

From: ssilvey643@aol.com
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Sept 12 meeting comments
Date: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 5:59:21 AM
Attachments: [Evergreen and Grand Commercial Corridors Strategy.pdf](#)

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

Sirs,

Attached are my comments on your meeting and some of the material presented via e-mail.

In general as one condenses a population, and changes demographics, it is best to comprehend all, meaning both sides of the coin in layman's terms, if one never shows what is to be done, by physically experimenting than the costs and inconvenience and unintended consequences add up.

As a commission you walk away never facing the real issues, while those whom buy, work, live in an area, do live with the consequences and its effects.

The real quality of life, not limited by telling folks what they cannot have, what they have to put up with, that they are not important and some ideal is the way you want yet you yourself are not there.

TA
Steven Silvey
Vancouver, WA

Evergreen and Grand Commercial Corridors Strategy

These PowerPoint points are vague, and seem to be based on some ideals with no common sense.

- 1- 1/2 a parking spot per unit
- 2- 1 bike spot per unit
- 3- 60 foot height 5 stories,
- 1- are those residents in signing a lease, buying a unit signing a paper to the city, planners and so forth that they will not own a car? Are they signing a paper stating they shall never need medical or public assistance help, from police, fire, medical, hospice, and meals on wheels? This is brought up as these services use vehicles. Further they shall not have visitors or guest? Further since this is to be a walking community ideal, how much more costs do these folks pay since the shops and so forth, are not large stores, and must have frequent deliveries, and have higher prices. What size parking spot is being created, tiny, medium, large, or is it stated that one can only have a vehicle that is 10 feet long, and 5 feet width? Where are the electrical plugs for chargers, and is there enough power for it? How about going to the area now and limiting parking and see what happens as a test for your theory dream, as it is a lot less costly to run a test than tear it down and build to find out it doesn't work.
- 2- Only 1 bicycle spot, per unit, how are they to get around? No kids, no spousal riding.... but it is understood with current social issues of thieves and lack of safety.
- 3- When are the story poles going up or containers to 60 feet to give real life visual so people can really see what are proposed. Where are the sun/shadow data, over the year showing how it is cast from these buildings onto existing and proposed buildings during the day and all. Simple programs such as AutoCAD, solid works have these data capabilities to show realistic data....

Other general comments

Further with this walk idea, where are the jobs? Are they in Vancouver? Or does one need to take a bus for 2 hours to reach them, or maybe a car, further it mentions families, where do they work, how do they get around? Does only one work or do both? What schools and sports activities are within walking distance, how many parks, green space are there. If a bus only comes every half hour is that calculated in "Quality of life" for residents, are connections such that off of one on another within a few minutes, or is it sitting at point B for 15 to 25 minutes while waiting to connect to C? Is there a major job area that buses go to? Or is it that as you approve the new warehouse space in the east how does public transit serve? Seems someone is talking BS, as in one breath you want everyone to stay in only their area, than you approve build a warehouse district out in middle of space where transport to it is not there.

When looking at plans, and ideas, one need only look at areas of 4th Plain, near Andresen, with wide sidewalks but power poles and other obstruction in the middle of the walking path, so both bikes and walkers share same space, brought up too long ago, and mention that using different colors for bikes and walkers, and told all were aware of system but doesn't matter. The other issue is, are their folks

whom know how to measure and that standards are met? I bring this up from prior experience also in that it appears folks do not know how and do not seem to care within planning.

Another example is permits required to do things, which are applied, given, and signed off on yet years later it is found that they did not meet code, did not meet what was set, yet all approved and bought off, now the owners pay again for lack of someone doing their job, in the first place.

It is simple to test out ideas, block off lanes, place objects in the way and see if they really work, yet it appears that all like to do that on paper, and use their ideas/dreams to say it might work, yet no one is out after work looking at what is going on, what folks really do, so do the planners live in these areas' walk to work, have to be at work at set time and not flex time or work from home.

