



**COUNCIL HEARING FOR 05/17/2022
HOUSING OPTIONS STUDY & ACTION PLAN
HEARING MINUTES**

BOWERMAN: So, we will next turn to the public hearing on the Housing Options Study and Action Plan. And for this we will begin with our presenter from staff, Jacqui Kamp.

KAMP: Good evening, Councilors. And I believe Oliver Orjiako, Director, I think he's going to want to say a few words, I'm just going to pass the baton over to him to kick this off. At least, I hope.

OTTO: Oliver, it looks like you're muted.

ORJIAKO: Sorry. Good evening, Chair, and members of the Council. Oliver Orjiako. I will just make a very quick remarks and then I'll pass it on to Jacqui and our consultants.

Councilors, as you are aware, this study was commenced by Council directing staff to move into Phase 2 of the affordable housing issues. As the Council is aware, not only local, but statewide and nationally, we have a housing affordability crisis, and when the Council approved this study, it was limited to the Vancouver urban growth area.

And the Council at the time approved the consultant that worked with us, consultant that has expert in housing and approved that contract to help us get this conversation going. It has been at least almost two years and involve a variety of stakeholders. We did our best in terms of public outreach. We had a very fast outreach interviews surveys and I'm sure that Jacqui and the consultant will get into the makeup of the advisory committee that the Council also approved.

The main purpose of this study is to identify ways to encourage development of affordable housing in the Vancouver area and in a manner that creates a variety of housing choice and a variety of housing types including cost levels. The plan also identifies strategies, timelines for implementation and also provides for monitoring and we will go over these in details.

There are no parcel or properties specific that calls for change in zoning. These are strategies to help us look at opportunities and remove barriers relating to housing choice and opportunities. So that's really the main focus of the study.

And, like I said, the Council approved this work and if you'll recall the Councilors that were here at the time, we did Phase 1 where we looked at the code and made changes to our accessory dwelling unit, manufactured housing, and cottage housing. Those were code changes made earlier in the discussion about affordable housing and the housing crisis, how we as a community or local here can begin to address them.

And with that, I will turn it over to Jacqui Kamp who is the Project Manager for this particular project. As I indicated, we had Steve Faust from 3J Consulting and also Elizabeth Decker from JET Planning and additional work was done by ECONorthwest looking at housing need, looking at demography, looking

at other issues pertaining to affordable housing. So, with that, I will turn it over to Jacqui.

KAMP: Thank you, Oliver.

ORJIAKO: Yeah. But, first, all of us are here to answer questions that Councilors may have so I give special thanks to these -- the stakeholders that worked on this and to my staff and the consultant that worked with us. I may also give a shout out to Councilor Olson who also participated on the committee. So, with that, I'll turn it over to you, Jacqui. Thank you, Councilors.

KAMP: Thank you, Oliver. Before I get started, I do just want to say, as Oliver said, we had a great Project Advisory Group and I notice -- I can see at least virtually in the attendee list we have several in attendance so I'm very grateful for them to be staying engaged.

So, we have Bryan from the City of Van- -- that represented the City of Vancouver. Heidi Rosenberg that represented schools. Mark Maggiora who represented community and neighborhood groups. And we also have Roy Johnson who had a staff, Victor Caesar, from the Vancouver Housing Authority. If anyone's in the room tonight, maybe you could raise your hand and let the Councilors there know that you participated. So, moving to the -- so kind of why we're here tonight.

So, this is a hearing on the Housing Options Study and Action Plan. On May 4th the project staff, we presented the Housing Options Study and Action Plan to Council during a work session in which we provided an overview of the plan and walked through all of the strategies. Tonight, we will be briefly going through those strategies identified as short-term and those were the recommendation by the PC to begin moving forward immediately, but we're happy to answer any questions from Council on any of the strategies in the plan or any elements of the plan that we may not specifically address in the presentation slides tonight. Next slide.

So as Oliver mentioned, the purpose of the study and plan was to understand our local housing challenges and identify opportunities to encourage creation of additional housing types that are affordable to a variety of households within the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area. You can see this area in the darker gray color on the map. This can be done through the removal of regulatory barriers and/or implementation of other strategies.

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 where different types of housing such as duplex, triplex, quadplex, condominiums, multi-family apartments can be built and where urban services are available and can be provided in an efficient manner. Next slide.

So, this slide shows kind of the relationship between the housing action plan, our comprehensive plan, and our development regulations. So, under the Growth Management Act, Clark County is required to plan for housing including housing affordable to lower income households. The Growth Management Act includes specific requirements for how cities and counties should plan for housing.

The County's comprehensive plan includes a housing element. The purpose of the element and its

policies is to identify the need and mechanisms that will lead to the construction and preservation of decent housing for all economic segments of the population. The County's Development Regulations, Clark County Title 40, implement the vision and policies of the plan, the comprehensive plan, and the code dictates how the built environment will develop.

So, as you can see in this chart, the housing action plan can inform housing land use and other policies outlined in the comprehensive plan. It can also guide implementation of those policies by identifying strategies such as amendments to development regulations and implementation procedures to further encourage housing development to meet our housing goals. Next slide.

Project staff have provided periodic updates to the Council since the beginning as well as members being interviewed as part of the stakeholder interviewing process in 2020, and, of course, as Oliver mentioned, Councilor Olson's participation on the Project Advisory Group. Next slide.

This graphic is our Project Schedule that we've had posted, so showing the various phases of the project, that gets us here to Phase 5 this evening as part of the legislative process. Next slide.

The full public participation plan along with a list of public outreach events and meetings that took place during the project is included in Appendix B of the plan. Part of that 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 and stakeholders that are listed here, and the PAG, the Project 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 the public participation process included those listed on this slide including two virtual public meetings, online questionnaires, CVTV videos and other briefings and meetings with stakeholders and interested persons. Next slide.

On April 21st, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan with the further recommendations to direct staff to begin immediate implementation of the short-term strategies. The focus on the short-term strategies is to encourage the momentum of the project and accomplish some immediate actionable items that could be accomplished within a year.

The recommended strategies include potential changes to the comprehensive plan, county code, zoning map and/or other nonregulatory recommendations for Council consideration. To be clear, approval of this plan does not approve any new policy, regulation, or code change 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 you select 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 a code or land use change, the proposed change would go through a Type IV public process with public participation followed by hearings by the Planning Commission and County Council.

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

Now I'd like to pass it over to our Project Manager for the consultant team, Steve Faust.

FAUST: Thank you, Jacqui, and good evening, Chair Bowerman, and Councilors. Next slide, please. As Jacqui said, at the outset of the project we engaged in a number of activities to better understand the issues around this housing crisis in Clark County. We conducted approximately -- or interviews was approximately 70 stakeholders to understand development trends, barriers, and opportunities.

We looked at trends in housing production and demographics. We conducted an audit to better understand the regulatory landscape in Clark County. A legislative review to summarize recent Washington State housing legislation. And conducted several case studies to gather inspiration from other jurisdictions, learn from their mistakes and think about which initiative might be utilized in Clark County. Next slide, please.

Sharing some of the key findings from this initial work that we did. You can see here that housing is getting increasingly expensive in this urban growth area. Wage growth has been outpaced by increases in rent and home sale prices, yet wages from 2012 to 2019 increasing by 12 percent, rents by 23 percent and home sales by 95 percent, so quite a disparity there. Next slide, please.

