

Melissa Tracy

From: Eric Golemo <Egolemo@SGAengineering.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2020 1:07 PM
To: Ali Safayi; dan@ospreyhomes.com
Cc: Greg Shafer; Dianna Nutt; Deanna Hovenkotter; Melissa Tracy
Subject: RE: DRAFT Agenda for June DEAB Meeting (Corner Lot Sight Distance and Driveways)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ali,

Can you please circulate this to DEAB Members in advance of the meeting.

We can also circulate to Rob Klug and Ejaz Khan if they are available to review for this meeting. This reflects the changes requested at the last meeting. But, it also includes and repeats the previous discussion.

Here is a summary of the main changes from the previous version:

- 1) Added that parked cars in the driveway are outside of the sight distance triangles of **collector and arterial roadways**. They can be in the sight distance triangles of Local roadway classifications per previous discussions.
- 2) Added back in the language “the driveway may be limited to twenty (20) feet in width and located five (5) feet from the property line away from the intersection or as a twenty-five (25) foot wide shared driveway at this property line, Per staff comments. The criteria is applicable to all zones not just narrow lots.
- 3) Reordered and moved the language “In the case of medium- and high-density residential developments (R-12, R-18, R-22, R-30 and R-43), or when lots less than forty (40) feet wide ...” to later in the section. This isn’t a condition of the driveway location and is confusing in the current location. It gives flexibility to change traffic control when sight distance significantly impacts dense development and narrow lots. It applies more to features such as structures required to be outside site distance not driveways. That said, it may be appropriate to move the that language from Access Management 40.350.030 (B)(4) to Sight Distances 40.350.030(B)(8).

Per our discussion, parking and driveways are not prohibited in the sight distance triangle. They are not considered an obstruction that is prohibited in 40.350.030(B)(8) relating to Sight Distances. This is the item that has caused the problem as it is difficult to have driveways outside the sight distance triangle in many situations. It was also noted that RCW 46.61.570 allows cars parked on the roadway within sight distance triangles as long as they are 20 feet of crosswalks and 30 feet of stop signs, yield signs and traffic signals. We also agreed that it is a best practice to locate driveways as far from the intersection as possible which should be covered in 40.350.030 (B)(4). But in the effort to fix a perceived problem regarding driveways location and size in the sight distance triangle, language was added to that section that was not appropriate and is now causing unintended consequences. So, we need to adjust this language. Below are the changes we discussed to 40.350.030 (B)(4)(b.)(1)(b.):

Corner lot driveways shall be a minimum of forty (40) feet from the projected curb line or edge of pavement, as measured to the nearest edge of the driveway, as long as the parked cars in the driveway are outside of the sight distance triangles of **collector and arterial roadways**. ~~In the case of medium- and high-density residential developments (R-12, R-18, R-22, R-30 and R-43), or when lots less than forty (40) feet wide are allowed in mixed-use, density transfer, and planned unit developments, or in the R1-5 zone~~ Where this is impractical, the driveway may be limited to twenty (20) feet in width and located five (5) feet from the property line away from the intersection or as a twenty-five (25) foot wide shared driveway at this property line. **In the case of medium- and high-density residential developments (R-12, R-18, R-22, R-30 and R-43), or when lots less than forty (40) feet wide are allowed in mixed-use, density transfer, and planned unit developments, or in the R1-5 zone** the applicant’s professional engineer may propose traffic control devices, including stop signs, to preserve or manage sight distance. The County Engineer, in reliance upon the determination of the applicant’s professional

engineer that the proposal for a stop sign meets the criteria above, may authorize the installation of a stop sign(s). Where a residential corner lot is located at the intersection of a nonarterial or noncollector street with an arterial street, the corner clearance requirements of Section 40.350.030(B)(4)(c)(2)(f) shall apply to the nonarterial or noncollector street.

It may also be more appropriate to move the following language shown above from **Access Management** 40.350.030(B)(4) to **Sight Distances** 40.350.030(B)(8).

In the case of medium- and high-density residential developments (R-12, R-18, R-22, R-30 and R-43), or when lots less than forty (40) feet wide are allowed in mixed-use, density transfer, and planned unit developments, or in the R1-5 zone the applicant's professional engineer may propose traffic control devices, including stop signs, to preserve or manage sight distance. The County Engineer, in reliance upon the determination of the applicant's professional engineer that the proposal for a stop sign meets the criteria above, may authorize the installation of a stop sign(s).

This language deals with balancing competing interests of density vs. sight distance. In particular, the challenges of applying the uncontrolled intersection criteria to lots less than 40' wide. This language relates to sight distance not driveways so it should really be in 40.350.030(B)(8).

In addition, it would likely be a good idea to add a clarification in 40.350.030(B)(8) to state that driveways and parked cars are not considered obstructions. But, note that per RCW 46.61.570 cars parked on the roadway is prohibited within 20 feet of crosswalks and 30 feet of stop signs, yield signs and traffic signals. It could also be noted that driveways should be located as far from the intersection as possible in accordance with 40.350.030 (B)(4).

Finally, the county would like to require the sight distance triangles on the plat to help enforce restrictions. The goal here is really to restrict structures in the triangles. We agreed this was appropriate as long as the driveways were excluded and the language in the code was clarified as suggested above. Another concern was that a note should be added saying the sight distance triangles are shown based on the proposed traffic control, they may vary if the traffic control changes. The goal here is to avoid an expensive and time consuming plat alteration if traffic control changes in the future.

Sincerely,
Eric

Eric E. Golemo, PE
Owner / Director of Engineering and Planning
SGA Engineering, PLLC
Civil Engineering / Land Use Planning
Development Services / Landscape Architecture
2005 Broadway, Vancouver WA 98663
Phone: (360)993-0911
Fax: (360)993-0912
Mbl: (360)903-1056
Email: EGolemo@sgaengineering.com

From: Ali Safayi <Ali.Safayi@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 9:51 AM

To: Eric Golemo <Egolemo@SGAengineering.com>; 'dan@ospreyhomes.com' <dan@ospreyhomes.com>
Cc: Greg Shafer <Greg.Shafer@clark.wa.gov>; Dianna Nutt <Dianna.Nutt@clark.wa.gov>; Deanna Hovenkotter <Deanna.Hovenkotter@clark.wa.gov>; Melissa Tracy <Melissa.Tracy@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: DRAFT Agenda for June DEAB Meeting

Good morning Eric and Dan,

Are you expecting county staff's input regarding the sight distance discussion? If so, we need to see if Rob Klug and Ejaz Khan are available for this meeting.

Regards,



Ali Safayi, PE
Development Engineering Supervisor
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
564.397.4102

Website: www.clark.wa.gov

From: Melissa Tracy <Melissa.Tracy@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 6:57 AM
To: Eric Golemo <Egolemo@SGAengineering.com>; 'dan@ospreyhomes.com' <dan@ospreyhomes.com>
Cc: Greg Shafer <Greg.Shafer@clark.wa.gov>; Ali Safayi <Ali.Safayi@clark.wa.gov>; Dianna Nutt <Dianna.Nutt@clark.wa.gov>; Deanna Hovenkotter <Deanna.Hovenkotter@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: DRAFT Agenda for June DEAB Meeting

Attached is the DRAFT agenda for Thursday meeting, let me know if you have any changes or corrections.

~Melissa