City Council – VEA Recommendations P&B Lakes

June 20, 2011

Jack Rodgers – 22708 SE 22nd Pl,

* I’m here to ask for the Council’s support for the “Recommended Alternatives” to the SMP that SHO will be discussing tonight.
* I’d like to specifically address the VEA requirements on Pine and Beaver Lake.

One of DOE’s 77 changes, is for the Requirement of a 15ft VEA on P&B Lake.
(This is for any new development, or expansion within the setback area)

I was disappointed to see this change after all the effort and discussion that went into this issue.

The Cities SMP Encouraged the use of a 15ft VEA, but didn’t require it. This was done as an offset for an 80% tree retention requirement. The City gave significant credit to having an 80% tree retention requirement as mitigation for a VEA Requirement.

DOE wasn’t a part of these discussions, and the correlation between the 2 requirements isn’t obvious in the SMP document. So I can understand how DOE arrived at this change.

It is frustrating for anyone involved in the development of the SMP to see the number of changes that DOE has made. Many sections of the code are related, and were designed as a cohesive set of requirement, and DOE has just dismantled some of these.

With that in mind here is a set of 6 recommendations with regards to the VEA’s on P&B Lakes that I would recommend the Council support.

1. 1st That the Council ACCEPTS DOE’s Requirement for a 15ft VEA’s on P&B Lakes. This change would be done in conjunction with the following.
2. That the Council support a 50% Tree Retention requirement as opposed to 80%.
   Note that the current requirement is 25%, The Planning Comm draft was for 50%.
   The 80% Tree retention requirement is extreme and was ONLY done as mitigation to offset a VEA requirement, which DOE rejected.
3. In addition -That a VEA is only Encouraged for new development that is Outside of the 50ft setback.
4. That the Replacement of an existing structure within the setback area can be done without a VEA Requirement.
5. That the provisions for a 200sqft addition within the setback area, and/or a 1000sqft addition within the shadow of an existing structure be reinstated as written in the Cities SMP.
6. That any addition that requires a VEA be proportional to the size of the addition. This is required by State Law, and is a change requirement of DOE.

These requirements all work in conjunction as a set. It’s SHO’s recommendation that the Council support this set of Alternatives.

Thanks for your time,

EXHIBIT NO. 1

Tuck Rodgers