Single-family, owner-occupied dwellings are the predominant housing type in the county, but don't reflect the entirety of local needs. One example is that of about 60 percent of households are one to two person households, but 70 percent of the housing stock is three to four bedroom units. We also note that impact and development fees are not really scaled to support the development of housing types with smaller footprints. Next slide, please.

So, there is a relatively small supply of land for medium and high density housing, and that really limits the variety of housing options that get built. You can see from these two charts here that both residential zoned land and residential buildable land are by a large degree predominantly low density. Next slide, please.

So, we look at this chart and we see that most single-family units for sale in the study area cost \$400,000 or more which is unaffordable to many potential home buyers. Households of the lower and middle income of the spectrum often have no choice but to pay increasingly higher rents because

homeownership is out of reach. Next slide, please.

So, what we see is a total needed housing, total number of needed housing units through 2035 of almost 13,300 units. About 2500 of those units are current under production and a future need of approaching 11,000 units. And you can see that about half of those units are at the 120 percent of average -- of area median income, 120 percent are greater and the market typically takes care of those households. It's the less than 120 percent that we're really developing strategies for because the market is not providing housing that they can afford. Next slide, please.

Based on this information, our Project Advisory Group developed five objectives for the housing action plan. To encourage housing development that meets the needs of middle income households not being served in the current market. Developing strategies to support the development of housing that is affordable to low, very low and extremely low households. Encouraging diversity in housing type and tenure, that's rental and ownership, including expanding middle housing options and increasing multi-family feasibility.

Encouraging the creation of a broad range of housing sizes to match the needs of our households. And guiding the development of diverse housing options to areas that have access to amenities like transportation corridors and transit, commercial services, schools, and parks and also supporting the development of those amenities in areas where more housing is added. Next slide, please.

Actually, two slides ahead. We'll go on to our recommendation. We created four categories of the strategies that were recommended by the Project Advisory Group. Housing options are strategies that expand housing development options and enhance residential development feasibility of existing options. We are trying to -- the second category is strategies that increase the feasibility of subsidized affordable housing for those populations I mentioned earlier.

The third category looks at the administration of county programs like development permitting and also partnerships where the county's role is supporting partners with developing solutions to some of these issues. And then, finally, advocating for State legislative changes that allow the county more strategies and tools not currently available.

So now we'll go through the 15 short-term strategies that we are highlighting for you this evening, and I'll hand it over to get started to Elizabeth Decker from JET Planning.

DECKER: All right. Good evening, Chair Bowerman, and Councilors. We'll try to keep these a little bit higher level tonight for the hearing but we do want to go through these short-term strategies on starting with the next slide, please.

To give you an idea of what the priorities were that emerged both in terms of ideas that percolated to the surface from our PAG input as well as our research and the Planning Commission input as well as ideas that have the greatest capacity to be implemented within this next year.

So, to keep in mind these are not necessarily the only strategies, the medium and long-term strategies

are equally important and can have also transformative effects in the county but these are the strategies that emerged as our immediate opportunities to get started on implementation based on your direction.

So, the first group of strategies really talk about expanding housing types and increasing the efficiency of existing land and housing types that are already permitted across the county.

And so, our first strategy under HO-1 is about using the -- that land in the low and medium density zones, reducing the minimum lot sizes for housing types that are already permitted to use that land more efficiently and to increase affordability with slightly smaller lot sizes. So, there we're looking at single-family detached, duplexes and townhouses primarily.

The next strategy, HO-3, turns the attention to high density zones. As you'll recall that's yet -- there's a more limited supply of land zoned for high density and so increasing the efficiency of that to focus development in those zones on projects that can meet a minimum density of we're proposing here 60 to 80 percent of what's permitted as a maximum density that would better support the creation of multi-family residential either as apartments or condos.

And HO-4 is where we're looking at introducing additional middle housing types into those low and medium density zones. So that's where we're looking at housing types, like, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and townhouses across a broader variety of zones than relative to where they're currently permitted so that, as more housing options. Next, please.

The next batch of strategies really looks to sort of the flip side of if we're using land for housing, we need to be thoughtful about the parking requirements and getting the housing and the parking in balance so that we can maximize our housing opportunities. So, looking at how parking can really be sized to improve development feasibility while still maintaining functionality of housing and communities.

So, our first strategy, HO-5, with these new middle housing types, the duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes that are being proposed introducing some parking requirements that are specific to those middle housing types that are less than the parking requirements currently for a single-family detached dwelling given that there will be more units on the lot trying to balance the feasibility of the parking area relative to the housing units can result in more housing units being built.

HO-6 talks about there are currently specific parking standards for narrow lots that primarily includes townhouses, some single-family detached, but a slight revision to that from 2.5 spaces per unit. The preliminary recommendation was to look at something, like, two spaces per unit as well as some revisions about sort of the geometry of how those spaces work to maximize the feasibility and utility of the spaces.

HO-7 is where we turn the focus to multi-family parking. So, again, that's those apartment buildings and there are some changes at the State level that direct the County to make changes to those ratios by adding some differentiation for sites that have access to high-quality transit as well as projects that

are regulated affordable housing that there are alternatives, slightly lower parking ratios for those types of projects in those locations. So, looking to implement that State direction. Next, please.

And then this third batch of code-related strategies has to do with making revisions to the existing development standards for some housing types that are already permitted in the county. So as Oliver mentioned earlier in the presentation, the County in their Phase 1 already made a strong effort to make revisions to cottage housing and ADU standards already in the code and so, you know, as code and thinking on how those evolve, those in Washington as well as across the nation dealing with this housing crisis, we see some incremental improvements to propose under HO-9 to the cottage housing standards, just to, you know, continue working on improving feasibility there.

Similarly, HO-11 really strong ADU provisions. I've worked on over 40 sets of ADU provisions across Washington and Oregon and California and, you know, you've got all the key ingredients already in your provisions, so just a few -- a few minor changes there that could even further strengthen those. To jump back up.

HO-10, we're looking at on multi-family projects. Some of the modeling we did show that the open space requirements at the higher end of the range by the requirement that to continue to increase the amount of open space area in direct proportion to the number of units really offers like limited additional benefits at the high end. The total amount of area starts to crowd out opportunities both for housing and for parking without really adding a lot of additional value. So, we saw some opportunities to adjust those ratios.

And then at the higher end for the denser projects instead of just increasing quantity of open space, changing the requirements to focus on improving quality to ensure that any open space and recreation areas that will continue to be required for these projects really provide maximum value for residents.

And then jumping down to the bottom, HO-14 is another one based on State direction as well as implementing some Federal standards around fair housing -- Federal fair housing laws, so some minor revisions to definitions for households, housekeeping unit and family that better address the number of people that can occupy a dwelling unit that is more neutral in terms of family relationships (inaudible) potentially discriminatory impacts. So, a fairly minor update there.

With that, I will pass it over to Steve to continue talking about our short-term strategies.

FAUST: Thank you, Elizabeth. Just a few more here. We'll start with these key strategies related to affordable housing. The first is expanding options for affordable housing or for affordable residential uses in commercial zones by allowing eligible affordable multi-family housing with no commercial component in all commercial zones. I believe they're allowed in some.

