

From: [Kennedy, Rebecca](#)
To: [Kennedy, Rebecca](#)
Cc: [Nischik, Julie](#); [Snodgrass, Bryan](#); [Jones, Keith \(CED\)](#)
Subject: FW: Community concern regarding proposed ADA compliant trail accessing Lot 30 from quarry bottom. - HQ Development Master Plan
Date: Friday, January 14, 2022 11:07:37 AM
Attachments: [Trail Integration.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Planning Commission –

Please see the below written communication from a community member related to the Fisher's Quarry/HQ Master Plan proposal. Thanks,

Rebecca Kennedy | Deputy Director
Pronouns: She/Her/Hers
CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
Community Development Department (CDD)
M: (360) 624-6070 | **O:** (360) 487-7896
rebecca.kennedy@cityofvancouver.us
www.cityofvancouver.us



Please note that I am working remotely. Please call my mobile number if you need to reach me over the phone. Learn more about the [City's COVID19 Response here](#).

From: stevenhaygood@mac.com <stevenhaygood@mac.com>
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 10:20 AM
To: Ledell, Marjorie <Marjorie.Ledell@cityofvancouver.us>; Schulte, Steve <Steve.Schulte@cityofvancouver.us>; jack.harroun@cityofvancouver.us; jim.atkins@cityofvancouver.us; Blaufus, Larry <Larry.Blaufus@cityofvancouver.us>; Pyle, Zachary <Zachary.Pyle@cityofvancouver.us>; tim.schauer@cityofvancouver.us; Nortz, Jason <Jason.Nortz@cityofvancouver.us>; Kennedy, Rebecca <Rebecca.Kennedy@cityofvancouver.us>; Jones, Keith (CED) <Keith.Jones@cityofvancouver.us>; Lopossa, Ryan <ryan.lopossa@cityofvancouver.us>
Cc: City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; Hansen, Bart <B.Hansen@cityofvancouver.us>; Stober, Ty <T.Stober@cityofvancouver.us>; Glover, Linda <Linda.Glover@cityofvancouver.us>; Lebowsky, Laurie (City Council) <laurie.lebowsky@cityofvancouver.us>; Paulsen, Erik <E.Paulsen@cityofvancouver.us>; Fox, Sarah <S.Fox@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Community concern regarding proposed ADA compliant trail accessing Lot 30 from quarry bottom. - HQ Development Master Plan

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.

Vancouver City Council
Vancouver Planning Commission
City of Vancouver Departmental Staff
Jason Nortz, Development Review Manager

RE: HQ Development Plan Buffer Area Development Proposal

First, I want to take a moment to thank you all and recognize the amount of effort and work necessary to consider development plans and how they align with the vision for the City of Vancouver, the impacted neighborhoods and the sub-area plans created to provide guidance to new development. I am continually amazed by the number of people and considerations necessary to review and approve significant projects. Thank you for your efforts.

I am writing today on behalf of the Hiddenbrook Terrace Community Association (HCTA) which is a homeowners association contained within the Fishers Creek Neighborhood Association (FCNA). Both organizations appreciate the support from City of Vancouver Staff and the Hurley Development group on finding a solution to the community concerns with respect to Lot30 of the HQ development proposal. We are very happy to support the current proposal for transforming Lot30 into 12 single family housing lots connected to SE 41st Dr.

The review of the Lot30 proposal illustrated a new potential feature connecting Lot 30 to the bottom of the quarry with an ADA accessible trail navigating the steep quarry wall to a lookout point. While this trail is not on Lot30, directly adjacent to our community boundaries, this trail if developed has raised some of the same concerns from the community that the former 165 unit multifamily housing product that was proposed for lot 30.

There are two main concerns that were discussed with respect to a connecting trail that navigates the steep quarry wall from Lot 30 to the bottom of the quarry.