Steven Silvey

Vancouver, WA

From: [Heidi Cody](#)
To: [Eiken, Chad](#); pc@cityofvancouver.us; [Nischik, Julie](#); [Kennedy, Rebecca](#)
Cc: [Cathryn Chudy](#)
Subject: Questions re: proposed code changes to Warehouse Moratorium 9/12/23
Date: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 11:50:38 AM
Attachments: [Questions re proposed Warehouse Moratorium Code Changes \(2\).pdf](#)

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

Hello Chad, the Planning Commission and others,

Cathryn Chudy and I have some questions and concerns about the proposed code changes to the Warehouse Moratorium. Please see below, and our letter is attached as a pdf:

September 12, 2023

Dear Chad Eiken and team and Planning Commission,

Thank you for giving us a chance to look over proposed changes to the City's Warehouse Moratorium. We appreciate that the larger than 250,000 square feet warehouses will now be allowed only in the IH District, and that there are special use and development standards being proposed for those warehouses, including measures to address visual impact, traffic, and climate action priorities.

We have questions and are concerned about a couple issues:

- There seems to be a loophole that would allow builders of new warehouses, or partly completed warehouses, to circumvent the 250,000 square foot threshold. What would prevent a warehouse builder to build a 200,000 sq. ft. warehouse and another smaller warehouse or building at 49,000 sq. ft.--and thereby avoid the "energy transition ready" stipulations that affect permitted use?
- These proposed changes also seem like a missed opportunity for the City to require more energy efficient/renewable energy ready stipulations of smaller warehouses. In addition, the change from permitted to limited use for these smaller warehouses limits the amount of public participation and engagement.
- On p.2, Amendment 1 under Proposed Change, the text says smaller warehouses facilities will continue as a permitted use. Is that correct, or will smaller warehouse facilities be limited use?
-

Is it correct to assume that because the Council changed the size threshold to 250,000 sq. ft, that the Warehouse Moratorium code changes can only be made for that size and larger?

- We recommend requiring or at least incentivizing more energy efficiency and climate friendly stipulations consistent with our Climate Action Framework, as well as more public engagement process, for all new warehouses. These new proposed code changes seem to limit the City's leverage and oversight of the planning process.

Thank you for allowing us to comment, and thank you for your work on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Heidi Cody and Cathryn Chudy

September 12, 2023

Dear Chad Eiken and team and Planning Commission,

Thank you for giving us a chance to look over proposed changes to the City's Warehouse Moratorium. We appreciate that the larger than 250,000 square foot warehouses will now be allowed only in the IH District, and that there are special use and development standards being proposed for those warehouses, including measures to address visual impact, traffic, and climate action priorities.

We have questions and are concerned about a couple issues:

- There seems to be a loophole that would allow builders of new warehouses, or partly completed warehouses, to circumvent the 250,000 square foot threshold. What would prevent a warehouse builder to build a 200,000 sq. ft. warehouse and another smaller warehouse or building at 49,000 sq. ft.--and thereby avoid the "energy transition ready" stipulations that affect permitted use?
- These proposed changes also seem like a missed opportunity for the City to require more energy efficient/renewable energy ready stipulations of smaller warehouses. In addition, the change from permitted to limited use for these smaller warehouses limits the amount of public participation and engagement.
- On p.2, Amendment 1 under Proposed Change, the text says smaller warehouses facilities will continue as a permitted use. Is that correct, or will smaller warehouse facilities be limited use?
- Is it correct to assume that because the Council changed the size threshold to 250,000 sq. ft, that the Warehouse Moratorium code changes can only be made for that size and larger?
- We recommend requiring or at least incentivizing more energy efficiency and climate friendly stipulations consistent with our Climate Action Framework, as well as more public engagement process, for all new warehouses. These new proposed code changes seem to limit the City's leverage and oversight of the planning process.

Thank you for allowing us to comment, and thank you for your work on this important issue.