At least one commercial zone right now this would open it up to additional commercial zones and, you know, typically these affordable housing projects end up on commercial properties that aren't really viable for commercial development or else they would be developed in that manner.

Affordable Housing Strategy 2 is revising the code to provide clarity on the review process and requirements for the conversion of existing motels and hotels into temporary or permanent affordable housing. We don't -- we don't -- have not done that deep dive to see what barriers might exist. So, this strategy is simply looking at the code and making any revisions necessary to allow those conversions to take place. Next slide, please.

And then we have two strategies related to programs and partnerships. The first is creating a mobile and manufactured home resource page on the County website. We had a number of people during our meetings, during the public comment period who live in mobile and manufactured home parks speak about the need for assistance from the County and others to help maintain that naturally occurring affordable housing.

And then the second strategy, PP-11, is supporting State and partner efforts to monitor regulated affordable housing properties that are nearing their affordability expiration date, so that everyone's aware, tenants, community members, that a particular building may be nearing the end of its established period of affordability.

And with that, I will hand it back to Jacqui and/or Oliver to talk about implementation and monitoring.

KAMP: Thank you, Steve. Yes, thank you. So, we've got a couple of last slides here before we are welcome to take questions. This kind of summarizes where we are so far. If Council approves the Planning Commission recommendations, county staff can begin work consistent with the direction of the Council.

We have current capacity and resources for consultant support to begin immediate implementation work. And as we've mentioned, we've identified short-term strategies that could be completed within a year, so some actionable items.

Staff will report to Council annually as we've put into the housing action plan on the progress of implementing the strategies and Council may elect to proceed with implementation of additional strategies as we continuously update Council on the progress of the plan implementation.

And then, lastly, as I had mentioned kind of earlier, the proposed monitoring program is we would like to also implement with as we choose strategies to provide a system for measuring the effectiveness of strategies in achieving the objectives that the advisory group had identified so that we can see if the strategies that are being implemented are having an impact or if there's any issues that we need to go back and rework and revise.

So, with that being said, I will move, ask for the next slide. And as we have here, the recommendation from the Planning Commission from their April 21st hearing was to recommend approval of the Housing Option Study and Action Plan including directing staff to immediately begin implementation work of the short-term strategies. And we're concluded there.

Oliver, I don't know if you have any final words before we take any questions.

ORJIAKO: No, I don't. We would like to open it up for questions from the Council. This is the recommendation from the Planning Commission and, again, I want to thank staff and the Project Advisory Group for the work that they did, so this is what is now before our Council.

BOWERMAN: Thank you. And, Council, this is just a reminder that at this time please keep your questions to clarifying questions in nature and we'll have discussion following the public hearing. So, do you have any clarifying questions on what has been presented so far? You can tell that we had a good work session, Jacqui --

KAMP: I'm glad.

BOWERMAN: -- when there's no questions at this point. Are there any questions from Council before we move into the public hearing? Okay. Hearing none, let's move to the public hearing.

And this is the time when the public is invited to speak on the presentation that we have heard and on the Housing Option Study and Action Plan. We will ask that when you're ready to speak that you spell and state your last name for the court reporter. And you can use star 3 to raise your hand or you can begin by raising your hand on the computer with the little hand signal that's down there. And if you're there in person, you will go first and we'll ask for you to be recognized by staff.

Is there anyone, staff, who wishes to speak that you have in person?

MESSENGER: Yes, Chair. We have Kathryn Neary.

NEARY: I am not staff, so is it okay if I continue? Okay. Thank you for this opportunity to --

BOWERMAN: Any member of the public who wishes to speak, you go for it.

NEARY: Okay. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Kathy Neary. My last name is spelled N-e-a-r-y, and I live in the unincorporated urban growth area that this plan addresses. I was not a member of the study group but I listened in on most of the meetings.

I want to reemphasize two important parts of this report that were just presented, parts that are sometimes overlooked. The first is the description of the monitoring program found on the next to the last page of the main report Page 56. You are going to be making important decisions about what recommendations to follow from this study, but none of the subsequent work will matter unless you measure the effects of every change implemented. The monitoring program will do just that.

Community Planning will be establishing metrics to use to track the progress of outcomes of specific strategies over time. This information will allow you to assess the effects of any changes you make and give you a means by which you can evaluate each change. I hope you will see this monitoring program has an essential part of the work that's before you.

The second point I'd like to reemphasize is that you now have excellent data with which to set goals for providing affordable housing in the UGA. On Page 17 of the main report, you will see Figure 8 titled Existing Housing Underproduction And Forecasted Future Housing Need by AMI 2020 to 2035, and this chart shows how many unit -- housing units we need subdivided by annual median household income by the year 2035.

For example, it shows that we need 887 additional housing units for households with household incomes of 30 percent or less.

MESENTER: One minute.

NEARY: I encourage you to set some goals for building affordable housing here in Clark County. Goals are aspirational but they also give us a target to aim for. I hope you will aim for every person in Clark County having a place to call home. Thank you.

MESENTER: Justin Wood.

WOOD: Can you hear me?

BOWERMAN: Yes, we can.

WOOD: Good evening, Chair Bowerman, and fellow Councilors. My name is Justin Wood, W-o-o-d. I am speaking here tonight on behalf of the Clark County Association of Realtors.

The housing option study and associated action plan represent a host of housing solutions thanks to the hard work of staff, consultants, and the Project Advisory Group. Many of these strategies expand housing opportunities but in particular the expansion of middle housing options in this state will be essential to house current and future residents and provide more affordable housing.

We are in a housing crisis and I would urge the Council to be permissive as possible when adopting the action plan and not overly dilute these crucial policies. The concerns of crowding and quality of life are valid, but you will, as policymakers can modulate these policies to work for our community while ensuring ample attainable housing in Clark County.

While stated previously to the Planning Commission, the following suggestions would improve the short and medium-term strategies outlined. First off, regarding Strategy HO-2, the 5-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 Council should adopt a maximum lot coverage of 70 percent and bring 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. Nothing would prevent the construction of a smaller dwelling.

Other jurisdictions have passed restrictive design standards within these zones which target garage and driveway width. Ample off-street parking and garage space are essential to secure storage and a functioning street scape within a neighborhood. Also, while we generally support reductions in parking standards, the Council should consider how viable parking strategies like tandem parking really are.

Moreover, in Strategy HO-9 Council should adopt an exemption for an attached garage that wouldn't count against the 1600-square foot maximum and also increase build height to 35 feet. Again, nothing would prevent the construction of a smaller -- smaller dwelling. I will make this quick.

HO-4 would increase middle housing options while using existing infrastructure, relieving cost pressures by using existing structures, and reducing or eliminating infrastructure development fees. These product types generally allow for a backyard and provide more upfront affordability and ownership opportunities compared to vertical multi-family construction.

Based on the recent study conducted by ECONorthwest, three keys to quality growth, 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. Thank you.

MESSENGER: Eric Golemo.

GOLEMO: Good evening, Council. My name is Eric Golemo and I'm here today representing the Development and Engineering Advisory Board. We are your advisory board and serve at your pleasure.

Before I go into my comments, I want to first state that there's a lot of great things in this report. Housing availability and affordability is a big issue and this takes some steps to address that issue. I want to -- like I said, I want to acknowledge that before my comments.