First is a concern for safety or people utilizing this trail. To be fair, we are making a few assumptions. Primarily that as an ADA accessible trail the trail may be paved, somewhat wider than a typical steep grade hiking trail, and the grade will be managed by switchbacks such that it is easily navigable by people with physical disabilities. All of these design considerations make sense to support disabled community members to allow them to enjoy the trail and viewpoint. However, all of these design considerations also may make this trail an interesting pathway for bikes, skateboards and sledding when snow is present. It is very common in our neighborhood to see children sled down the few roads and hills when snow is present. These roads and hills are relatively small, do not contain steep drop offs when off the path and do not have turns and switch backs. In addition, as a single-family housing development, the number of children living within immediate walking distance to the hills come from perhaps 100 homes per hill site. The proposed path will be directly adjacent to over a thousand multi-family housing units. The illustration shows the path entrance from the quarry bottom adjacent to the HD development multi-family development zone, which is coincidentally the furthest area from the proposed park development in the HD development plan. This leads us to assume that children who may find a long "ride" down the path will find this an attractive feature and thus a potential safety issue.

The second concern also relates to the density of the housing units at the bottom of the quarry and the relative distance to the HQ development park and green spaces. The concern is that

the proposed trail specifically has been illustrated to join the bottom high-density housing to Lot 30, where the lot 30 illustration continues the trail to terminate directly across the street from HCTA's community trail system. HCTA maintains the trail and three bridges crossing Fisher's creek and two tributaries. All the expenses for trail grading, gravel and bridge maintenance are paid for by HCTA which contains approximately 450 housing units. While we respect that the HQ development housing units span multiple lots and includes housing units in the "commercial" zone, we also expect that most of the housing units may be focused on lots 22-29 in the multi-family housing area of the HQ plan. Our concern is that having a trail connection that is created specifically to provide a connection to the top of the quarry (Lot30) and directly aligns with the HCTA community trail system may have significant maintenance impacts to the existing community.

In a recent conversation with Scot Brantley (Hurley Dev) Scot mentioned that they are still trying to work through some challenges with being able to engineer and plan that connecting trail due to the grade. When I mentioned that the community did not see the connecting trail as a desirable attribute of the plan and that we would be happier if the connecting trail was removed from the plan, he indicated that the trail connector is a feature the City has an interest in.

The purpose of this letter is to present the community concerns and perhaps open a dialog with the City of Vancouver Staff that may be seeking the connector trail as a desired feature. We would prefer no connector trail that scales the quarry wall, removing the connecting trail that joins the high-density urban concept designed community with the low-density existing community. We can appreciate the desire to promote integration with the surrounding community, however we anticipate that this integration leads us to unique concerns given the elevation difference the connector trail must navigate and the fact that the trail specifically connects to a community-maintained trail system.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this information, please let me know if you have further questions or would like to discuss these concerns.

Steven Haygood

503 437-2995

stevenhaygood@mac.com

Fishers Creek Neighborhood Association - Chair

Hiddenbrook Terrace Community Association - Treasurer

From: [Nischik, Julie](#)
Cc: [Kennedy, Rebecca](#); [Snodgrass, Bryan](#)
Bcc:

Subject: FW: Citizen Communication
Date: Friday, February 18, 2022 8:51:00 AM

Commissioners,

Please see the below request for information and response from staff.

Thanks,
Julie Nischik (She/Her/Hers)
CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON

-----Original Message-----

From: Kennedy, Rebecca
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2022 8:35 AM
To: 9.brooks@gmail.com
Cc: Snodgrass, Bryan <Bryan.Snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us>; Martinelli, Domenic <Domenic.Martinelli@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: RE: Citizen Communication

Hi Nan-

Thank you for your email below. There are currently no initiatives underway for the St. Johns/St. James couplet, although it was slated for a commercial corridor study prior to the pandemic but was subsequently paused. This will likely be revisited through the forthcoming Comprehensive Plan Update process. It would be helpful to get a better understanding about your specific concerns about the houses you mention- can you provide some additional information here? I'm also happy to jump on a call sometime next week if that would be easier. If this works, are there times that work better for you? Thanks again for reaching out,

Rebecca Kennedy | Deputy Director
Pronouns: She/Her/Hers
CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
Community Development Department (CDD)
M: (360) 624-6070 | O: (360) 487-7896
rebecca.kennedy@cityofvancouver.us
www.cityofvancouver.us

Please note that I am working remotely. Please call my mobile number if you need to reach me over the phone. Learn more about the City's COVID19 Response [here](#).