Sincerely,
Heidi Cody and Cathryn Chudy

From: [Eiken, Chad](#)
To: [Peter L. Fels](#); [Nischik, Julie](#); [Kennedy, Rebecca](#)
Subject: RE: Warehouse Moratorium
Date: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 10:19:40 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Hi Peter,

Thanks for your note. I'll try and respond to your questions at today's workshop. Regarding the partially-completed properties, I'm attaching an aerial photo of one IL-zoned property near the Port that appears to have a remaining pad available – shown in blue (likely for a warehouse) but because warehouses already exist in excess of 250K total square footage around it, it could not be developed even for a small warehouse. This is just one example but I'm sure that other examples exist. Anyway, I hope this answers that question. Thanks, Chad



From: Peter L. Fels <plfels@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2023 9:21 PM

To: Eiken, Chad <Chad.Eiken@cityofvancouver.us>; Nischik, Julie <Julie.Nischik@cityofvancouver.us>; Kennedy, Rebecca <Rebecca.Kennedy@cityofvancouver.us>

Subject: Warehouse Moratorium

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

Hello Chad and Planning Commission,

I've reviewed the new proposed measures regarding large warehouses, and I have the following questions, which I hope you will address in the workshop on September 12:

What "partially completed" properties in IL districts would be affected by "unintended consequences" if these changes were not implemented and the original plans were? What would those consequences be?

How do neighbors of existing warehouses less than 100,000 square feet feel about their impacts? If there are negative impacts, shouldn't they be addressed?

What are the expected impacts of currently vested projects not yet built? How can those be avoided?

"Solar ready" roofs should include consideration of how to maximize available space for PV panels, e.g., by clustering HVAC and other rooftop equipment and spacing any skylights as well as addressing the carrying/load capacity and electrical outlets/junction boxes.

For larger parking lots throughout the city - i.e., not just at warehouses - , can we incentivize using solar covers (which also serve as rain shelters)?

Why did these changes eliminate solar roofs in favor of solar-ready roofs?

Under these new proposals, will it be possible for a developer to evade requirements for large (over 250,000 square feet) warehouses by placing more than one building on the same IL parcel, where the total of the multiple buildings exceeds 250,000 square feet?

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Fels
Vancouver

From: [Peter L. Fels](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: VIC Revised Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 11, 2023 9:26:19 PM

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

Dear Commissioners,

I have looked through the appendices to try to find details about bicycle transportation within the revised VIC Master Plan. It appears the plan calls for a 20 foot wide perimeter trail and some interior trails that reach the interior loop ("pedestrian lanes" shown in green on the Site Plan Mobility Plan). Also the plan appears to call for some shared roads.

Pedestrian and bike separations are not specified. There also are no specific provisions for other types of transportation, e.g., e-bikes, motorized scooters, motorized skateboards, etc., which are now proliferating and not well regulated. In my experience, current combined use trails, such as the Renaissance Trail and Burnt Bridge Creek trail, are hazardous for both cyclists and pedestrians because there are no designated lanes. Pedestrians often are unaware of approaching cyclists and sometimes do not hear warnings because they are using audio devices. Pedestrians with dogs create additional hazards for cyclists and the dogs.

The safest bike routes are separated from both motorized vehicles and pedestrians.

I encourage the developers to consult bike use groups such as Vancouver Bike Club and Cascade Bicycle Club for input on how to manage combined pedestrian, motorized vehicle and bicycle traffic. The traffic study noted two reported bicycle/car collisions in the area which appear to be the result of mixed bike and car traffic.

In addition, it is not clear how cyclists or pedestrians will reach the buildings inside the interior loop, as no paths are shown. It would be helpful if the developers were to provide interior bike routes as well as indoor bike parking or at least bike racks at the entrance to every building. This would encourage more bike use by employees and visitors and help meet our CAF goals.

Otherwise, I appreciate the VIC Owners for acknowledging the Vancouver CAF and proposing some excellent sustainability features.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Fels
Vancouver