the "planned off-street parking areas including the number of spaces to be provided," as requested by Code 17.36.030(2)(a) and (c) needed for the preliminary development plan analysis.

While no engineering is required for the preliminary plan, it must provide adequate information to judge the ability of the land to accommodate services necessary for such a development. Changes can be made to the preliminary plan as deemed necessary as the project develops, but there must be adequate information provided to analyze those proposed changes. From the maps provided with the Black Gold PUD and No. 5 Canyon PUD applications, it would be difficult for the County to evaluate potential proposed changes as being "minor" or "major."

Another issue which you bring up in your letter is that the application "vests" with the submittal of a completed application. While I have addressed the adequacy of the submitted map as being a "Master Plan" for the PUD, it should be noted that the application does not vest the entire project because it is a rezone, and the only action that "vests" is the subdivision that accompanies the rezone application. Rezone applications do not vest. The rezone application's "completeness" is intended to continue processing the rezone, or PUD, application; it does not vest the application. Therefore, County has decided to vest only the subdivision related to the PUD as indicated by Mr. Valoff's and my letters since subdivisions do "vest" with the application according to past court cases and State law.

Should you wish to discuss this further, please call me at 962-7506 or by email at doc.hansen@co.kittitas.wa.us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Doc Hansen", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Robert "Doc" Hansen
Planning Official

cc. Neil Caulkings, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dan Valoff, Planner