-----Original Message-----

From: NB <9.brooks@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Citizen Communication

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.

I am interested in planning for the Minnehaha area (west) in particular. Do you have any firm plans for the large

area currently zoned as "community commercial" starting at the corner of NE 53d Street, south to about 52d St. and west approximately 3 houses? Thank you. This is a question to be addressed at the next meeting on February 22.
nanC

Peter Fels
5121 NW Franklin Street
Vancouver WA 98663
TELEPHONE: (360) 737-3154 • plfels@gmail.com

Vancouver Planning Commission

RE: HQ Master Plan

Dear Planning Commission:

I reviewed the HQ Master Plan with considerations of global warming in mind. There are many positive aspects of the plan for which the developer should be lauded. However, a few tweaks would be helpful.

The developer states it will use a “smart city” approach. Specifically, it plans to use technology to incorporate water and energy conservation. As a person who is not dependent on my cell phone, I suspect there are others like me. Residents and visitors may not know how or want to use technology to control their energy and water uses. I would ask what additional ways can people be encouraged, and buildings and parking be designed, to minimize energy and water use?

The developer promises to use an unspecified “acknowledged green building certification”. While Vancouver is still developing its climate action plan and the state legislature is still debating “stretch” building codes, we need developers to lead the way. I would ask what level of certification is the developer planning to achieve?

The developer, along with the accompanying exhibit letter from C-Tran, notes that the area is currently underserved by transit. C-Tran notes that increased density may lead to a need for increased transit, but plans for serving the area are not fully in place. While the developer has planned for pedestrian and bicycle use, I would ask how it plans to encourage and incorporate public transit, electric bikes/scooters and ride-hailing services to reduce single vehicle use? (Note, due to the hilly terrain, some people will find it difficult to walk or bike. Perhaps the developer should consider electric mini-trams to allow very young, elderly and disabled residents and visitors to circulate throughout the development and take advantage of trails, park and views.

The HQ development is part of the Riverview Gateway Subarea, which includes another large development east of 192nd Avenue. With all this new density, it is likely there will be demand for public transit to the area. Why not pre-plan for bus stops and perhaps even a small transit center so that they will be less costly to incorporate at a later date?

Finally, with regard to tree plantings, the submitted materials state the developer intends to reach a 30% tree canopy and the “HQ Design Guidelines” at F.1(a) refers to a list of approved street trees provided as an exhibit, but I did not find the attachment within the posted meeting materials. Given the site is now a former rock quarry, any trees will be welcome, but it would be nice to see a mix including mostly native species, especially ones adaptable to a warming climate, pollution from the SR 14 traffic, and drought, and larger mature trees that will achieve the stated canopy soon, not many years in the future.

s/Peter Fels

From: [Snodgrass, Bryan](#)
To: [Nischik, Julie](#)
Subject: additional housing comment for PC
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 8:34:58 AM

Julie

Can you send this to PC and post as additional housing comment? thanks

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Margot Rice <mrd303@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jan 28, 2022 at 1:20 PM
Subject: Question on code changes
To: <Bryan.Snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us>

Dear Mr. Snodgrass,

The proposed code changes would allow shared kitchen and bathrooms. So how would someone self isolate if they have Covid? Covid isn't going away anytime soon, so these code changes would put people at greater risk even if you are vaccinated and boosted.

Sincerely,

Margot Rice

From: [Don Steinke](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Community forum, public comment Feb 22, 2022
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 6:37:52 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.