So, while good intended, there are some recommendations that could be improved to be more effective, some have unintended consequences and some are contrary to the goals and decrease affordability and housing options. We're also concerned that some of the strategies could have impacts to the character of existing neighborhoods and we recommend that DEAB be involved in the process to help mitigate those impacts and find some unintended consequences.

I'm not going to go over the full memo but I do want to direct you to the DEAB memo dated May 13th for recommendations for a complete recommendation. A few examples that I wanted to bring up, and Justin touched on a few so I'm going to skip over some of those, but he mentioned, you know, the limiting HO-2 which limits max lot coverage to 40 percent and the 25 percent max height. Mathematically, that doesn't work.

When you look at applying that standard, as the size of the lot decreases, the coverage increases to continue to have a marketable product and sometimes the height has to go up as well. So,

mathematically, it doesn't work. It's actually contrary to the goals.

Design standards are another one that Mr. Wood touched on that I wanted to further expand on. While it wasn't specifically stated in that memo, there was a lot of discussion and it's going to come up later, but some of the design standards are meant to discourage garages and also to encourage alleys. While that may be a good choice in some neighborhoods, we don't feel it should be codified. It should be market driven. For example, you know, garages demanded by the public find homes, by consumers, they want them for automobiles, hobbies, storage, et cetera.

Alleys are another significant issue where while good intention in some cases, they eliminate backyards and open space, so they increase impervious surface which has more environmental impacts and they increase construction cost. So, while they may be right in some situations, they should not be mandated by code, they should be market driven.

HO-3, it increases maximum density and high density zones from 47 to 60 per- -- 47 to 60 percent to 60 to 80 percent. DEAB does not support this recommendation. It limits housing options and instead it expands it. It would also reduce the ability to build much needed housing types like townhomes and narrow homes in these zones. It basically forces multi-family which also takes away the options for affordable homeownership as opposed to rent options.

There's quite a few more in here. I think I might be running out of time. Another one that was touched on was the cottage code and garages. DEAB brought this up as an issue a while ago. It's a significant issue. While, again, good intention, there was an unintended consequence of some language that we used and it's almost making where cottages are no longer an effective housing type that has market demand and needs to be fixed immediately.

I wanted to compliment on the -- one of the comments about simplifying permitting for triplex and quadplex uses through a Type I process. So, if you have ever gone through the land use process, if you're going through a Type II process or a Type III process, the soft cost alone is over \$100,000. When you're trying to put a triplex or a quadplex through the same process as you do an apartment complex or a subdivision, it no longer becomes cost effective and that housing type is discouraged.

So, I think I'm running out of time, but I did want to conclude with we do DEAB recommends that you adopt these strategies but also incorporate the DEAB recommendations from the May 13th memo. And while that doesn't make any, you know, decisions today, what it does is it set the policy decisions to make sure that the group that actually uses this code is involved in the process going forward to make sure we don't have unintended consequences. And thank you very much.

MESSENGER: Stephanie Ryals.

RYALS: Hi. Stephanie Ryals, R-y-a-l-s. I'm not anybody fancy. I'm just someone who's been trying to buy a house in Clark County since 2019 and has been priced out of this current market. We don't have children. It's just my husband and I. We would love a two bedroom or a cottage community home.

The housing inventory has been severely constrained since I started working in real estate in 2018, and it has not gotten any better with COVID. What we could afford at the start of COVID is not even in the markets anymore so we are forced to be renters at 44 years old. I would like to someday buy a house.

Even the townhomes being built in our neighborhood are selling in the mid-400s right now so even multi-family units are not currently affordable for most of us. An increase in cottage communities and multi-family homes would be wonderful for people like us.

With the improvements it seems that Clark County's been trying to make in public transportation, I would gladly give up one or both of our cars to get a house and take public transportation to work. It gives me more time to read. And with all due respect, whenever I hear the words "market driven," I cringe a little because the market is driven by the people with the money which, once again, leaves us behind. So, I understand that people like big backyards that are completely useless, with green grass, but we prefer a house. Thank you.

MESENTER: Roy Johnson. You're unmuted.

JOHNSON: Good evening, Councilors.

MESENTER: Roy? Oh...

JOHNSON: Can you hear me? Chair Bowerman and County Councilors, this is Roy Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n representing Vancouver Housing Authority. I would like to express our support for the strategies that are in the study. Increase different models of development and seek (inaudible.)

BOWERMAN: Staff, can you adjust the echo that we're hearing?

JOHNSON: How about there?

MESENTER: Roy, go ahead.

JOHNSON: Okay.

BOWERMAN: Begin his time. Yes, thank you.

JOHNSON: All right. So, I'm expressing our support and encouragement for the strategies that are provided in the study. As housing needs increase, different models of development must be considered that are more dense and with lower per unit parking requirements.

We are behind in production to meet the current needs and not well-prepared for the future needs of practices of the past with overly generous parking and large lots with low density continue forward.

We need to take acknowledge of lifestyles, the populations entering into housing markets, whether rental or homeownership, having the option to have a unit takes precedence over lower density. That being said, we support increased density and reduced parking requirements especially when close to public transit options.

Relative to zoning, we strongly encourage residentially and commercially designated zones foregoing commercial requirements if the residential is affordable. This is especially true for commercially zoned properties that are located where commercial development is unlikely. As the report states, I hope the Councilors strongly encourage that the County will need to plan for sizable future housing units to be affordable to low-income households and given changes in demographics and housing affordability concerns, the counties will need to plan for different types of housing units in the study area.

Of course, we definitely support PP-13 which is in the middle strategies which is to identify ways in which the county can support VHA achieve its mission. I think that's actually an active one. It has been active and we appreciate that with the county and that's been strongly witnessed in our newest project increase (inaudible.) So, thank you for the opportunity to make comments.

MESSENGER: Bryan Snod- -- Bryan Snodgrass. You're unmuted, please go ahead.

SNODGRASS: Good evening. Can you hear me?

BOWERMAN: Yes.

SNODGRASS: Good evening, Chair Bowerman, and Councilors. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. It's Bryan Snodgrass, S-n-o-d-g-r-a-s-s, testifying here on behalf of the City of Vancouver in full support of the housing study and action plan. We appreciate being -- privileged to be part of the process. It was a very well run process. This is also a very good product.

The City is interested not just because the Vancouver UGA abuts the city and may be annexed over time, but also to help us with our own issues of affordable housing within our city and so we found this process very helpful in gaining further ideas.

The three -- a couple of pieces of background information that were in the county study that I think kind of caught our eye that was -- and some of this was already alluded to in this presentation tonight, was that the predominance of urban low density housing, it kind of accounts for approximately 60 percent of the total land mass in the unincorporated VUGA, where the urban medium and urban high designations together are only in the single digits.

So, one of the things we did is look at what the latest price is of new single-family home sites in the urban low density designation. It's now just over a half a million dollars. One of the other things we noticed in the study was the cost of a typical Vancouver UGA resident now appears to spend, according to the report, just over half of their income on housing and transportation. Typically, 30 percent at least for the housing part is considered to be cost burdened. We have many of these same problems

in the City of Vancouver.

We also noted, as Steve did tonight in the presentation, that there's an imbalance between the size of home out there and the size of the households that are occupying them, and there's nothing wrong with having a little more room, but it does mean some folks are probably paying for a little more house than they might otherwise would.

