



## Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair  
Matt Swindell, Vice Chair  
Aldo Lampson Veranzo  
Bryant Enge  
Steve Morasch  
Bryan Halbert  
Eldon Wogen

---

### PLANNING COMMISSION HYBRID MEETING THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 2022 MEETING MINUTES

Public Service Center  
Council Hearing Room, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1300  
Franklin Street  
Vancouver, Washington  
6:30 p.m.

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

##### Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

WISER: Okay. Karl, we're ready to go.

JOHNSON: Okay. Good evening, gentlemen, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid public hearing to order for Thursday, April 21st, 2022. My name is Karl Johnson and I'm the Chairman of the Clark County Planning Commission.

The role of the Planning Commission is to review and analyze comprehensive plan amendments, zoning changes and other land use related issues. We follow a public process including holding hearings during which the public has an opportunity to provide additional perspectives and information. In legislative matters, the role of the Planning Commission is advisory. The County Council will hold separate hearings, consider our recommendations, and make a final determination.

Planning Commission Rules and Procedures. The Planning Commission will conduct a hearing tonight and take testimony regarding the matters being considered tonight. If any public comments were received before tonight's hearing, they have been sent to the PC members and entered into the public record.

Our staff will go first tonight and present information on the agenda items to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission can then ask questions to staff. Next, we will provide

the applicant to speak, if there is one, then members of the public who wish to provide comment.

When we get to the public comment portion of our agenda, we will provide more detailed information at that time. You will have three minutes to speak and remarks should be directed to the Planning Commission only. Please do not repeat testimony that has already been provided.

At the conclusion of public testimony, the applicant, if there is one, may take up to three minutes to respond and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. Staff may respond to the testimony from the applicant and public. The Planning Commission then will deliberate and make a recommendation to the County Councilors.

Before I begin tonight, I would like to announce that our Planning Commissions this evening are now hybrid and that means that we are both in person and on WebEx over the Internet. For the virtual members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure that your microphones are turned off or muted unless you are speaking. Also remember turn off your video -- or excuse me -- to turn on your video camera throughout tonight's hearing.

For virtual audience members, you are all muted. You will only be unmuted if you wish to speak during the public comment period. If any PC members have questions, I will call upon you individually and you can respond with your questions. I will do the same during discussion time. When you make a motion, please state your name, and then make your motion. Also, when you second your motion, please state your name and then second the motion.

Conflicts of interest. Before we begin tonight, would anyone on the Planning Commission like to disclose any conflicts of interest?

HALBERT: None.

JOHNSON: Okay. Hearing none, we will move on to the roll call and any introductions of guest. Sonja, can you please begin a roll call for the Planning Commission. Please say I'm here if you are online and I'm here if you're here too. Sonja, will you please take roll.

## **II. ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

ENGE: I'm here.

HALBERT: I'm here.

VERANZO: Absent.

MORASCH: Absent.

SWINDELL: Here.

WOGEN: Here.

JOHNSON: Here.

**Staff Present:**

Chris Cook, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director; Jacqui Kamp, Program Manager II; Jenna Kay, Planner III; Jose Alvarez, Planner III; Susan Ellinger, Planner III; Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant; and Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant.

**Other:**

Elizabeth Decker, Jet Planning; Steve Faust, 3J Consulting; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

**III. GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Agenda for April 21, 2022**

JOHNSON: So, can I have a motion for the approval of the agenda of April 21st, 2022.

HALBERT: Yeah, Karl, I'll make a motion that we approve the agenda as presented.

SWINDELL: I'll second it.

JOHNSON: We've heard a motion and a second. Sonja, can you please take roll call on the motion.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

JOHNSON: That motion passes.

**B. Approval of Minutes for February 17, 2022**

JOHNSON: Can I take a motion and second for approval for the minutes for February 17th, 2022.

SWINDELL: I make a motion to approve the minutes from February 17th, 2022.

HALBERT: I'll second that motion.

JOHNSON: Okay. I've heard a motion and second. Sonja, can you please take roll call on the motion.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

WISER: 5 ayes.

JOHNSON: Motion passes.

**C. Communications from the Public**

JOHNSON: We are now going to take communications from the public. This is for communications for those items that are not on tonight's hearing agenda. Sonja, it's your turn to speak.

WISER: Good evening, members of the public. For attendees using their computer or WebEx application, if you'd like to speak, please use the raised-hand icon. You can do this by clicking the participant button or icon, the location of which depends on the device you are using. Staff will only acknowledge those attendees during the public comment period who have raised their hand by selecting the hand icon. When you have finished your comment, lower your hand.

For attendees using the telephone, which is the audio only option, you need to press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise your hand. Please provide your name before making public comment. When you have finished your comment, press star 3 to lower your hand.

For attendees present in our hearing room, we will call on you to speak after virtual attendees have given their comments.

Public comments are limited to three minutes per person in order to accommodate all speakers. Again, this portion of tonight's hearing is only for items not listed on tonight's agenda.

Larisa, are there any members of the public attending virtually with their hands raised wishing to provide public comment?

SIDOROV: There are none.

WISER: Okay. Karl.

JOHNSON: Are there any members of the public in our hearing room this evening wishing to

provide comment on any non-hearing item? If so, please come up to the front table and provide your name and address for the record. Seeing none, we will now close the public comment and go on to the hearing items. Public hearing items, Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan.

#### IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan:** Clark County is responding to the need for a greater variety of housing options. The proposed Housing Options Study & Action Plan (HOSAP) identifies housing challenges within the unincorporated Vancouver Urban Growth Area and includes recommended strategies as solutions to support a wider range of housing options affordable to a variety of household incomes. The strategies are recommendations only and will require County Council direction to move forward with implementation. Many of the strategies require a separate legislative approval process to be implemented. Other strategies are administrative and could be implemented immediately upon County Council direction.

**Staff Contact: Jacqui Kamp, [Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov) or (564) 397-4913**

JOHNSON: The next item on our agenda is the Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan. Our staff is Oliver Orjiako and Jacqui Kamp along with housing consultants Elizabeth Decker and Steve Faust. Does the Planning Commission -- excuse me. Go ahead, Jacqui.

KAMP: Thank you, Chair. Good evening, everyone. This is Jacqui Kamp, Clark County Community Planning Program Manager. I'd like to welcome everyone to tonight's hearing and I see Oliver is on video now so I'm going to pass the baton over to him to say a few words before we start.

ORJIAKO: Okay. Thank you, Jacqui. And I would like to also thank members of the Planning Commission, the Chair and Planning Commission members. For the record, Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning. I would like to sincerely thank our consultant, 3J Consulting and Elizabeth as well, a team with the consultant, they have really done a good job in working with the Project Advisory Group that the Council approved to work on this project and also our staff Jacqui Kamp, Jenna Kay, and Susan Ellinger, cannot thank them enough for the work that they've done and all the park members that participated.

I will say just briefly to the Planning Commission members that this -- this -- this is a little bit different from what we used to bring before you. This is not a policy document, it is not a plan and a zone change amendment, it's not a code update, it is a plan that focuses on strategies to remove barriers and provide opportunities for affordable housing, which is a challenge in Clark County, not only here in Clark County but the State of Washington and also nationally.

Staff will present the work done by the Project Advisory Group, ask for your favorable

recommendation to our Council. The presentation is structured by focusing on short-term strategies, midterm and long-term. You are free to ask us questions and we are here to help answer them and we have had a work session with you and responded to some of your questions.

So, with that, I will turn it over to staff to go over the materials this evening and if you have questions, as I said, I'm here to answer them. Again, I thank you for the opportunity. Jacqui, go ahead, take it away.

KAMP: Thank you, Oliver. Steve, can we go to the next slide. So, the purpose of the Housing Option Study and Action Plan is to understand the local housing challenges and identify opportunities to encourage the creation of additional housing types that are affordable to a variety of households within the unincorporated urban growth area Vancouver. This could be done through the removal of regulatory barriers and/or implementation of other strategies.