From Don Steinke

To be distributed to the commissioners and relevant staff, re planning for stronger energy codes, solar and EV readiness

Hello, my name is Don Steinke

I'm a retired science teacher, 43 years, mostly at Fort Vancouver High School.

I am here just to remind people that the City Council has established the goal of reducing ghg emissions at least 50% by 2030 and 95% by 2050.

Please consider that goal for every project you consider. The worst thing is to install barriers to clean energy solutions.

Before approving road widening projects, consider the induced emissions. Before approving new pavement in parking lots, consider installing the conduit under it for EV charging for most parking spaces.

Before approving buildings, encourage the builder to make it solar ready and all electric ready.

SB 5722 requires that commercial properties that exceed 20,000 square feet, upgrade to meet new energy code standards. The law already applies to buildings that exceed 50,000 sq ft.

It is far cheaper to do, and easier to finance when those things are done at the beginning, rather than as a retrofit.

On January 21, I attended the WSU Green Transportation webinar on electric trucks and buses. In 2020, our legislature adopted the California mandate for electric vehicles including trucks and buses.

Starting in 2025, Washington State Law requires that a steadily increasing percentage of sales by auto manufacturers in all weight classes are battery electric. The requirement is on the manufacturer, not the buying public. I assume the manufacturer will need to lower the price enough to make it happen or buy credits from manufacturers that have sold more than required.

Washington has already met the 2025 requirement for light duty vehicles such as cars, small pickups and vans, but the law will require a greater percentage of their sales to be electric every year until 2035, when their sales are required to be 100% electric.

The electric vehicle sales requirement varies depending on weight classification. For large pickups and vans, 7% of the sales must be electric in 2025 increasing gradually to 55% by 2035.

Providing for the infrastructure requires planning. I have more in my written comments
Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

For delivery vans, bucket trucks, service vans, school and transit buses, 11% of the sales must be electric in 2025, gradually increasing to 75% by 2035.

For Class 7-8 Tractors, 7% of the sales in 2025, and 40% of the sales in 2035 must be battery electric.

Fortunately, large fleet operators and manufacturers seem eager to make the switch. Amazon, FedEx, UPS and Walmart are in the news with plans for 200,000 electric delivery trucks.

Amazon has said it wants 100,00 electric trucks. FedEx plans to convert its entire feet of 87,000 to battery electric. It is rumored that Walmart, UPS and Frito Lay are planning to electrify their fleets.

Ford is making the e-Transit Cargo Van for fleets with fewer than 50 vehicles, such as for plumbing and HVAC contractors.

Rivian is targeting the SUV market.

The General Motors BrightDrop is for delivery fleets.

Another speaker on the program was Andrea Tousignant, who spoke about fleets owned by Cities, Ports, school districts, and PUDs.

Andrea discussed the vehicles that were available via the state procurement contracts managed by the Department of Enterprise Services. If I remember correctly, the Tesla Model Y, and the Ford 150 Lightning are listed, and DES has 4 Mustang Mach-E to rent for testing.

Another speaker discussed grant opportunities. The last 1.5 hours was on school buses.

More take-aways:

A planning matrix is available.

Use 2022 to plan. It's already too late to buy anything this year.

Several companies are in the business of conversions.

Plan your charging infrastructure before you start choosing a vehicle.

Grants are available.

Fleet operators can send their fleet data to Andrea Tousignant to match needs and

opportunities.

From: [Ceci Smith](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Citizen Communication
Date: Sunday, February 20, 2022 2:13:13 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.

Brian and members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing concerning how these housing codes will be mitigated, in the Historic Hough Neighborhood. The Hough Neighborhood is the ONLY Historic District, in Clark County. Therefore some credence should be given to the architecture, of any new structures.

How will this be accomplished?

What you are doing is certainly in line, with what many communities are addressing, to increase their housing stock. Historical significance needs to be observed, in the initial planning stages of change.