Three areas in which we would suggest either amendments to the study or considerations and implement the study and I think that the biggest one of those is that to begin considering some, you know, and I emphasize just some rezoning of urban low density to higher densities or other densities that would allow some more housing products, a little bit higher density, a little bit more affordable. That I think is at HO-16 if I'm -- if I'm not mistaken. That was recommended actually by the advisory committee without any objections to do that in the near-term.

So, we know that might take a little while, our concern is just that the work should begin right away, at least in potentially identifying some sites. It doesn't have to look like the City of Vancouver. We're not suggesting that it does, but our concern that as the work begins in earnest on the comprehensive plan update, it will tend to sidetrack on the projects and so that's, I think, of the utmost importance is looking at areas where there may be some opportunity in select areas to do some rezone.

Somewhat related to that is you could look at that, and this is also a recommendation with that that maybe could be given a higher priority or sooner, a quicker look, is that looking at potential commercial lands for some housing and it's often talked about as that being at the expense of jobs, but if you have mixed use development you can get some of both. We've had relative success in the City with doing that. Again, we're not suggesting that the Vancouver UGA should look like the City but I think that's an option that should be looked at in the short-term so that it's fully part of the comprehensive plan which we're about to embark on.

And, lastly, I think we applaud the identification of specific strategies designate to affordable housing as kind of a separate category in the report and in the process that typically as you know private markets don't do a good job of providing, without subsidy, of providing truly affordable housing and so tackling that sort of as a separate angle I think makes a lot of sense. In our letter, which you should have from Chad Eiken submitted last week, it -- or yesterday, rather, you should have a couple of suggestions for doing that.

So, all of these considerations are things we would hope can be looked at as you move quickly to implementation, recognizing that the comprehensive plan is around the corner, but I think overall we were congratulations on a very good product and we hope to see it implemented.

MESENTER: Thank you, Bryan. Chair, I believe that's all we have.

BOWERMAN: And is there anyone else remotely, staff, that wishes to speak?

MESENTER: No.

BOWERMAN: That's it. Okay. Very good.

MESENTER: No, we do, I'm sorry, Chair, we just had another hand go up. Si- -- oh, Siobhana, I'm sorry, McEwen.

McEWEN: Yes, good evening, Councilors.

MESENTER: You're unmuted. I'm sorry about that.

BOWERMAN: And please spell your last name.

McEWEN: Yes, ma'am. My name is Siobhana McEwen. M-c, capital E-w-e-n.

BOWERMAN: Thank you.

McEWEN: Good evening civic County Council members. My name is Siobhana McEwen. I'm the Equity and Advocacy Director at Council for the Homeless in Vancouver. As you know, we serve as the continuum of care to (inaudible) the entire county and we are currently experiencing, as you well know, not only a housing crisis but a homelessness crisis in our community as well.

I would ask you to do due diligence tonight to adopt the housing options plan that has been presented to you this evening. As mentioned, several times, the housing in Clark County is not affordable to the overwhelming number of residents in our community. While this Council has continued to voice concern over the homelessness crisis in our community, not approving this plan would directly impact the number of individuals in our community who experience homelessness.

Amendments proposed to this plan, both by the realtors and the developers and audience tonight, are not helpful for our neighbors who currently live in Clark County, but rather continue to attract outsiders from other more prominent communities, price out our current neighbors, and again continue to drive up costs in an already unaffordable market.

Addressing the homelessness starts with upstream solutions to preventing homelessness, which means ensuring through market regulation that the housing market is accessible and sustainable for members of our community.

The continued impact of COVID will continue to be felt this year and in many years to follow. If members of this body are sincerely concerned with the economic health and well-being as the individuals and families currently living within our county, and I believe you are, you will adopt this plan and will continue to support staff and our community organizations to develop higher density, low cost housing options throughout our entire community.

I appreciate the opportunity to make a statement this evening. And, again, urge you to adopt this plan and thank you very much.

BOWERMAN: Thank you. Staff, are there any others virtually who wish to speak?

MESSENGER: Oh, we have a couple of folks in the audience who wish to speak.

BOWERMAN: Very good.

VAUGHN: Good evening, everyone. Three years ago, --

BOWERMAN: Would you spell your last name for us?

VAUGHN: I'm very sorry. Sorry. My name is Chris, Vaughn is my last name, V-a-u-g-h-n. Okay. Three years ago, I can proudly say I called the Vancouver/Portland area my home. Much like those living in the surrounding areas, I'm effected not only by the inflation of our economy but ultimately the increased housing cost within our community.

Like many people such as myself who have moved to the Pacific Northwest, I did so out of what seemed to be the promise of a better opportunity and better life which seems to become less a reality and even further from reach. As housing costs soar, many of the local citizenry, including my friends and colleagues, even with multiple jobs that pay 25 bucks an hour have moved out of state as their wages cannot keep up with demand of the housing cost.

I can also attest that while I have a roommate it is still extremely difficult for us to make ends meets, to keep a roof over our heads while putting food on the table, not including all other expenses having to be paid; i.e., gas, electricity, utilities, et cetera.

As a healthcare worker, I have had to work double my hours in order to keep up current demands while rent increases at least 3- to \$400 a year.

Even with affordable housing, it is still a less savory solution as safety and location of areas are questionable as homelessness crime and IV drug use are prevalent. Moving here I do not speak -- I not only speak for myself, but for everyone with whom this resonates. This was not the reality nor the life that I envisioned where I would have to worry from day-to-day about true safety or having a roof over my head.

In short, I don't think it unreasonable for housing to be safe, clean, and above all, affordable for all walks of life and not just corporate affiliated or well-to-do. With this as a goal in mind, this can be a reality not just for some, but for all who call Pacific Northwest home. Thank you everyone for your time and attention.

HARDING: All right. Good evening, everyone. My name is Michael Harding, H-a-r-d-i-n-g, and I am a realtor in Southwest Washington and Clark County and I just want to share some numbers just to show how dire the situation is.

As a realtor, I keep track of the number of market pending relative price reductions, but I also keep

track of the prices and last week there were 42 homes that sold in excess of \$700,000. There were 29 of them that sold in excess of 800,000. That's just one week. And 13 of them, I believe it was, I don't have my notes in front of me, sold for over \$1 million.

So, there's a definite increase in housing, but one concern that I have with the presentation that was made earlier was if we have smaller lots where are kids supposed to play. I have grandkids that live in this community. So, if my kids were to move to one of these new developments, where are the kids supposed to play if they have smaller lots and where is my daughter supposed to work if she works remotely?

You want smaller yards. You want the configuration to be, you know, whatever, but I'm thinking about my family and I'm thinking about the families that I represent that I help buy and sell homes. They have kids that like to play. They have pets that they like to treat as kids and so my only concern is where are they going to go?

We do have a definite need for more affordable housing but at what cost. You want to increase the density. Well, that sounds more like a multi-family situation, which I'm not opposed to, but is that something that's going to translate into homeownership that's affordable.

So that's just my thought as I sat here today and I do thank you for your attention to this matter because it is something that really, really needs to be addressed and we do need more affordable housing. I'm not one of those guys that wants to see the prices keep going up, because the higher the prices go up, the smaller the pool of people that can afford it and so I think we need to find a balance. At the same time, we need to take a look into the future and ask ourselves where our kids are going to play.