In 2018, the County Council made amendments to the development code to allow more flexibility for the development of accessory dwelling units, cottage housing and manufactured housing. The County Council was interested in finding additional ways to provide more housing in the Vancouver unincorporated urban growth area that is attainable to people of a variety of household incomes.

The project area is a large urban area next to but not incorporated into the City of Vancouver. This area is the focus for the county as it is its urban jurisdiction for different types of housing, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, condominiums, multi-family apartments, et cetera, can be built and where urban services are available and can be provided in an efficient manner.

The plan provides guidance for County staff, elected officials and other decision-makers to encourage the construction of additional affordable and market-rate housing that meets the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area's current and future housing needs. The recommended strategies include potential changes to the comprehensive plan, county code, zoning map, and/or other nonregulatory recommendations for Planning Commission and County Council consideration. Next slide.

Clark County under its Growth Management Act is required to plan for housing including housing affordable to lower income households. The GMA housing goal is to plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all economic segments of the population in the state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

The county's comprehensive plan includes the housing element with housing policies to identify the need and mechanisms that will lead to the construction and preservation of decent housing

for all economic segments of the county's population. The county's development regulations are Clark County Title 40 implements the vision and policies of the comprehensive plan. The code dictates how the built environment will develop.

As is shown in this chart, the Housing Action Plan can inform housing, land use and other policies in the comprehensive plan. It can also guide implementation of the comprehensive plan policies by identifying strategies such as amendments to developmental regulations and implementation procedures to further encourage housing development to meet our housing goals. Next slide.

Project staff have provided periodic updates to the Commission since the beginning of the project as well as members being interviewed during the stakeholder interview process in 2020 and a Commission member, Ron Barca, was appointed to the Project Advisory Group. So, this graphic just indicates those meeting dates where we met with you and gave you project updates. Next slide.

This was the project or is the project schedule for the overall project which shows the different phases of the project. As you can see, we are now in the final phase which is the legislative process. Next slide.

The full public participation plan along with a list of outreach, public outreach events and meetings that took place during the project is included in Appendix B of the plan document. Part of the public participation plan included the initiation of an 18-member Project Advisory Group appointed by the County Council and County Manager to provide input throughout the project and assist the County with developing recommendations for consideration by the public, the Planning Commission and County Council.

The advisory group represented a variety of interest groups that you can see listed here and stakeholders that are -- I'm sorry -- that are listed here. The advisory group met regularly for a year to learn and understand the issues and to develop consensus based recommendations. Next slide.

Other key tools used for public participation includes those listed on this slide including two virtual public meetings and the graphic here is when we used a tool called Google Jamboard to do virtually, to have an online open house, we did online questionnaires, CVTV videos and other briefings and meetings with stakeholders and interested persons. Next slide.

Staff is recommending tonight that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval of the plan and direct staff to begin immediate implementation of short-term strategies or low-hanging fruit to keep the momentum going.

As we discussed at the work session, approval of this plan, and as Oliver mentioned, does not approve any policy regulations or code changes to go into effect.

The plan includes a list of recommended strategies that are still at a conceptual level. They include a wide variety of ideas that could encourage the development of more housing types in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area. Whichever strategies are selected for implementation, additional analysis and feedback with interested parties will be required to figure out how best to implement the change.

And for those strategies that are code or a land use change, the proposed change would go through a Type IV process, public process, with public participation followed by hearings by the Planning Commission and County Council.

We also discussed at the work session Planning Commissioners providing input on the plan and its strategies as part of your discussion which we welcome and will be helpful for staff and Council. For example, you may have interest generally in a strategy but you might have some concerns or different ideas regarding how it's implemented. Providing that feedback to staff and to the Council can help begin our implementation work.

We won't be able to implement all the strategies at once, but as is proposed for a monitoring program, we can incorporate check-ins of the plan as part of our annual work program discussion with Council to continue the momentum of implementation.

And I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Steve and he's going to go over some of the short-term strategies this evening.

FAUST: Good evening, Chair Johnson, and Commissioners. My name is Steve Faust with 3J Consulting. With me this evening is Elizabeth Decker from JET Planning and I also want to mention that ECONorthwest was another member of our consulting team. In just a minute Elizabeth is going to take you through the short-term strategies, but first I want to give a little background information on how those strategies were developed.

The consultant team took on a number of research projects and outreach activities in order to gather information for the Project Advisory Group to deliberate when they went through the process to develop the different strategies.

We conducted a series of stakeholder interviews to help understand development trends, barriers, and opportunities. We conducted, we collected and analyzed housing data to understand trends and housing production and demographics. We did an audit of land use policies, zoning, and regulations to understand the existing regulatory landscape. We conducted a legislative review to summarize recent Washington State housing legislation. And we prepared case studies from other communities in Washington to gather inspiration learned from mistakes and discover which initiatives might be utilized in Clark County. Whoops. I'm going to briefly go through some of the key findings from that work.

So, first of all, housing is getting increasingly expensive in the Vancouver UGA. You can see that wage growth has been outpaced by increases in rents and home sale prices. Single-family, owner-occupied dwellings are the predominant housing type in the county, but do not necessarily reflect the entirety of local needs.

So, these charts show that nearly 60 percent of households are one to two-person households, but 70 percent of the housing stock are three and four-bedroom units. Impact and development fees in the county are high and not necessarily scaled to support the development of housing types with smaller footprint.

There is a relatively small supply of land for medium and high density housing in the county and that limits the variety of housing options that get built. You can see that both for residentially zoned land low density is the predominant zone and for residential buildable land 84 percent of that land is urban low density.

The aging of baby boomers and household formation of millennials will drive demand for renter and owner-occupied housing of all sizes. So most single-family units that are for sale in the study area cost \$400,000 or more which is unaffordable to many potential home buyers.

Households have lower -- households at the lower and middle part of the income spectrum often have no choice but to pay increasingly higher rent because homeownership is out of reach. So, you can see that the need in Clark County is approximately 13,300 units over the next 15 years.

This chart on the right shows that about half of those units will be for households making 120 percent or more of the area median income, but we know that the market will take care of those households. That is not necessarily the case for households in the 80 to 120 percent of the area median income and most certainly not for those at less than 80 percent of the area median income.

So based on these key findings, the Project Advisory Group developed these five objectives that were proposed and approved by the Project Advisory Group.

First, to encourage housing development that meets the needs of middle-income households who are not being served in the current housing market. Second, to develop strategies to support the development of housing that is affordable to low, very low and extremely low-income households.

Third, to encourage diversity in housing types and tenure, so both rental and homeownership, including expanding middle housing options and increasing multi-family feasibility. Four, to encourage the creation of a broad range of housing sizes that match the needs of all types of

households with the focus on one to two-person households not currently being served in the housing market.

And finally, Number five, to guide development of diverse housing option to areas with access to transportation corridors and transit, commercial services, schools, and parks and conversely to support the development of those amenities in areas where more housing is added. All right.

Now we will move into the Housing Action Plan Recommendations. So, the strategies that were developed, and there's I believe 50 strategies, were placed into four categories based on their intended outcomes. There are housing options, which are regulatory strategies that expand housing development options and enhance residential development feasibility of existing housing options. Most of the short-term strategies you'll hear about tonight fall into this category.

The second is affordable housing. Increasing the feasibility of subsidized affordable housing for low, very low and extremely low-income households. Programs and partnerships are strategies relating to the administration of county programs like development permitting or where the county's role is to support and/or collaborate with partners to develop solutions to community concerns.

And finally, advocacy. These strategies advocate per State legislative changes to allow new strategies and tools that aren't currently available to the county. So, for each of these strategies we identified, we evaluated them for several different factors.