Thanks,

Ceci Ryan Smith
Hough Neighborhood Resident

From: [Kathe W.](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Kennedy, Rebecca](#); [Jones, Keith \(CED\)](#)
Subject: My written testimony for February 22, 2022 meeting
Date: Sunday, February 20, 2022 1:49:22 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.

We have lived in Fishers Landing for over 3 years. We chose this area for its convenience and quiet tranquility complete with walking trails and parks. It is incomprehensible to us that the Vancouver Planning Commission would plan such an intensely packed development with retail and businesses mixed with over 1900 residential units and only have a tiny 4 acre park for this many residences when there should be at least 20 acres if not more. The Planning Commission has almost tripled the originally planned residential units from 700 to now 1900 units (with all but 12 being apartment units). The Planning Commission is not following the Sub Area Plan suggesting a mix of housing types, lots of trails and parks, etc. To top it off the Vancouver Planning Commission wants to shove a gondola (really ??) through the middle of the development from the bottom of the quarry up to the top of the ridge overlooking our homes. That leaves our quiet, peaceful neighborhoods open to a lot of folks wandering around our nearby homes, using our trails and parks as they have no place to wander down below. In addition to that, how about some folks parking their cars in our neighborhood and taking the gondola down to their apartments? If there are 1900 residences below our neighborhood the traffic impact on SE 192nd will be horrendous. Traffic on SE 192nd is already jam packed with commuters coming and going plus there are already more apartments built alongside SE 192nd and also off of SE 20th, SE 15th, SE 1st etc etc. How will parking be handled for all these Quarry residents living in 1900+ apartments? I do not believe that there is even a bus line that goes by that part of SE 192nd. The closest transit center is on SE 164th and no buses stop near that quarry site. Traffic congestion when SE 192nd gets backed up will have drivers cutting through the only alternate route which would be through our neighborhood. That would be a huge mess. Lots more cars, trucks etc mixing it up with school buses and school children not to mention pedestrians and joggers. Please reduce the number of apartments at least back to the original 700, scrub the gondola idea and give the future residents some breathing room with at least a 20 acre park that is NOT next to the freeway #14.

Respectfully,
Katherine E. Worsley
17956 SE 41st Loop
Vancouver WA 98683

From: [Pat Lanagan](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Citizen Communication
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 10:32:55 AM

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.

Regarding the proposed bike/pedestrian path that is proposed to travel across a section of my property, I'm concerned that the current plan fails to address issues that directly impact my property and potentially would involve "use" of my privately held property. Among my concerns is the potential for crime on this somewhat remote parcel; our continued vehicular use of this roadway, liability issues inherent in such a change of use, environmental issues with respect to the creek at the top of the road, the unstable hillside above Quarry road which regularly "releases" rock and debris onto the road.

The other issue of concern, which doesn't potentially impact me as directly is the unicorn concept of a tram. Are we to take this seriously? What consideration has been given to the engineering and construction cost? What would be the annual operating budget and how would it be funded? If a level of ridership is needed for the income projections, where would those riders park?

Thank you

From: [Ben Grobe-Heintz](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Citizen Communication-Affordable Housing
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 11:06:55 AM

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.

These comments are in response to the Columbian's February 20th article describing the city's response to the affordable housing crisis. As described by the article, changes to the city's zoning code aren't actually intended to provide affordable housing, but rather "middle housing", which seems to be a euphemism for additional mechanisms to enrich developers. Going through some of the changes described by the article:

1. Cottage Clusters: I really like the county's cottage housing code, but the fact is it has been on the books for a great while with next to zero permitted projects. The Cottages at Robison Place is mentioned in the article. According to the internet, one of these 900 sq ft cottages costs \$387,000, or \$430/sq ft. On a price per square foot basis, nothing in the area even comes close to this cost, with other new construction in the area on Zillow generally closer to the \$300/sq ft ballpark. Cottage clusters as a tool for private developers might provide more housing, but it will be more expensive and smaller than what we have now.
2. ADU's: Vancouver's ADU code is an awful joke which has led to next to zero units being built compared to Portland, which is seeing them pop up everywhere. Whereas many other proposed changes to the zoning code will actually negatively affect housing affordability, changes to the ADU provisions will have next to zero effect. In that sense they are a bright spot in the proposal.
3. Expanding High Density Limits: New construction by private developers isn't affordable. The idea that permitting more of it will somehow make it affordable is the central folly of the approach to affordable housing. What will happen through expansion of density limits is more new projects will go forward. What will get bulldozed to make room for these projects will be the cheapest, most affordable, existing housing. Smaller units with wall-to-wall granite and stainless will replace existing larger units with carpet and Formica. We'll have more housing, and it will be more expensive than what we have now.
4. New Low-Density Standards: Much like the expansion of higher density limits, these provisions will put a big target on the somewhat run-down rentals that are in fact the only affordable housing in the city. Developers will snatch up run down (ie affordable) rentals on larger lots and replace them with two gleaming luxury units. Again, we'll be left with more housing, but it will be less affordable than what we started with. To reiterate: these provisions will put a big target on what is currently the only affordable housing in the city.
5. Micro Housing: Great idea. There will be zero of these units built by private developers, because larger luxury housing will always turn a larger profit. Non profits may build a few that will be available to a very select group of people. The effect on affordable housing will be almost zero.

I'm sure a lot of work went into the 2016 Affordable Housing Task Force Report. Unfortunately basing affordable housing code provisions in 2022 on a 2016 report is not a good idea. The world has changed too fast. Time for a new report.

I can tell you what the city should be doing: focus public dollars on preserving existing affordable housing. Help landlords maintain their run-down rentals. Help transition mobile home parks to resident ownership. Eliminate short term rentals in structures that are not owner occupied. To the extent any public money is spent on new construction, it should be spent on providing a type of housing that doesn't exist, like micro housing, campgrounds, and new owner-occupied mobile home parks. If there is any tax mechanism that could disincentivize luxury housing, definitely implement that. If the public sector provides the lowest rung in the housing ladder, the private sector will have to start competing. Trying to get the private sector into the business of affordable housing has been an abject failure. Stop with the carrots, try using the stick on the high end of the housing market.

Thanks,

Ben

From: [Michael Burton](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Planning Commission Comments for 2.22.2022
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 11:52:42 AM

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.

My family and some of my neighbors in Fisher's Creek have expressed interest in the most recent master plan submitted by Hurley/Otak which limits Lot 30 to 12 single family homes. This plan would align with the current neighborhood's character and have minimal impact to traffic on the winding side-street, SE 41st Drive. This will require a change in zoning for this particular lot to allow single family homes.

If plans for single family homes on Lot 30 are not approved, I recommend that the city hold onto guidelines set in the original subarea plan which did not include development in the area of Lot 30. The subarea plan maintains a buffer with the surrounding established neighborhood to moderate impacts of differing residential densities (noise and visual impacts). The subarea plan also minimizes traffic congestion by locating the high density housing on the quarry floor in a mixed-use configuration to reduce vehicular trips out of the development.

Before I purchased my home, I was aware of the subarea plan for the quarry and assumed that the city would maintain the direction of that plan. Deviations from that plan can impact surrounding property values, neighborhood character, and traffic congestion. Please keep this development aligned with the previously defined goals.

Thank you,
Michael Burton

To: Vancouver Planning Commission
Public Comment/February 22, 2022/Cathryn Chudy

The Housing Code Updates reflect a tremendous amount of effort, and I appreciate the staff and Commissioners for the work being done to increase housing options as reflected in the report covered in today's workshop.