So, thank you for your time and, Madam Chair, I thank you for your time and your service to the community and the entire Council Board, so thank you all so much.

BOWERMAN: Thank you.

MESSENGER: Chair, we have one more.

SALSBURG: My name is Salzburg, S-a-l-s-b-u-r-g. Good evening to the assembly. I am a healthcare worker and even with the wages I earn, I find myself in danger of being priced out of housing in Clark County. I dread when my lease ends that rent will be raised beyond my means.

Before my best friend and I decided to become roommates, I was living in an apartment in a dangerous neighborhood with homeless camps, IV drug needles scattered all over the place, people breaking into the apartment buildings and creeps staring at me through bushes. I was working 48 hours a week to keep the roof over my head and that was killing me.

I know many colleagues who also work in healthcare who have left the Pacific Northwest because they can no longer afford to live here. I know I am not the only healthcare professional who needs

roommates or a second income or to work overtime or to work a second job. The cost of housing is out of control.

I have lived in this area since 2008. My apartment was \$600 a month, and when I left that apartment in 2013, it was about the same price. Right now, that apartment is advertising starting price \$1,050. My friends had an apartment in 2010 that they were paying \$750 for, their website now says that apartment is going for \$1,679 to \$1,875. The apartment I moved out of in November was \$1,120 a month. It is now being advertised for \$1,250 a month.

I have noticed their property management companies has taken over multiple apartment complexes and they have no incentive of dropping the cost in price. Airbnb's are taking over which are driving out the permanent citizens of Clark County. Most Americans living in Clark County are one missed paycheck away from homelessness.

Homeless people have an extremely hard time getting back on their feet. Most jobs require a permanent address and basic hygiene and that is not a reality when you are homeless. The homeless are also subjected to being attacked by violent criminals when they are just trying to survive.

There is the argu- -- I have heard multiple arguments such as minimum wage is meant -- not meant to be living wage. That is not what FDR said when he made minimum wage in the '30s. Minimum wage in Washington is \$14.49. Working full-time, net pay comes to less than two grand. That apartment that was \$1,050, they can't afford that, not when rent requirement is triple of your gross pay.

And why do the people who are poor, who scrub your toilets and flip your burgers, why do they not deserve affordable housing? The person who cannot go back to school because this is a luxury to be able to go to school in this country, it is expensive, they might not be able physically to do it. They might not have the intellect.

And I have heard many arguments directed at me, find a roommate. Let me tell you some of the roommates I've had. Crack pipes on the -- crack pipes, drunks, sexually inappropriate comments. I've heard the argument I should go back to live with my family. Well, not everyone has a loving family to go back to. I've heard domestic survivor stories and they were told they had to stay with their abusive partner. They end up battered or they end up dead.

And then there's also the solution that people should move away to someplace more affordable. Some people are too poor to move. They are stuck. I've heard people saying that it takes years to get subsidized housing. Where do they live in the meanwhile?

I do not know what the solution is for the people of Clark County in regard to the outrageous cost of housing, but it must be found. And if you are driving out your healthcare workers, who will take care of you and your loved ones when we are gone? Thank you for your time and I hope you will consider my words and the words of all who have spoken today.

MESENTER: Chair, I believe that's all.

BOWERMAN: Okay. And that's all virtually as well; is that correct?

MESENTER: That's correct, yes.

BOWERMAN: Okay. Thank you so much. So now we turn to Council discussion and let's begin with any questions from Council given the dialogue that has taken place so far.

OLSON: Madam Chair.

BOWERMAN: Yes, Councilor.

OLSON: Yeah. Actually, we have Jacqui and Oliver still with us. I just want to make it -- to clarify for everyone specifically taking into, you know, Eric Golemo's comments and Justin's comments and everybody, but in particular, we're not -- what we do tonight if we adopt this plan is not codifying anything, that this is just a recommendation.

That any work that's going to be done after tonight is where all of these discussions need to take place, DEAB input, Planning Commission input, community input. This is just accepting and adopting this plan. And I just want to confirm, Oliver, that I'm on track there.

ORJIAKO: Yes, you are, Councilor.

OLSON: Okay. Thank you. And so, I'll just say one more thing, I would hope that we don't spend a lot of time trying to amend or change the recommendations tonight because all of those things can be worked out as we work to implement some of these recommendations, so... I'll end there until we have a motion.

BOWERMAN: I do have a question and this is probably for Jacqui, probably for you both. DEAB and the realtors, the Clark County Realtors, I believe both had suggested that there be maximum lot coverage increase up to 70 percent and up to a 35-foot height versus 25. I know that effects HO-2 but other areas as well, is that something that was considered and rejected or how did it get to the recommendation that you have now?

KAMP: Of course. Let me, I would like Elizabeth Decker, she's our -- kind of our code specialist that helped with development of the strategies and working with the advisory group on those.

DECKER: Yes, thank you for the question. So, with regard to the recommendations on the 40 percent lot coverage and 25-foot height, it's important to think about the context of that strategy. I believe that's HO-2, and that strategy is about developing an alternative set of development regulations for what we have tentatively termed a compact subdivision option.

And the idea there is that there's a tradeoff, that the lot sizes get significantly smaller and that the

dwellings stay with the small footprint proportional to those smaller lot sizes. And the idea is that there's some tradeoffs in terms of the compatibility in the neighborhood as well as sort of the overall development footprint that there are more smaller lots but that the homes are smaller so you're not just getting a lot of large homes crammed onto the same amount of land.

And in terms of increasing lot coverage or keeping lot coverage as it is, Strategy HO-1 talks about the existing lots and how the lot sizes for single-family detached homes could be reduced. I think we used language of, like, 10 to 20 percent, that's where we're looking for a more modest revision to the minimum lot sizes for a more traditional subdivision similar to a lot of the developments that you see today across the county.

And we did hear some really constructive feedback that, yeah, from some of the developers that participated in our PAG as well as we appreciated the input from DEAB and realtors on that, but in those situations, you know, in a more traditional subdivision we are seeing relatively similar densities relative, you know, modest changes to the minimum lot sizes.

There could be a corresponding modest increase to allowed lot coverage there that that would help keep those homes more feasible in for those types of lots, but specifically for Strategy HO-2 the whole point of the recommendation is to scale the homes with those smaller lot sizes and so that's where those, you know, whether it's 40, whether it's 50, you know, what the exact number is would be part of further development, but the concept of HO-2 was really to focus on a smaller footprint home that is more in keeping with the scale of the smaller lots as a tradeoff.

BOWERMAN: Moving it to 70 percent would yield even smaller homes, correct, or that potential?

DECKER: Well, it could. It would actually allow for a much larger footprint than rather than a smaller footprint in that option. And keep in mind, the compact subdivision in HO-2 is being proposed as an optional path. Developers would not be required to opt into that path. It would be an alternative to the existing minimum lot sizes and lot coverage if there was a desire for more smaller homes through this alternative set of standards.

BOWERMAN: And how about the height? Their thought had been to raise it to 35 feet from 25. Was there talk about that and what are your thoughts?

DECKER: Yeah. Again, on that particular strategy there was not talk about increasing the height because those are dwellings that, you know, were just meant to be smaller scale, but that could be part of ongoing discussions that that -- maybe that becomes part of the tradeoffs and the package of development standards that make a more feasible development type adding in some flexibility to go up to a third story there if that, you know, seems like it's part of a package of compatible development regulations.

But, again, the idea was to keep it a smaller scale there with the idea that the 35-foot height would remain an option for all by-right development in those zones through a traditional subdivision whether it's single-family detached, duplexes, townhouses. All of those housing types on the lot sizes that are

permitted, you know, outright through the code would continue to be allowed at that, the 35-foot height limit.

BOWERMAN: Other questions from Council or comments?

RYLANDER: Madam Chair.

BOWERMAN: Councilor Rylander.

RYLANDER: This problem is daunting. It is overwhelming. It is -- it's difficult to grasp. I know I'm new to the Council. I have -- I see the need to adapt to the future to make changes and I understand that by passing this tonight we're not saying, yes, this is everything that should be done and et cetera.

Saying that, I do have concerns broadly about the impact on some of these changes on neighborhood scenarios, people who are currently living in areas who have in-fill projects or houses are torn down and higher density is allowed.

If you have reduced number of parking spaces given the cost of housing right now and the need for roommates, then you may have more need for parking because you the allocated number of parking units per space is insufficient because the densities higher.

As we fill in some of these areas is the infrastructure going to support -- are we going to have enough water or sewerage capability or do we have to go back and retrofit and upgrade and the costs that go with that. When we shrink lot size, are we concerned about children being able to play and people to have green space outside, et cetera. Some will say yes. Some will be less concerned about it.

I guess I tend to like quantification so measuring results and outcomes is valuable and I hear that they want to monitor and provide feedback but how does that really actually work. The devils in the details because you've got to have the information and the feedback or do you put everything else on hold until you're waiting for a pilot project to give you information to use to make decisions or do you just keep rolling and the process never works on feedback.

How much impact on affordability will some of these changes have? Is there a way to actually dollarize it; in other words, if we're going to reduce the size of the land and that shaves 10 percent off of the cost, how does that translate or how do we know that translates into affordability? What are these changes collectively going to do to the prices of residential units?

On the other hand, I'm in that older age group and we're going to need to downsize from the house that we have at some point and I understand the elderly, disabled, and others probably need a single-story ground floor level, that means then we get into triplexes and quadplexes and whatever plexes. Then do we have a mix of residents that are older maybe living on ground floor, disabled people who can walk upstairs then are above, but does that mix work?

I'm sorry. I'm rambling a bit but there's just so many implications to this. We have to try to find the

solution. I hope some of these things help, but I would feel a little better if we actually had some information to use to say this is what the results we're projecting will look like and will it really affect affordability. Thank you.

OLSON: Madam Chair.

BOWERMAN: Councilor Olson.

OLSON: Thank you. Yeah, I appreciate the comments, Councilor Rylander. Maybe Oliver and Kathleen, we can, if we were to adopt this set of recommendations, so if we adopt this tonight, we haven't done anything except accept the report. My question is with regard to process.

If we accept the report tonight, we have a list of certain short-term recommendations. What would be the next step? Would it be a work session to review, the Council says, okay, you know what, these two or three let's do this right now and then we dig into the details?

I guess just for the purpose of Councilor Rylander, I just -- I don't want to get you caught -- I don't want to get caught up in unnecessary, for lack of better words, "weeds," when we have ample, ample time to get into the weeds on all of these recommendations as we move forward.

So, I guess, Kathleen, maybe, Oliver, what would be the next step after tonight in terms of taking action or not taking action on anything that's in front of us?

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Councilor. I believe if the Council were to approve the plan that's one thing and directing us to work on the short-term we will begin that work immediately. It will entail work session. It will entail direction from the Council to move forward.

We still have a very small, limited resources to engage our consultant to help us through that process. So, we will be engaging the Council and the community, DEAB and others to move forward and then coming up with what are the solutions. Does it require amendment to the code or just a policy, that's the first step -- that's the first step that we are going to take.

And we talked about monitoring. I concur with the observation of Councilor Rylander. We will be coming back. Sometimes some of this, if it takes effect, it will take more than a year or two. For example, when the County and the Council made a change to the accessory dwelling unit, we were also charged to begin monitoring how many are we seeing being built and is that making a difference and what are the issues that builders are encountering and how can we use that to inform us on whatever additional changes can be made to our code.

This is going to be an iterative process, but if the Council were to approve the short-term strategies, we will come back to the Council and say we are beginning work on that and we will be checking in until such a time that we're able to go to a hearing and then come back to the Council. So, I hope I'm answering your question. That will be the process.

OLSON: And just a quick follow-up if I might. So then, Oliver, to your specific answer there, when you come back to the Council after you've started working on these short-term recommendations, so when we hear from DEAB and we hear from the realtors that they have concerns about, you know, certain numbers in the report, then that's where we would take the time to work through specifically what those regulations are going to say, specifically how they're going to be impacting developments, each type of development, we're not -- we haven't built the house tonight, we can figure out how many bathrooms and bedrooms later; is that correct?

ORJIAKO: That's correct, yes. And like I said this, some of this is not parcel-specific, you know, it may work for one or two lot property. If you take cottage housing, for example, whatever changes that are made until someone comes in to build that we will know whether that change is having an effect or not, but I think this is going to be both improvement in our process and also providing choices and variety of housing type, that's really the goal here. Hopefully some of the strategies will get us there over time.

BOWERMAN: Other comments from Council?

MEDVIGY: Madam Chair.

BOWERMAN: Yes, Councilor Medvigy.

MEDVIGY: So, there's a number of things I want to say. First -- first and foremost, I want to approve this plan and move forward. I want to say this is amazing work, we really got our money's worth out of this and, Oliver, thanks to you and your staff, there could be an infinite number of picking and choosing between these different strategies from short-term to midterm to long-term and we can't get mired down in that today.

On the other hand, I mean, I think our role is to provide some strategic guidance. I also want to thank everyone that came to testify today that took time out to come here and we are well aware of these issues out in the community. We can't get out ahead of this. We are so far behind. So, we need to open up the aperture, every aperture on every kind of housing that would fit in different locations.

Now if you look at Vancouver's planner and their recommendations and some of it's focusing on commercial properties and the future of annexation, we've had some, you know, I wouldn't say false starts, but we've had some mixed results in looking at some commercial properties to rezone that have been languishing for decades from when they were first zoned commercial.

You know, we need to dig into that and some of these recommendations, you know, for mixed use, for more residential use within commercial zones.

I think we need to provide some strategic guidance though, Oliver, on some of these short-term goals because we need an aperture open in every kind of housing. So midlevel housing, I disagree with the limitation of 25 feet tall on five acres. I think we can look at two-acre parcels. It shouldn't be -- we need to listen to DEAB and the realtors as to what can be affordable and valued by customers out there, so I don't want to put limitations.

And it gets me back to the first comment I had; you know. I had come here tonight with a note and it absolutely was in line with, I think it's Ms. Neary, what she was saying, I mean, as a strategic overview. We need to have goals. I want to eliminate homelessness. I want to at least stop its growth and housing availability is right at the heart of that at the very low cost housing. We need to address it right now.

So, we need to have goals and we need to monitor and measure what's going to work and what is working and what's not. So, I don't want to wait a year to start looking at middle housing. I want to open up that aperture right now, and if 25 feet is a restriction on architecture and costs for developing, we need to get away from that. Let's get away from that restriction.

I want to be nimble and flexible through this whole process, and it is overwhelming the amount of material that we have in front of us, but so I do want to approve this plan, but I do want to address some of what was said here tonight from DEAB.

I think we do need to amend some of this and look at more carefully their May 13th memo and as well as HO-2 and 9 that the realtors were more focused on so we can be aggressive in every category in the short-term and that will inform us as to where we need to turn for the midterm and the long-term. And I appreciate Roy Johnson's comments as well. I mean, we just need more of the above.

The only other thing I would say that I wish we had a better handle on, you know, the Van- -- I would like to defer to Vancouver's planners in some areas of our county. I wish we knew when they were going to annex. We don't have a whole lot of control over that, but there are some areas that look ripe for annexation and quite frankly I would like the City planners -- I would like to defer to them and their requests in those areas whether they're zoning changes, density changes, you name it. I would like to move forward with that.

I wish -- I don't know if the City knows exactly when they're going to be flipping the switch on some of their annexation plans, but that's something to really think about and to be flexible and nimble and be able to anticipate that and, you know, we're not going to have a Clark County, the City of Clark County. We're going to remember -- remain a county and we're going to have individual cities that are going to be on their own timeline for annexation.

So, anyway, I do want to -- first and foremost, I want to approve and move forward, but I, you know, I, at least, Oliver, I wanted to give you those that I do support some of those changes that were recommended to middle housing and also the recommendations by DEAB that we consider some of their amendments to this plan in the short-term. Thank you.

BOWERMAN: Thank you, Councilor. I would add a couple of comments of my own as well that are really in concurrence with what you've said. Number one is the very first person who testified tonight I believe said we've got to have goals and I so agree with that and with what you said, Councilor, with goals that we track we will know where we stand and how well we are doing on creating affordable housing, and I emphasize creating because it's not really here now. We need to

create it.

And so, let's be sure that in however we go forward that, staff, you are encouraged to create those goals, publicize them, share them with Council so that we can all keep track of that. You used several words that I thought were key, one of them being balance, that is so important as we try to develop housing that meets the broad range of what people need in the realm of affordable housing.

For example, the gentleman who spoke on where are the kids supposed to play, where are the pets going to be located out back, those are really good questions and fly in the face of the recommendation for incentives for alleys and disincentives for garages.

So, we need to balance what we are doing so that questions like where the kids are supposed to play really have an answer even though not everyone, we know is looking for backyard space, so finding that balance, not just of affordability but of the variety of housing that is available is so incredibly important.

And one other area that we haven't really touched on where I feel the balance is so critical is in making it be affordable housing but also safe housing. I have seen communities that do away with parking, doing away with driveways, doing away with garages, making it so difficult to find any place to park except on the street that the affordability of the housing is really sacrificing the safety for the people who live there.

Because if you have housing that pushes people to park in the street, and as I have said before and I did during our public hearing, for that type of parking to co-exist with pedestrians for whom there is probably not a sidewalk, for skateboarders who are out in the street right there with the cars that are trying to park, for fire and police protections that needs to have a way to get through on the street, and also this sounds obvious but it isn't always, for there to be the opportunity for two-way traffic on a street because as the streets get more narrow and parking is pushed into the street, that ability to even maneuver, let alone maneuver safely around the pedestrians and so on, can really be sacrificed.

So, let's ensure that that balance is always maintained, not just for affordability, but also for safety of the people who live there. It's great when there can be the availability of mass transit for them, but many people are going to want their cars and want to have them available to them and will have to have a place for them to park.

So, I think we need to be very creative in how we find those ways to accommodate those people as well and their needs for their cars. So, there's a lot to be said for balance. It is hard to achieve, particularly if we go through creating code just one here and one there and one at another place without looking at the totality because it is in the totality where you really see what is going to take place in a neighborhood.

So, let's be wise as we go forward with that and be sure that the variety of testimony that we've received is listened to and incorporated in what goes forward along with as has already been said, the DEAB and the realtors memos which have such good information, not just for the safety aspects of it,

but also for even increasing density when they see opportunities for doing that.

So, with that said, are there other comments or questions from Council?

LENTZ: Chair.

BOWERMAN: That sounded like Councilor Lentz.

LENTZ: Yes. No additional comments. I move to approve the Housing Options Study and Action Plan.

OLSON: Madam Chair, and just for Councilor Lentz, just for the record, it's Resolution 2022-05-11.

LENTZ: Excellent.

OLSON: And I will second.

BOWERMAN: Is there further discussion?

MEDVIGY: I'm sorry. I thought -- did Councilor Lentz make the motion or, okay, so there's a second.

OLSON: I just gave her the resolution number, yeah.

MEDVIGY: So, if there wasn't a second, I'll second it with the comment that --

BOWERMAN: It is seconded. Thank you.

MEDVIGY: Okay. I'm very hopeful that we can use those words nimble and flexible that we look at some of those comments that were made tonight and they very quickly become part of an amended plan, but I do want to move this forward.

OLSON: Madam Chair.

BOWERMAN: Yes. That sounded like Councilor Olson.

OLSON: Yes, thank you. So, I want to start with thanking everyone for being here tonight, we're getting sort of semi-back to normal of having folks here in the hearing room with us. So, thank you for taking the time out of your evening to be here with us.

I also do really want to thank Oliver and his team and Elizabeth and Steve and the consultants and all the folks that participated as part of the advisory group. It was almost a two year process and project and we do have a phenomenal product here that has been vetted.

It's not perfect. We're not going to take everything that's been recommended to us tonight and just run with it, but it provides the foundation for us to begin to really look at opportunities to provide

better housing choices here in Clark County.

And this missing middle is so critical and we've heard it tonight and we know it. We see it. We know people who experience it in our lives and we have an obligation I think to take some action as quickly as we can to take the pressure off of housing prices here in this community, and there's not one solution, and we've seen that here by this report, there are many opportunities to take action on ways to improve housing options and choice.

So, with that, I just, yeah, I can't say thank you enough to all the folks who participated in the process and look forward to trying to get some things done as quickly as possible.

BOWERMAN: There are other aspects to affordability that we haven't discussed tonight, although we did earlier at the work session. We talked about how permitting that was mentioned tonight can be speeded up particularly when it is known that certain things can be done simultaneously to move through the process more rapidly, but there are other things too.

There's the availability of aggregate to keep down the cost and that aggregate being within Clark County would help bring down the cost. So, there are ways to make housing be affordable that are not just making it denser and removing parking. There are ways that are structural and that the builders are looking forward to executing when given the opportunities that I just mentioned.

Other comments? Then let's go ahead and take a vote. It has been moved to approve Resolution 2022-05-11. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

BOWERMAN: AYE

OLSON: AYE

LENTZ: AYE

MEDVIGY: AYE

RYLANDER: AYE

BOWERMAN: Those opposed? The motion is passed. Do we need to take a voice vote on this, Kathleen? I'm sorry. Not a voice vote, a roll call vote?

OTTO: No, you don't.

BOWERMAN: Okay. Very good. We are done. So, with that we move on to Councilor communications in that event. And thank you, staff, for seeing this project through.

ORJIAKO: I also want to thank the entire Council. Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Council, thank you very much and thank you to staff. Thank you.