One is proposed timeline. Short-term strategies are less than one year to implement and they build on and extend existing policies. Medium-term strategies look at one to two-year time frame and include policies that require further study or refinement. And then long-term, two plus years that require significant study are beholden to a set timeline or should not be implemented until other short or medium-term strategies are implemented and evaluated.

And, again, we are going to be presenting the short-term strategies this evening, but we're happy to answer questions or discuss medium and long-term strategies as well.

The other factors that we used to evaluate the various strategies are cost, a relative comparison of cost. Staff time and funding resources to the level of effort needed to implement. The household income target whether it's low income at less than 80 percent of AMI or medium income at greater than 80 percent AMI. And then the type of action needed whether administrative work or legislative action.

And with that, I'll hand it over to Elizabeth Decker to walk you through the short-term strategies.

DECKER: Yeah, thank you, Steve. Good evening, Chair Johnson, Planning Commission, members of staff and public for joining us tonight. I'm Elizabeth Decker with JET Planning, part of the consultant team to talk about the short-term strategies which incidentally as we get into, you'll see are really focused on changes to the development code which is my area of expertise.

So generally these are going to be pieces of the development code that the County directly controls and can take action on, and even within the code the short-term strategies are generally focused on modifications to portions of the existing code as well as meeting some new State regulations and we really saw that through our PAG work as being some of the low-hanging fruit that we did accomplish in this first year as part of immediate implementation of this plan based upon your recommendation and ultimately the County Council's direction, so... Next please.

So, the first piece really deals with addressing the existing zones that are already all of the residential zones in the low and medium-density zones and looking at ways to use that land more efficiently by reducing minimum lot sizes across the board with corresponding changes to density to line up with those lot sizes.

And so, this charge is really focused on existing housing types already permitted in the code, so that's single-family detached, townhouses and duplexes looking at ways to bring the lot sizes down. And in particular for duplexes setting those lot sizes the same as single-family detached so that there's more flexibility of what any one individual lot can be developed as. Next, please.

The next strategy brings us over to the high-density zones, and for a short-term strategy there are no increases to the maximum density proposed. We did not find through our analysis that that was a significant barrier to development under current development conditions, but that there could be an opportunity to get greater efficiency from that very limited supply of high density zoned land by making these relatively modest increases to the minimum density in those zones so that that better supports multi-family residential as well as bringing down the size of average dwelling units rather than encouraging townhouses and single-family detached in those zones. Next, please.

Now the next major strategy, if you'll recall one of the overarching goals, was to expand middle housing types and so HO-4 here really takes that and identifies a number of steps that could be done within the code to better support a range of middle housing including duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses, and then as to any of those plexes both new construction as well as conversion of existing homes into multiple units.

And so, there's opportunity here to support middle housing through a range of dimensional and density changes, that includes changes to the lot sizes so that they can work in both the R1 or the low -- excuse me -- the low-density zones and the R zones are the medium-density zones

here. So, bringing additional -- yes, thanks -- just bringing additional middle housing types into particularly the low density zone.

And then HO-5 is really a key companion piece to HO-4 about middle housing. So, in order to make middle housing feasible on some of these lot, smaller lot sizes, a key is to get the parking requirements right so that they are scaled for the level of development and do not, that the parking requirements don't overwhelm the lots such that housing crowds, such that parking crowds out housing opportunities.

And so right now in the code there are not specific parking standards that are tailored for duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes and so the recommendation is to introduce specific parking standards for those housing types, those middle housing types, that get at a balance. We're looking to start the conversation but not end with one space per unit as a way to add more flexibility on-site.

And I'll also just note that throughout all these strategies, some of the specifics that we're listing here, for example, like starting with one parking space per unit for consideration, these are all advisory, they inform our discussion, they reflect some details that came up in the PAG discussion, but by approving the plan you would not be approving any of these individual details, it would simply be the basis of where we would start and where the County would start with future code amendments that would later come back for a full legislative review and could be further modified, but the details are just there to help us capture the detail of conversation that we had and start the implementation conversation. So next, please.

Another companion strategy, this is about parking specifically for townhouses looking at some ways to make a modest change there and adjust some of the driveway spacing and access requirements to make it more feasible to develop townhouses. Next.

Next piece has to do with outside of middle housing. Here we're looking at multi-family parking in particular and the part of recent State legislation is for the county to look at introducing new parking ratios that are tied to bedrooms of one per bedroom.

So, if it's a one bedroom, the maximum the county can require is one space for that apartment; two bedrooms, two spaces; for studios it's .75 spaces, and these new ratios apply only to sites that have access to high-quality transit which is defined in the legislation and mostly applies, Jacqui, maybe can you help me out. I know we have a map of this at one point.

KAMP: Yeah, I think it's probably Highway 99.

DECKER: I think so too. Okay. So that's mostly where the -- within a quarter mile of there is where these changed multi-family parking ratios would apply. And, again, this is we're looking at the low-hanging fruit in these short-term strategies to implement the State mandate.

And you'll also see when you read through the plan there's a medium long-term strategy to take a much more comprehensive look at multi-family parking, but again pulled out for short-term this is where we'd start or where the recommendation is. Next, please.

As Jacqui mentioned in her introduction, the County has taken significant steps both to introduce cottage housing and to already make some revisions to those ordinances. And through the work of the PAG and some of our stakeholder interviews, we identified another round of minor revisions to the cottage housing standards that various members of the public and the stakeholders felt could improve feasibility, the clusters, these cluster developments have the smaller-scale units to preserve the sense of the coherent site design, provide a mix of amenities that make them a little more feasible.

So, part of that is to, and again these are just places to start, issues that came up in the discussion that will be further vetted as part of any code development in the future based on direction we receive, but looking at higher densities, a variety of attached and detached units in this clustered format. Looking at reducing the quantity of both the common open space as well as the private open space for each unit.

Looking at some more flexibility in how parking areas are laid out both shared and individual, bringing those parking requirements in line with that one space per unit we talked about with some other middle housing types and looking to move away from discretionary architectural standards that can be interpreted differently and can cause some hiccups and using more objective language. Next, please. Okay.

And then back to multi-family. This next strategy talks about the open space and recreation requirements. And so, through some modeling that we did with this project and part of the code audit past the density of about 30 units per acre in the current code, the site demands for housing, for parking and for open space start to come into conflict.

It can make it really difficult to actually achieve the allowed maximum densities in the highest of the high density zone where we're looking to get that greater efficiency for multi-family projects. And so, we saw an opportunity in the highest density zones for some of this highest density development that's over 30 units per acre to add some flexibility, a slight change to ratio of open space and recreation area so that there's a way to capture the full zoned density potential of those lots.

There still remains a focus on quality and accessibility of open spaces, that will absolutely continue to be required for these larger and higher density projects, but they just don't continue to increase in size past a certain point. Next, please.

And then HO-11 is in my mind a pair with the cottages in the sense that the County has really

led the way through initiating and multiple rounds of revisions to the ADU code and also, I read a lot of ADU codes, at least over 30 or 40 to date. So, it was difficult to find additional recommendations for you because a lot of it is already so strong, but we did see some small tweaks that could help support even, even greater ADU development across the county.

First is looking at are there ways to remove parking or make any parking reductions more targeted using that same framework of access to high capacity transit that is going to guide some of the revisions to the multi-family parking we discussed, that could be having that access to transit and/or access to on-street parking, could be site-specific features that could lead to reducing the parking required or even eliminating it for ADUs.

Some slight changes to the size of ADUs similar to the cottages taking out some discretionary language about architectural compatibility focusing on more objective standards that are easier to interpret and apply. A little bit more flexibility on where a detached ADU can be placed on the development. Looking at potential for allowing two ADUs on the property, you know, if one's good, two's even better particularly as we look at these other middle housing types like duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes that could have more than two units on a property, why not extend that same number of units for parity by allowing the two ADUs, so that's one piece to look at.

And then also a recommended change from I believe County staff but that was vetted by the PAG also was to use these really strong ADU recommendations or real ADU code standards and use those standards in the mixed use zone rather than right now there's an alternative set of standards that we heard weren't working quite as well, so that came out in our code audit. Next, please.

This is a little bit more of a shall we say a housekeeping change to some of the definitions that are in households and housekeeping units and family also comes from the State, so pretty low-hanging fruit. It's just about removing some of the numbers of how many unrelated persons can meet the definition of the household so because that can have discriminatory effects under fair housing laws and so this is a change in Washington. There's also been a very similar change done in Oregon, so this just keeps Washington and the county abreast of the best fair housing practices. Next, please.

This is another strategy. So, as I talked about most of our short-term strategies are looking at how can we use the existing code and provisions and further strengthen provisions of the code that already exist.

As a companion strategy, we also heard that, you know, if you go back to those pie charts and you think of how much land is available at the urban low, urban low designation for buildable land, it's only about 84 percent, or it's 84 percent that's urban low which means that only 16 percent combined is available for medium and high-density zones, so we heard that there was

just a real shortage of that land.

So, while we're trying in the short-term strategies to do as much with the zones on the map today, we also heard very strongly from our PAG that it was important to as a medium-term strategy to begin looking at where and how to up zone existing county land, and then as a long-term strategy to look at how to apply even, how to apply higher density zoning for new land as it is brought into the urban growth area. And that latter one is by necessity a longer term strategy because it will be ongoing as the urban growth area urbanizes.

And the first part about up zoning we felt needed to be a medium-term strategy just given that we're looking to do some of this first round within a year and we thought that the consideration of up zoning, developing some criteria, identifying it, and analyzing it would be more appropriate for the medium-term.

FAUST: Elizabeth, this is Steve, sorry to interrupt. I included this because in our previous presentation this was listed as a long-term strategy and a PAG member rightfully pointed out that the PAG had agreed to move at least a portion of this, as Elizabeth described, to medium-term, so I apologize, but this is the one that is not a short-term strategy. On to the next.

DECKER: Yes. Excellent. Next. Thanks. And so that really wraps up the package of the code strategies that are designed to expand housing options through the very short-term code updates. And then moving into the affordable housing category. We identified a number of strategies that are code related but are targeted at affordable housing projects.

So, the first of those is to expand options for affordable residential uses, ones that, you know, qualify for state tax credits that meet the definition of regulated affordable housing, you know, so a narrow focus of specific projects with strong programmatic backing to look at from allowing those outright in commercial zones without a requirement for ground floor commercial.

Getting that mix can be really difficult for affordable multi-family providers whose expertise is in building housing, not in building commercial spaces can make it difficult to qualify for some tax programs, and so this is a recommendation that we're also paralleling with strategies in place in the City of Vancouver.

I just heard that this can give affordable multi-family providers an additional competitive edge to bid for some of those vacant commercial sites that can be developed for these multi-family regulated projects. Next, please.

And then this other piece in the code is that can support affordable housing is taking another look at the code and making any necessary revisions so that it more clearly permits the

conversion of existing motels and hotels that are generally in commercial zones into temporary or permanent affordable housing.

And that's an emerging model that we've seen nationwide and in the county of another way that affordable housing providers are helping meet the needs of lower income households. So, we want to make sure that there are no barriers in the code. And we don't believe that they're significant because hotels and motels are already permitted in these zones, but we just want to add some clarifications. So next, please.

And then moving into programs and partnerships. Again, since we're looking at the short-term we wanted to focus on the things that could be done most immediately and so one of those was turning to the issue of mobile and manufactured home parks and to begin with starting a resource page on the County web page to provide some links to different state programs around park preservation, relocation assistance if parks can change.

You'll see when you review the full plan that there are further medium and long-term strategies to better understand the inventory, the existing parks and understand how they contribute to affordable housing opportunities in the county and then look at ways to preserve and strengthen those parks, but this is the first step that we recommended as for short-term. Next, please.

Also, programs and partnerships looking at ways to support the state as well as some of our partner agencies that participated in the PAG to make sure that the county is monitoring as regulated affordable housing projects near their expiration dates.

A lot of these projects are built with tax credits that require affordability to be guaranteed for a certain term whether that's 20 or 30 or 60 years depends on the project, but as those projects near that expiration date, it's important to monitor those to understand if those projects are leaving the affordability portfolio or if there are ways to continue to support the tenants either in continued affordability or additional resources. Next, please.

I think that, yeah, I think that gets us through it. So, thank you. We'll be available to answer any questions about those and I'll turn it back over to Steve now. Thanks.

FAUST: Thank you, Elizabeth. Just a few more slides here. To echo what Jacqui said earlier. So, if these go forward to Council and Council approves, County staff will begin the work to implement these short-term strategies that we presented this evening.

The proposed monitoring program will provide a system for measuring the effectiveness of strategies in achieving the objectives that I presented to you earlier.

Staff will report to Council annually on the progress of implementing the strategies and Council

may elect to proceed with the implementation of medium and/or long-term strategies at that time.

So, again, the proposed action, staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval of the Housing Option Study and Action Plan including directing staff to immediately begin implementation work of the short-term strategies.

Thank you very much. And I'll hand it back to Jacqui if there's anything else to add and we're happy to answer questions. Jacqui, please let me know if I should continue to share my screen or stop.

KAMP: I do, just wanted to say, like as I think Steve mentioned, so at the work session we went through all of the strategies, right, and we so and it took a couple of hours to do that and we heard from you that, you know, it would be, it would be helpful to have the short-term kind of, you know, summarized somehow so that was easy to reflect to since that might be the immediate action perhaps that Council directs, so we did include those as part of the executive summary so you can see a direct list to that.

So, tonight's presentation just, we just highlighted the short-terms for sake of time and that we went through all of the medium and long-term on the 7th, but once we, as we concluded here with our staff presentation, we're happy to take questions on any of the strategies or any parts of the plan that you have questions about.

JOHNSON: So, with that said, does any of the Planning Commission have questions for staff? And we'll call, Bryant Enge, do you have any questions for staff?

ENGE: No, not at this time. I think the information in the housing action plan is substantial. I think we did talk about this last time that it appears to be a lot of strategies. I see this as a few strategies and a lot of tactics to get to get to the objectives that was outlined by the PAG. So, a lot of good information and I look forward to more discussion as we move through this.

The only comment I would put or have is that I think we need to be careful in terms of the density and the changes in density that it actually encourages affordable housing as opposed to, you know, unintended consequences in terms of increasing the cost of housing for folks per square foot.

So, you know, we just need to be careful about how that and after then would be to how do you incentivize folks in a way that it moves in the direction of making housing more affordable, and not just on the market rate side because the demand is there to continue to charge, we just need to be careful I think of unintended consequences. So somehow as staff deliberates and talks about this in the future that there is some type of connection between incentivizing affordable housing to these density tactics. That's it. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Bryant. Bryan Halbert.

HALBERT: Yeah. I have a question on the housing inventory, that part of the study. I saw or I see that the prediction is that between now and 2035 we need 13,200 housing units. And right now, do you predict by 2035 that at the current rate that we're building that we will hit that 13,000 mark that we'll make up that or are you seeing a shortfall?

And in that shortfall will is the idea that these strategies as they're implemented will help make that or make up for that shortfall and maybe what percentage of that shortfall could be made up by these strategies?

KAMP: So, I'm looking at the graphic that we have on the page that shows that we're looking for that, you know, we're planning for the need of 13,281 and according to all the assumptions that we have currently that we have the capacity for that as that was what we're planning for.

There may be still a need for different type of housing that's affordable that we may not be having in the stock. I'm going to refer also to Oliver as our expert of kind of our planning and our modeling to see if he has any other comments for you for your question.

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Jacqui, you answered that very well. This is going to be an ongoing, and there's always also going to be, depending on timing, additional land added to UGB, so we're going to continue to make adjustment as we plan for the future, but I believe that the numbers shown in the study area there is some available land to accommodate that and it's going to take some time for all that to come online.

There may be other hiccups there because, a, there may be some of the land that we are saying is available now where the property owners may not want to sell right away for a variety of reasons, so we're going to be monitoring that and see how land develops over time.

HALBERT: So, Oliver, how many building permits for single-family residents or I guess even multi-family are we issuing a year or what's the average there?

ORJIAKO: I don't have that in front of me but we can get you that. We will have to ask for that information from our Community Development staff or check in with GIS staff through their assessor's database to give us an idea of looking at year built, how many units are being built both multi-family and single-family, but I can tell you by just preliminary evidence that the housing market is really hot and there are a couple of units that are in the pipeline but I cannot pinpoint and tell you it's X or Y, but we do have data on number of building permits or, you know, getting information on even a year built, but I think as you look around the county there's apartments and other subdivisions coming online.

KAMP: I just noticed, and I got a note from Jenna, that we do have on Page 16 of the plan that was summarizing that study that they noted that housing production has increased since 2010 averaging 930 units per year with a low of 164 units built in 2011 to a high of 2,106 units built in 2017, but I think that we're still not -- don't have enough to meet the demand, although we have capacity, so just encouraging, you know, more different types.

HALBERT: And we also know that the county seems to outpace the growth of what we've predicted for some time so it seems like we actually may need even more housing units than what we're showing if the county continues at the same pace it's going.

And I understand it's a pipeline and that we need to, the implementation of some of these ideas will help increase the availability of housing whether it's low, medium or, you know, higher end homes, single-family residence, but... Okay.

I guess I just want to understand if we were in a crisis of being extremely short of homes thereby driving up the cost of the home because there's more demand than we could even keep up with or are we at a place where we can permit and build enough homes for the, for Clark County and the demand that's here, and in some ways helping the market conditions because there's not as much competition?

KAMP: Yeah, I think what the study shows and what our planning has shown is there's enough land currently to meet that number of units that we need but that the development hasn't kept up with that. I think there's a lot of reasons during the recession that things kind of slowed down, but that the other piece of it of course is what we are building affordable for people of all variety of household incomes and do we have that variety of different types that people are looking for and able to afford.

HALBERT: We also understand that in that Vancouver urban growth area that we need infrastructure to support those homes and that's the other side of that coin there. We may have the land, but if there's no infrastructure to support homes where, whether it's affordable or not, you can't build.

KAMP: It would be difficult, yes.

HALBERT: Okay. Thanks.

ORJIAKO: Yes. I have nothing more to add. I agree with Jacqui that, you know, there are different types of, you know, housing types and what is coming on the market those that could not yet afford a single-family detached they may look to rent, but overall, there is still, it's an ordinary house, but in homeownership and in also in rental, so that's what we're really seeing, the demand is there.

You know, the inventory may be very very low and it may not be low because folks are not selling, it may just be low that the existing homes are not coming on the market as well to increase inventory. So, there are so many things that are happening in the marketplace, but, you know, land availability is one of those and how much it's costing per square footage to build, there are so many things that are happening, so I hope that answers your question.

HALBERT: It does. Thanks. I'm good, Karl. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Matt Swindell.

SWINDELL: Nothing at this time. No questions.

JOHNSON: Eldon.

WOGEN: Yeah. Is this on? Is it on now? How did you pick which strategies were to be short-term to work on? I mean, I see that there was one long-term, medium-term that was put in there.

KAMP: That there was kind of a specific reason for that. So that one HO-16 was designated when the advisory group was finalizing the recommendations, we had two categories, kind of two bigger categories, near-term and long-term and that one fell in at their last meeting, there was a suggestion to move it from the long-term to the near-term.

When we developed our implementation matrix for the decision-makers we wanted to really be able to call out and have a distinction with what we call the low-hanging fruit, the short-terms that are easily implemented because it's a code change or it's something that the County has direct control over versus something that might need some more study, an analysis to implement which we're going from medium or long.

That particular strategy has kind of a couple of different elements in it. It has it's talking about up zoning land which would definitely not be able to be done within a year, that's a pretty big planning effort, so we wanted to include that tonight because we wanted to make sure that we showed that that was an error and we wanted to make sure that we indicated that that strategy for the changing of zoning to a higher density in some areas where appropriate could be done medium-term because we had it designated as long in the original document.

And then the other piece of it is to consider when you expand your urban growth boundary to consider a higher density zoning when you bring that up, bring that in and we aren't able to do that until we do a periodic update which is not until 2025 so that gives it that longer term because of the timing on that. So, we've added that to the Slide Deck tonight just to identify that and inform the Planning Commission that that was the case.

WOGEN: Well, I understand why you want to pick some objectives that are easy to meet short-term, it builds on momentum, but a lot of this stuff that's in what's identified in the short-term aren't very impactful to reducing costs, you know, making whether you're going to change fees and permits, how you're impacting land costs, which rezoning will do that in higher densities, and materials and labor which ADUs and things like that, but I'd like to see some more effort being made to look at some of the middle or long-term that have more impact on making housing actually affordable for low and moderate incomes.

You know, like last, a couple of weeks ago we discussed about impact fees, I don't see any of that here in the short-term looking to reduce those and the way that the word it's worded is nothing's going to be done on that until the short-term is done, so...

KAMP: Very good point and, you know, we welcome that feedback. And what I think our approach was to kind of keep the momentum going and now that we can at least get some of the short-terms done was to, and I encourage that, but to, you know, the Planning Commission can of course recommend, you know, implementation to the County Council of any of the strategies that they would like to see as a priority and then the County Council of course can direct us to start implementation on any of them.

WOGEN: Okay. Well, I would encourage the Commission to look at that to find some strategies that have more impact on lowering the cost and start working on those even though if they are middle or long-term like impact fees, you know, we talked about time for reviews to be reduced, you know, time is money. So, I think there's opportunities there that we might be overlooking.

JOHNSON: So, Jacqui, thanks and it was very good. And I'm sorry I missed the work session because obviously this was a big monster or the wrong one to miss. So, I just want to make sure where I'm looking at this this is probably just a basic question that staff recommends that we're going to direct, we're going to recommend to the County Councilors that you immediately begin implementation work or will you come back with some of these?

So, because I noticed we talked about at the beginning it was like, well, we're going to, we'll come back and we'll talk, you know, this is not going to be, and especially the bigger picture so, and I'm assuming we'll take little bites or when we, when we vote on this and if we push this forward that means these short-term strategies will be implemented or we're working on the implementation?

KAMP: Right. Correct. So, I think what we're asking is that we would like to keep the momentum going and we know that taking on the short-term strategies on this, the low-hanging fruits, right, so that's what we're asking at least to begin immediately if so chosen by the County Council with your feedback.

JOHNSON: Right.

KAMP: But you're more than welcome and, you know, to encourage or put as part of your deliberation or individual specifics on the strategies or encouragement of other strategies that are not just short-term to begin immediately.

JOHNSON: Yeah. And I want to be clear, it's fine, it's mostly I could see this going forward, it would be good to begin to hear more and more pieces of this and I think that's where we can't just, you know, jump into this with two feet, I think that's not doing due diligence, so... Thank you. That was very good. Yes.

HALBERT: Karl, can I interrupt real quick?

JOHNSON: Yeah, go ahead.

HALBERT: One of the, one of the strategies I heard in the workshop was that most of these will be coming back to the Planning Commission for further work individually, not as a 50-page implementation, so then we will get to get more feedback and revisit each one of these individually as they move forward on some of them, not maybe all of them.

KAMP: Absolutely. I mean, with any code change is on as what we call a Type IV so this is what you normally would see, right, so, yes, we would be doing that whole public process of reaching out to the community, working with stakeholders that have interest and in the build the code and things like that to draft that and then bringing it before you all for discussions and things like that, so there's another step involved with actual implementation that the Planning Commission would be involved with.

### **Public Testimony**

JOHNSON: Thank you. Anything else from the -- I'm trying to look out there. Okay. With that said, as I see there's no applicant for this proposal. So, we're now going to open the hearing for public testimony. I'll begin with the summary of the public participation process for the public to understand how to participate in tonight's hearing.

To be a party of record, you must submit written testimony before, during or prior to the close of tonight's hearing or provide oral testimony at the public hearing or request in writing to be a party of record. No person shall be a party of record who has not furnished their full name, e-mail address or Post Office mailing address.

If written comments were received prior to April 20th, 2022, they were submitted to the PC members and posted on the Planning Commission website. We will now take oral public testimony as we did earlier this evening. Sonja, you are up.

WISER: Thank you. If anyone from the public joining virtually that would like to comment on this proposal, now is your opportunity. You need to let us know that you would like to be called on either by clicking the raised hand symbol on the bottom of the list of participants on your computer screen or pressing star 3 on your phone's number panel.

Staff will unmute you if your hand is raised when it's your turn to speak. Public comment is limited to three minutes. You can raise your hand now.

Larisa, are there any members of the public wishing to speak?

SIDOROV: Yes, I see two members of the public wishing to speak. I see Kim Hamlik, I will go ahead and unmute you now.

HAMLIK: Okay. Can you hear me?

SIDOROV: Yes.

HAMLIK: Am I there? How do I unmute you? Am I unmuted?

KAMP: Kim, can you go ahead and spell your name for our court reporter.

HAMLIK: Oh, I certainly can. I'm Kim Hamlik, H-a-m-l-i-k.

KAMP: Thank you.

HAMLIK: Oh, you're welcome. So, as I sit here and listen to tonight's presentation, which I do agree with affordable housing and planning is very important, I do have a couple of questions.

First of all, this, the data that was used from 2010 and 2017, now please excuse me I haven't looked at it completely, but is that the date of the data that was used for this report? I mean, 2017 seems pretty old to me is what I'm saying my point is.

And then the unintended consequences of allowing more housing on, on property and the developers developing it, how can we have them make it more affordable. I mean, there's nothing ever in here about how we can, I mean if we give them impact fees, no impact fees, how do -- how do we make them give that to the homeowner?

I mean, I'm okay for the density and I think it sounds really good, but how do we really get this. We don't have where I live, which is in the Salmon Creek area, there's no bus lanes, there's, or bike lanes, there's no bus stops, the closest grocery store is two and a half miles and you want extra parking but there's no parking spaces. I mean, it just, it's the infrastructure is not there

and I guess that's just my stating tonight what I'm just going off of, I need to read more, but that's, those are my comments. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you for your comment.

SIDOROV: Okay. Bryan Snodgrass, you're next. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now.

SNODGRASS: Good evening. Can you hear me?

SIDOROV: Yes, we can hear you.

ORJIAKO: Yes, Bryan.

SNODGRASS: Great. Thank you. Pleased to be here and good evening to the Planning Commission, Chair. We're here representing the City of Vancouver in enthusiastic support of this work which was very good. I was a part of the advisory committee, the materials as part of that process are not before you tonight, but I think are very good and well organized and presented and so was the process.

You should have a letter from me dated today. I know we submitted it kind of late so I don't know if you've had a chance to read it, so we're supportive of the vast majority of work, we just have a couple of suggestions of how the recommendation might be modified.

One of those has to deal with the issue of zoning and the need for changing some of the zoning designations that was touched on, Steve spoke about it tonight. The advisory committee voted to actually bring that into a near-term proposal. I understand the nomenclature of the timing has changed a little bit and the City's concern on that is not so much the timing, it's just that we don't believe we should lose sight of the priority just given how little land is zoned for the higher or medium densities.

I think according to one of the appendices in the report two percent of the land under the UGA is zoned for high density and I think it's five percent for medium, so it's going to be hard to achieve some of the other goals or even to enable some of the other goals that are very important and that we're talking about without some changes.

It doesn't mean that zoning, the zoning map under the UGA should or needs to look like the City of Vancouver, but if there is some way within the recommendation to perhaps acknowledge that that process of thinking about that and identifying that can happen in the shorter term, I think that's, that's something we would support. We recognize it's not low-hanging fruit, it's a bigger job and would take some time to complete, but I think the importance of not losing sight of the importance though I think is critical and having some aspect of getting that in the shorter term is important.

The only other suggested change we have around the issue of the category of the affordable housing recommendations, and I think it's very, it's very good that the report calls those out as sort of a separate category. In a lot of cases markets don't provide for affordable housing, it does need some levels of assistance of some kind or enablement through zoning.

And so one of the factors, these are again in our letter, just really quickly that you might think about is recommending adding to the criteria when there is a lead on a proposal of any kind that one of the factors, it wouldn't necessarily trump all of the other ones that are already being considered, be about affordable housing or even below rate market housing, that's something we've done in the city in the last couple of years and it's helped us.

Consider recommending that in the case of subarea plans or multisite mixed use proposals that there be some requirement to have some affordable housing there, and that's not inclusionary zoning, this is a matter of on a much bigger proposal.

We one of our recent master plan -- or excuse me -- subarea plans we have such a requirement and it's helped us now as we're moving toward implementation, another we didn't, and when we talked about it with the developers of that site, I'm talking about the Vancouver Innovation Center, the old HP site if you're familiar with it, there was not necessarily objection to including something like that, there was some concern about possibly that how it would pencil out in terms of the finances. So having some kind of, you know, it could be a recommendation or something along those lines I think could help.

Lastly, since some of the parking issues are being considered in the short-term, it might be appropriate to consider parking reductions for affordable housing in the short-term. There's a lot of data about that and although affordable housing doesn't mean that everybody takes the bus, it doesn't, affordable housing residential often have cars, but on average they have quite a bit less traffic generation, quite a bit less parking generation and so any short-term effort I think to recognize that can be helpful, so...

Those are the only adjustments I think, and otherwise it's very good work and we were happy to be part of the advisory committee and look forward to continuing dialogue on these issues. We have many of the same affordable housing concerns within the City that we're in the process of addressing the various programs now and will be a big part of our upcoming comprehensive plan effort.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Snodgrass.

SIDOROV: All right. The next one up is Cindy Hosszu. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now. Please spell your first and last name.

HOSSZU: C-i-n-d-y. Last name is H-o-s-s as in Sam z as in zebra u.

BARRITT: And I'm her husband here with her David, so...  
So, we had wanted to comment on (inaudible) --

JOHNSON: Spell your first and last name, please.

BARRITT: Yes. David, D-a-v-i-d. Last name Barritt, B-a-r-r-i-t-t.

SIDOROV: Okay. Go ahead. Thank you.

BARRITT: Okay. Sorry about this audio problem. Yeah. We just wanted to be on record that we attended the meeting. We appreciate all the information that you guys gave us. We assume that there's going to be more meetings coming up with more opportunity to give input; is that correct?

KAMP: Yes. There's also the County Council meetings that will come up in May and then any implementation strategy that is a code or land use change is an all new public process.

BARRITT: Is that where the code changes will take place at the County meeting?

KAMP: No, no code changes are going to take place with the approval of this plan.

BARRITT: Okay. Okay. Well, at this time I didn't have any farther anything to say so does Cindy.

JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

HOSSZU: Thank you.

SIDOROV: Okay. I do not see anyone else on virtually at least that has their hand raised. So, we will go over to the -- okay. Go ahead.

JOHNSON: Yeah. With that said, I will now call on members of the public who are present here this evening. When I call your name off of the sign-up sheet, please come up to the front, provide your name and address for the record. If you do not wish to provide public testimony, please say so. With that said, I have two names on here. The first being Justin Wood. Justin, would you like to come forward and spell out your name so our recorder can hear it.

WOOD: Yep. Can you hear me? Okay. Very good. Well, good evening, Chair Johnson, and fellow Commissioners. My name is Justin Wood, W-o-o-d, and I am speaking here tonight on behalf of Clark County Association of Realtors.

The Housing Option Study and Associated Action Plan are borne out of House Bill 1924. The expansion of middle housing options in the state will be essential to house current and future residents and provide more affordable ownership model housing. All of the strategies outlined would increase housing inventory in Clark County; however, I would like to make a few suggestions to the short-term strategies that the Commission may want to consider.

First off, Strategy HO-1 could reduce lot sizes for townhomes even further to 1,750-square feet to 1800-square foot. Strategy HO-1 could also increase maximum lot coverage to 70 percent across the board except for where it is already higher in the zoning code and reduce minimum lot width to 20 feet in medium-density zones except for attached housing which could go down to 14 feet.

Regarding Strategy HO-2, the five-acre minimum may limit the potential of the strategy. Having a maximum lot coverage of 40 percent and building height of 25 feet in the new zone would severely limit the type of product and living space provided. The Commission should recommend a maximum lot coverage of 70 percent and bring the build height up to 35 feet so more living space can be added vertically. These two increases will give builders and realtors a more marketable home and buyers a more livable home, there's nothing to prevent somebody from building a smaller unit.

The Commission should ensure that restrictive design standards are not instituted which can increase cost and decrease the livability of the home. Other jurisdictions has passed these restrictive design standards which target garage and driveway width. In the small new lot subdivision zone, restrictions on garages and driveway widths would reduce the livability of this product type. Ample off-street parking and garage space is essential to secure storage and a functioning street scape within the neighborhood.

While we support reductions in parking standards, the Commission should consider how viable parking strategies like tandem parking really are. Moreover, in Strategy HO-9, the Commission should recommend an exemption for an attached garage, an exemption that wouldn't count against the current 1600-square foot maximum for cottage housing.

The code is never intended to count garage space as conditioned living space. Also, the building height of cottage housing should increase to 35 feet to again increase livability within the parameters of middle housing options.

I also really want to take the opportunity to voice our support for HO-4, it's going to provide a great opportunity and brings costs down because you're using existing infrastructure and I think the idea of the conversion element of that strategy would also bring down those costs as well.

Based on a recent study -- in closing, based on a recent study conducted by ECONorthwest, Washington State has the fewest number of housing units per household of any state in the

country. A chronic underproduction of housing in the state is to blame and this will be the first in many steps to alleviate the situation.

Our association is overwhelmingly supportive of the strategies outlined to increase housing options, specifically middle housing options. I hope the Commission thinks about these suggestions outlined when considering its recommendations on this matter. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Justin. Up next, Ron Barca. Would you please spell your name, Ron.

BARCA: Ron Barca. R-o-n, B-a-r-c-a. That doesn't take from my three minutes, does it? It does. No. No. Okay. I have submitted several documents to the Planning Commission because I think this issue is so so important for the future of the county. I would really like to make sure that the Commission understands what the constituency is that is going to be impacted or perhaps ultimately helped by the decisions that are made with the choices that are made.

I have tried to emphasize the fact that I think workforce housing in the county is severely impacted right now and we can genuinely do some very tangible things toward the aspect of improving both availability and potentially homeownership for the population in the 80 percent or lower AMI.

I think it's very possible to bring us back to that type of goal if that is one of the goals that we have in the county, which brings me to the thought that I believe the Planning Commission should genuinely set the tone for what goals you want to achieve and figure out how you want to see them measured.

And in some cases, as Commissioner Wogen talked about, I believe you're going to have to bring some of the medium or long-term goals forward to start working on them if you're going to have any chance of actually being able to see a tangible result in any kind of time frame that will make a difference.

Commissioner Halbert talked about the aspect of the horizon that goes out to 2035, I think you're going to want to start seeing some form of annual reports towards targeted portions of the population if you're going to say that what you're doing here and the impacts that you're going to try and have are genuinely being achieved or they're not being achieved. You'll get done what you measure or you'll modify to try and get to that.

I think it's very important for us to understand that all the work that was done in the Housing Options Planning Action Group all have merit and I support all of them. I was the Planning Commission member participating in it. I do think though that in some cases we're definitely past the aspect of encouragement. I think you really want to see the forms of what changes are necessary to create action. And so, in that regard I think it's still important to understand

whom are you trying to serve with the changes and understand whether you're going to be effective or not.

I would suggest that you look at bringing the in-fill ordinance back and look at how with all the other changes that have been put forward by the housing options task force that you might find that the in-fill ordinance actually could dovetail quite nicely with that.

I think HO-1 is not enough for the single-family home discrepancy that's in place and that is why HO-16 needs to be brought forward. Bryan Snodgrass' testimony I think is right in line with my own in that regard that you will have to really look at if you have 59 percent of your zoning is in single-family dwelling type zoning, that you're going to have to make some impacts and changes.

If you only have 7 percent of it in any form of multi-family dwelling, you don't have enough inventory of land in the targeted area to get the results that you really want to see. Then you can start thinking about whatever changes that you're making how they will have a positive impact as the urban growth boundary is grown or changed as a result.

I would like to recommend that you get as specific as possible with what you would like to see done knowing that staff is going to have to come back with recommendations and ideas about how to achieve the goals. I think as it was stated, you're going to see these things over and over again, but the order of the work statement, the planning for it, how rapidly you want to see it, you can have an influence in all of this.

And as you've seen by the kind of information that I put forward, I'd like to go through just a couple of slides right here to talk about the idea that when we talk about affordable housing, part of it is in the context of supply and demand. I think there is actually a good opportunity by changing what is available in the marketplace that we can hit some of the numbers that we have no longer been able to achieve. Can I have the next slide, please.

Just as a disclaimer I need to say that you're going to see some product here, I am not here as an advocate of Wolf Industries, I am utilizing some photos from their website to make it easy to try and show you the outcomes that I think are possible.

If we start talking about land division down in the 1500 to 2,000-square foot range and we talk about proportionality of the footprint, you can see just from these pictures that there is an opportunity to go into small lot subdivisions and have very livable and nice development while still getting a smaller package at a lower price available. Next slide, please.

Here's 2,000-square foot lots with setbacks. The pictures that are shown are in-fill lots that are very difficult to normally be able to put something in there that makes sense, but in both of these cases this is in the left-hand side it's 3500-square feet but most of it was a steep hill and

then on the right side, that's 2700-square feet. Next slide.

So, what we also have here is the idea that areas that have not been deemed as acceptable because of environmental restrictions, the house on the left is in a zone that would be considered wetland, but there was enough space to engineer the fill and be able to get the house on-site. And in the case of the one on your right where it says, "built in a floodplain," it was actually engineered to allow it to be right on the edge of the designed wetland area.

These wouldn't have happened if we had been talking about houses that were 2,000-square foot, the envelopes would not have allowed it. I think in all of these cases you could be seeing these houses on the market for under 3,000 -- 300,000, and I think in subdivision scenarios we would be able to drive the prices down even lower.

Homeownership can be a reality for people in the middle income bracket again and there's opportunities to get our density in existing areas where we already have utilities and the infrastructure is in place. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Ron. Okay. That is all I have on my sheet. It doesn't look like there's anybody else in the audience. Is anybody else by phone by any chance?

**Return to Planning** Commission

JOHNSON: Okay. We'll now close the public testimony portion of the hearing and return to the Planning Commission. Staff, you may now respond to public testimony. Anything regarding public testimony?

KAMP: None.

JOHNSON: Okay. Are there any more public comments? No. We are now officially closing it again. Okay. The Planning Commission will now deliberate and make recommendations to the County Council or questions, any other questions for staff. With that, Bryant Enge, do you have anything for us, thoughts?

ENGE: Some. Karl, my thoughts are that this was a major undertaking given, well, under any consideration, but given the pandemic that staff and the consultants had to work with, I think this is great work. I have to applaud Jacqui, Steve, Elizabeth, Oliver and to not forget in terms of the advisory committee in terms of them putting in the hours that they did for the type of work given the challenges they had to work with so I want to say thank you and applaud them.

Again, I think this is a lot of good work and I'm just a little stickler in terms of organization so I may call it a little different in terms of strategies and tactics, but a lot of good work that I think is going to create and generate a lot of conversation in terms of how we get to a community

that provides housing for everyone, the eventual homeownership.

The caveat and qualifier that I will say again, and I think we heard it from Commissioner Wogen and we heard it from callers, is that we just need to make sure that what we do, there are no unintended consequences, that the market doesn't take advantage of the strategies that we implement.

So how do we incentivize these actions in a way that creates an opportunity for affordable housing and not continue to incentivize the market and continue to support the hot market. We need to figure out how to incentivize more affordable housing and I think the tactics in here will do that, we just need to make sure that we package it in a way that we encourage and incentivize affordable housing.

So, again, a lot of good work and I want to thank all those involved for the time and effort that they put into this work. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

ENGE: Back to you Karl.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Bryan.

HALBERT: Yeah. I'd also like to thank Oliver, Jacqui, Steve, Elizabeth, and your teams for this report of this, it's great and I think it's a great plan and I say that we would like to, I would recommend that we approve it.

There's a lot of things we have, a lot of things that we can't control, we can't control interest, we can't control interest rates, we can't control the price of materials, we can't control, you know, incomes and -- but what we can control or what we can play a part of is helping to remove the barriers to affordable housing and I think this plan is that start is where we can have that impact. So, I'd like to say, yeah, this is, this is a good plan, let's move forward.

JOHNSON: Matt.

SWINDELL: I think I said in the last time we got together that I didn't agree with all of the things that are in this plan and, and I'll have to say that there's quite a few things that I particularly personally would not like, but what we're talking about is everybody and, you know, affordability is it's a moving target, interest rates, cost of labor, everything you just said, I agree with it a hundred percent and the best thing we can do is just kind of get out of the way, let free market figure out how best to do it and if we can reduce lot sizes, and like you said before in your testimony, if you, you don't have to make it three stories tall but you can if that's what the market wants, and I think at the end of the day it's up to the consumer.

The builders are going to go out and figure out what the consumer wants and they're going to build what the consumer wants at the end and so I just think creating opportunities is great. I love this, I call it a shotgun blast approach, you got 50 ideas, 50 ways of doing this, you got some really quick ways, things you could do to implement now and then in the next year to two years, you know, keep going, keep going.

And I believe you had stated, and this is a question I do have for you, that you're going to be bringing this back once a year to us and, right, is that right, that you're going to bring it back once a year and say, okay, here's what we've done, here's the effect that it's had, those kind of things, correct, to adjust what Ron has --

KAMP: Yeah. Well, I had said that we are definitely doing that for County Council as part of our work program, annual work program discussion to see, give them a status of where we are and then what, what may they want to do next, but we are happy to come before you all as well annually and give you an update.

SWINDELL: I would really like to have that annual update, you know, that you're already doing, if we can just see that because I think what we're talking about is we're all concerned about is what we're doing working and, you know, I think you had a concern about, you know, are you going to be able to do it quick enough, are these changes actually going to affect it and so I think having that annual report would be great, so...

And, again, I'll just say thank you to everybody, great work, a lot of work involved in this and, yeah, I support it wholeheartedly.

JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you, Matt. Eldon.

WOKEN: Is this on? Yep. So, I agree, it's a good, good plan. As I stated before, I'd like to see some more in the middle and the long-term stuff addressed so we can start tackling things like the associated cost associated with fees and permits. The two that come to my mind that I'd like to see to the other Commission members if you agree put on the list, review impact fees.

In fact, I think, Jacqui, you sent out an e-mail a couple of weeks ago related to that, that if you could conduct a comprehensive review of impact fees to implement up to an 80 percent impact fee reduction, that sounds very good, so I think that's something that should be put on the list to recommend to Council for them to start working on.

And then also there was another strategy, reduce development review timeline was also on your e-mail, Jacqui, about PP-1, maybe you can take 60 days. Is that the one? Yeah. Staff estimates that approximately 60 days of review time could potentially be saved in the review process. These are all measurables. I mean, obviously you'd want to start out you think that it

takes 180 days and now you can get it down to 120. You know, so those two that I think we should encourage the Council to start working on.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Eldon. I want to refer back, Ron is in a unique spot being on the Planning Commission for 20 plus years but also being on this committee. So, it was interesting, I read a lot, we had this and we're not in the (inaudible) phase of this problem solving, my words to add is we're in the do phase.

One of the things that I would like, if possible, plausible is an expedited process, an annual review sounds good and that's good, but I would like to see you back, Jacqui, sooner. And I don't like jumping in the weeds right now with those mid, yeah, I want to look at them, I want to, I'm a bite-by-bite guy, I think some of those have been tried.

I know we've been talking about cost inventories for a long time, you know, and this comes around and we talk about it and we get the facts and figures and we implement some things and they may work kind of for a while, but in the end, we're hearing the same results over and over again and we know that, but so what could we do, what could we do with those mids. We're going to take care of this tonight, we'll probably do the business tonight. But can we expedite your timeline, that's a good way.

And I know when I say that you're like, oh, great, you're a busy group and you do great work and you're, but back to us, you know, all right, what are we doing, we can move on some of this stuff or we can take stabs at some of this stuff sooner than later.

So that is a tangible way of going farther, I think that's what I was trying to read here, Ron, what you said, but over the decades of this county as we've gone through this, we just seem like I've been hearing about this like and it's, you know, it's not because we're not trying and it's not because -- I just think we got to find the thing that's working and all of these things that are on there in some form twist or whatever have.

So, my only ask is maybe find a way to try to come back and say, okay, we're going to really start to dig into this and make this something that you're voting on a quicker pace if possible, so... With that said, I'll take a motion.

HALBERT: So, Karl, I'd make a recommendation or a **MOTION** for recommendation of approval of the Housing Option Study and Action Plan including directing staff to **immediately begin implementation work on the short-term strategies.**

SWINDELL: I'll **second** it.

JOHNSON: Sonja, we have a motion and a second. Can we get a roll call?

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

ENGE: AYE

HALBERT: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

WOGEN: I'll say AYE but I would still like to see AH-4 and PP-1 implemented also

JOHNSON: AYE

WISER: Unanimous.

JOHNSON: Motion carries **5/0**. That concludes tonight's public hearing portion of tonight's hearing.

**Conclusion of Public Hearing**

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

JOHNSON: Sonja, are we going to be in session here during work sessions or --

WISER: In May?

JOHNSON: Going forward? I know you're hybrid in hearings.

WISER: Yes. We'll be in hybrid work sessions, but for the month of May we don't have any items coming up. I'll be in touch with you in mid-May about the month of June.

JOHNSON: Okay. So, both hearings and work sessions we'll be hybrid?

WISER: Yes. Correct.

JOHNSON: Okay. All right. Okay.

**VII. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

None.

### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

JOHNSON: Thank you, gentlemen. And special thanks seriously to our staff on this one, extra, extra thanks. And of course, thank you, Cindy, and it's good to see you again. Our hearing is now adjourned.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

***<https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes>***

Television proceedings can be viewed on CTVTV on the following Web Page at:

***<https://www.cvtv.org/program/clark-county-planning-commission>***

Minutes Transcribed by:

*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Rider & Associates Court Reporting*

*Sonja Wisser, Program Assistant, Clark County Community Planning*