The Columbian covered on Sunday what they describe as "sweeping changes to the city's zoning regulations that will reimagine what it means to live in the growing city's neighborhoods [.https://www.columbian.com/news/2022/feb/20/the-affordability-zone-planners-consider-ways-to-give-more-people-a-shot-at-living-in-vancouver/](https://www.columbian.com/news/2022/feb/20/the-affordability-zone-planners-consider-ways-to-give-more-people-a-shot-at-living-in-vancouver/)

The article notes "...a widespread shortage of affordable housing" "getting worse, not better," according to Bryan Snodgrass, Vancouver long-range principal planner. According to the Columbian, Vancouver "...is joining governments across the nation supporting measures to promote affordable housing through increased housing density and adding lower-cost "middle housing" concepts into single-family residential areas."

My understanding is that "discussion of changes to the SFR zones will begin in 2022 to allow increased density in the form of duplexes and triplexes, something recommended by the Affordable Housing Task Force over 5 years ago.

Another Columbian article reports:

<https://www.columbian.com/news/2022/feb/16/washington-bill-allowing-duplexes-fourplexes-fails-to-pass-key-deadline/>

"Cities across Washington will continue to be able to zone land exclusively for single-family homes after the failure of a bill in the state Legislature that would have required them to allow greater density. HB 1782, known as "missing middle" housing legislation, would have required cities with more than 20,000 people to allow duplexes or fourplexes on certain single-family lots, depending on how close those lots were to frequent bus or train lines. For smaller cities, with at least 10,000 people, the bill would have allowed duplexes on certain lots that do not already have accessory dwelling units."

The failure to pass this key bill, that would have moved things forward for cities across Washington, including Vancouver, "...met resistance from local governments, who argued they should be able to set local zoning rules without state mandates."

I appreciate Rep. Jessica Bateman, D-Olympia, who sponsored the bill, pointing out that "We don't have time to waste. The housing crisis is being felt in every corner of our state, impacting families on all ends of the income spectrum. Land use is inextricably linked to our ability to mitigate climate change..."

Housing and Climate are both urgent priorities for our City, and it is up to Vancouver and our Planning Commission to avoid the Catch-22 that we are experiencing, moving forward as soon as possible in 2022 to address these priorities with the necessary local changes.

From: [Bev and Ken Tyler](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [tylerknb](#)
Subject: Housing Code Updates
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 12:04:47 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.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Hello

Just a note to share our thoughts regarding housing code changes.

Our recommendations:

1. Property line barriers code allows for 6 ft high shrubs or **fencing** between established neighborhoods and 3 apartments. Recommend 8 ft **wall** barriers between established neighborhoods and development over 25 ft tall (i.e., 3 story apartments).
2. Current code allows for a 5 ft building setback between properties for building new construction. Recommend code designs allowing parking lots and old tree lines between establishes neighborhoods and the start of multiple new buildings over 25 feet in height. This designs creates space between occupants in both residential and apartments preserving privacy to all. This design can be viewed at Park Apts in Fircrest Neighborhood.
3. If extending established building heights to accommodate ADU development such as one might find on a garage, recommend the builder place limited 2 story visualization into neighboring back yards. Multiple windows along property lines tends to minimize neighboring privacy and cast shadows. Many neighbors are planting small gardens and need sunshine versus shade.
4. If new construction is to receive a discount for using aging in place designs, recommend established senior households wishing to upgrade receive the same discount.
5. We are not in favor of decreasing apartment building code parking from 1.5 to 1. We believe this will promote more street parking, vehicle theft and safety site endangerment. The extra parking is needed for families owning more than 1 car and visitors.

Ken and Bev Tyler
1403 NE 131st Ave
Vancouver, Wa 98684

From: [jaynee Haygood](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Copy of public testimony 02222022
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 8:12:54 PM
Attachments: [PC testimony 02222022 \(1\).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.

Here is a copy of my public testimony from the Feb 22, 2022 planning commission meeting:

Thanks again for the opportunity to provide my testimony,

Jayne Haygood

Thank you Commissioners,

2/22/2022 PC Mtg.

I appreciate the opportunity to once again share my excitement and concerns regarding the HQ Development. As this development is adjacent to our neighborhood we want to ensure the desired Sub Area Plan design goals are being met.

Hurley's website for this project states that the HQ Master Plan, "implements the goals and policies of the Riverview Gateway Subarea Plan." Unfortunately, the current Master Plan falls notably short in this regard.

*First, the subarea plan calls for a diversity of options from townhomes, apartments and single family. P. 15 of the subarea plan states, "Since the surrounding area has been developed as a predominately low-density suburb, there are naturally concerns that more intensive multifamily development will change the character of the community." Page 19 of the subarea plans shows about a 50/50 split of low density and high density residential; however the current master plan has less than 1% low density to 99.5% high density residential thus showing a *monumental* change from the subarea plan goals. Hurley has also *dramatically* increased the number of residential units—tripling the number from 675 (?) to over 1900 residential units. This increase will exceed the school enrollment capacity as noted in the Evergreen Schools Letter which states, "it is essential that the developer and prospective residents of this subdivision understand that students residing there may not be allowed to be enrolled in their neighborhood school" and the "excess enrollment capacity would negatively affect the quality of school's instructional programs."

*Second, this dramatic increase in residential units significantly impacts the traffic vision that was originally stated in the subarea plan. With the increase in units from this development, plus the proposed 1200 units from the VIC along with the multiple apartment complexes that have been built along the 192nd corridor recently, all of this traffic is bound to cause backups when trying to enter SR-14. This congestion will have only one alternate route through the HQ development which will be through our neighborhood during morning bus/school times. This poses a significant safety risk for the children in our neighborhood.

*Next, parks, trails and open space plays a pivotal role in the original subarea plan for this development. P. 25 of the subarea plan states, "The quarry site's streets, trails, and open space network are the big picture items that frame development." Unfortunately, the current master plan has all but eliminated the majority of open space networks and trails and replaced them with parking lots to compensate for the tripling of residential units. For the considerable increase of residential units, there should be approximately 20 acres of park space, but unfortunately the master plan only has 4 acres of usable park space. This is once again a pronounced deviation from the subarea plan goals.

*Finally, the gondola was not in the original subarea plan and has since been added to the master plan. As a key feature of this development, I find it of concern that nothing about the gondola is stated in the HQ website, even under their "Key Project Features" tab. The height

and purpose of this proposed gondola has the potential to significantly impact our neighborhood. The gondola would allow riders to view into the residential units in the development and possibly into the homes and yards of those in our neighborhood, therefore the proposed gondola's purpose and construction should be further clarified before approval.

Once again, it is an honor to participate in this inclusive process which helps ensure clear communication during the planning phase.

From: [Christine Dickinsen](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Terry Ibert](#); [elizabeth verbeck](#); [Michelle MC DERMID NEIGHBOR](#)
Subject: Unintended consequences
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 7:33:43 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.

Good Evening Planning Commissioners

I generally support the updates to the housing codes presented at the 2/22 workshop. My concern is that we have weak code governing short-term rentals. Currently, they are technically not legal in residential zones. However, despite this, we now have over 250+ STRS and numbers continue to grow. In my neighborhood, we have a developer that last year purchased a double lot zoned R9. They have split the formerly single family home on one lot into two airbnb's. The 2nd lot (which used to be the yard and garden of the SFH) now sits empty. This particular developer is known to build duplex in Clark County so we believe the empty lot will have a duplex once these codes go through. We need to have STR code in place along these housing code changes so duplexes such as these stay housing stock, not STRS. The same could be said for new ADU's, apartments and cottage homes.

Short-term rental policy is complex. We are behind the eight ball in comparison to other cities. It will take some time to get it right for Vancouver. Nonetheless, we need to have some STR code happen simultaneously with the new housing codes changes if we want to protect the goal of increasing middle housing stock. Perhaps caps or bans on STRS for duplex, cottage homes, etc.

Thank you for all that you do towards keeping Vancouver a great place to live and work,

Christine Dickinsen
503 704 7143

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows