



Clark County Planning Commission

Karl Johnson, Chair
Bryan Halbert, Vice Chair
Jeremy Baker
Mark Bergthold
Kyle Fadness
Jack Harroun
Eldon Wogen

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2025 MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

Public Service Center
Council Hearing Room, 6th Floor
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

JOHNSON: Good evening, Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff members. I would like to call this hybrid meeting to order for Thursday, May 15, 2025. My name is Karl Johnson, 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 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 will conduct a public hearing tonight and take testimony. All public comments received before tonight's hearing have been sent to the PC members and entered into the public record.

County staff will present first and then Planning Commission can ask questions. Next, we will invite the applicant to speak, if there is one, then members of the public who wish to provide testimony.

When we get to the public comment portion of our agenda, we will provide more information on how to participate both virtually and in person. However, if you're in person tonight and wish to provide comment on a hearing agenda item, please sign up via the sign-in sheets in the back of the room.

During public testimony you'll 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 the public testimony, staff and the applicant may respond to comments and the public portion of the hearing will then be closed. The Planning Commission will then deliberate and make a recommendation to the County Council.

For both virtual and in-person members of the Planning Commission and staff, please ensure that your microphones are muted unless you are speaking. Planning Commissioners, when you make a motion and/or a second to the motion, please state your name for the court reporter.

Tonight, do any members of the Planning Commission have any conflicts related to tonight's hearing? With that said, Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: HERE
BERGTHOLD: HERE
FADNESS: HERE
WOGEN: HERE
HARROUN: HERE
BAKER: ABSENT
JOHNSON: HERE

Staff Present: Christine Cook, Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Stephen Archer, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney II; Brent Davis, Community Development Program Manager III; Kevin Tyler, Public Works Division Manager; Hunter Decker, County Forester; April Furth, Community Development Director (Virtual); Sherry Villafane, Public Works Division Manager (Virtual); Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant; Larisa Sidorov, Office Assistant; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter (Virtual).

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for May 15, 2025

JOHNSON: Jeff, excuse me, next I'll be asking for approval of agenda for May 15, 2025. May I get a motion and a second.

BERGTHOLD: I'll make a **motion** to approve the agenda.

HALBERT: Bryan Halbert. I'll **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: Jeff, can we get a roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE
BERGTHOLD: AYE
FADNESS: AYE
WOGEN: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/0.

B. Approval of Minutes for April 17, 2025

JOHNSON: Motion is approved. May I get another motion and second for approval of the minutes for April 17th, 2025.

FADNESS: Kyle Fadness. I make a **motion** to approve the minutes for April 17th, 2025.

HARROUN: Jack Harroun. I **second**.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: ABSTAIN
BERGTHOLD: APPROVE. AYE
FADNESS: AYE
WOGEN: AYE
HARROUN: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 5/0, 1 abstention.

C. Communications from the Public

JOHNSON: Approval is passed. With that said, we will now move on to, excuse me, is there any communications first from the public for items that are not, I repeat not listed on the agenda?

DELAPENA: There's nobody online.

JOHNSON: I'm sorry. Jeff, go ahead.

DELAPENA: I can go ahead and provide instructions on how to provide comment. For attendees using their computer or Webex application, if you would like to speak, please used the raised-hand icon. For attendees using the telephone audio only option, press star 3 on your phone's number panel to raise

your hand.

For those in person that would like to provide comment, please raise your hand. Once acknowledged, you may come to the microphone towards the front of the room. 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. We will begin with those in the hearing room who would like to make a general comment. Please raise your hand and the Chair will call on you to come up front to the microphone. Please provide your first and last name for the court reporter. I see no raised hands in the hearing room. And we will -- we have nobody online so there's nobody, no online testimony as well.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

Spring 2025 Biannual Code Updates: proposed amendments to various sections of Clark County Code Title 40 (Unified Development Code) for corrections, clarifications, and minor changes.

Staff: Brent Davis, Program Manager III, Brent.davis@clark.wa.gov or (564) 397-4152

JOHNSON: Thank you, Jeff. The public hearing portion will now begin. Reminders to the public, if you provide public testimony in person please sign up on the sign-up sheet in the back of the room. If you are joining remotely, instructions will be provided again at a separate time. So, we will begin with the Spring 2025 Biannual Code Updates presentation. Brent, you're on.

DAVIS: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Brent Davis, I'm the Land Use Review Manager in the Community Development Department, and I'm presenting to you tonight a batch of Biannual Code Amendments.

I have some staff from Public Works available tonight as well to answer questions and present information on the Forest Practice Ordinance updates in this package as well as a Finance Manager if there are questions about the impact fee amendment on in this package. Next slide, please.

So, a little bit of background. Periodically staff batches minor code amendments for the Council to consider, these are generally things like corrections of scrivener's errors that we find in the code, updating references, clarifying standards which can include ensuring that we're consistent with changes in State statute and then also we include proposed policy changes that are minor in nature and approved by the Council to move forward in work session prior to coming to Planning Commission.

So historically we've called these changes Biannual Code Amendments. When they were initiated, they were generally done twice a year. As time has gone on, we generally don't have enough to bring forward that frequently, so we do bring them forward as-needed but we have not changed the name of the program.

One other note you'll notice that the SEPA documents contain amendments that are not in Title 40, those are not before the Commission, so they're not in the package that's being presented, but we only wanted to do one SEPA and those other amendments will be going to Council in conjunction with these and your recommendation for these. Next slide, please.

So, the process that we go through, over time we gather proposed updates from staff, from the Development Engineering Advisory Board and suggestions from individual customers and then we present those to Council for direction as to what to include and what not to include.

Once we have Council approval to move forward, we prepare preliminary drafts for the updates and then present those to Council in a work session. In addition to that, we take them to DEAB for feedback and comments that this batch we did that on the 6th of March.

We initiate the 60-day notice process with Department of Commerce that's required for changes to our Development Code and that occurred I believe it was March 17th. And then we brought -- brought these changes to you on April 17th in a work session.

And since that time, we've completed legal review of final drafts of the updates, and we initiated the SEPA process a couple of weeks before this hearing and the comment period closed at 5:00 p.m. today and I believe we have not received any comments in the SEPA process. We do have one comment in the record that was submitted prior to the SEPA process.

Then we're here tonight for this hearing and your recommendation to Council and we are scheduled to take this to Council, the date has actually changed, it's July 15th at this point. Next slide, please.

Just a brief overview of the scope of the changes in this batch. Non-policy changes, we are making some, a minor change to the Type II and Type III timelines that pertains to extra time that we're granted. Our code grants us when we request additional information from applicants, the code currently gives us 14 additional days to review that when that's submitted, that is no longer consistent with State statute, so we are removing that 14 days. We're proposing to extend the time limit for expenditure of impact fee revenue to be consistent with the ten-year limit that's granted in State law.

We're updating urban ADU standards because the most recent updates weren't entirely consistent with the State law under the middle housing work that the legislature did a few years ago.

We're clarifying language regarding townhouses in the low-density districts that are allowed without a planned unit development. The current language suggests that a development, no matter its size, can only have four townhouse units. The intent was townhouse structures with no more than four units, and if you want more than four units in a structure, then you need to go through the PUD process as well.

And then we're clarifying the calculation methods for the student factor in the school impact fee calculations. This is a request that came from the school districts to allow some additional flexibility in

customizing the formula with County staff approval. Next slide, please.

In terms of the minor policy changes in this batch, we're adding a rural light and glare standard for new development, this was a request that came from Council.

We're making some updates to the Forest Practice Ordinance to align with State law and the County Development Code and County forestry staff is here tonight and will present some additional slides on the details on that.

We're proposing to add an allowance in the temporary hardship to allow use of existing permanent structures. The current code only allows temporary structures such as a manufactured home, but we've seen cases over the last few years where a landowner is building a new house on their property and would like to use the old house for hardship, so we're proposing to allow that as long as they record a covenant that requires them to decommission that second dwelling once the hardship is ceased.

And then we're adding a standard for street adjacent off-street parking associated with middle housing. This may actually become moot with new State legislation, but we have 18 months to comply with that new legislation.

So in the interim while we're requiring guest parking in particular for some middle housing developments, we want to ensure that if the developers proposing head-in parking immediately adjacent and connected to the right-of-way, which we have seen in a few cases, that the sidewalks go around the parking instead of across the back of the parking creating a situation where people using that parking may be trying to back out into the street while pedestrians are on the sidewalk behind them. Next slide, please. Okay.

Before I get into the forest practices and pass this on to the County forestry staff, I did want to point out that yesterday I did put a memo in the record responding to some questions that came up in the work session and I just wanted to go over those briefly.

The first item, we made some revisions to the proposed language for the rural light and glare development standards simplifying it and making it much clearer, and that's the first item in this memo.

The second item, we also made some revisions to the language in the school impact fee student factor change. Essentially the portion where we propose to eliminate the requirement in that standard for an annual update, we made it clear that the update or the recalculation is required with the capital facilities plan updates that the schools have to do every four years.

And then we're also deleting some language indicating that, that single-family, multi-family housing has to be calculated separately because the reference in that section, actually that's the standard in the reference in another part of that code, so we felt that that was duplicative.

And then lastly there was a question in the last work session about the impact fee timing changing from six-year time frame to a ten-year time frame for expenditure, I did reach out to Public Work staff, and I've provided their response in this memo. With that I will pass it to Kevin Tyler.

TYLER: Good evening members of the Planning Commission. For the record Kevin Tyler, Lands Management Division Manager with Clark County Public Works and with me tonight is Hunter Decker the County Forester.

Following the work session with Planning Commission we felt that it would be a good opportunity to present an overview of forest practices jurisdiction in the state or really in the county before we start talking about the changes that were being proposed.

So, with that, this slide shows you kind of the difference between jurisdiction with essentially outside the urban growth area on resource lands where a landowner might be undertaking commercial forestry operations, Department of Natural Resources typically has the jurisdiction for forest practice rules. The County has jurisdiction for forest practice applications typically inside the urban growth boundary.

And then also in situations outside the urban growth boundary when we're talking about conversions of land use from commercial forestry to some other land use like agriculture or residential, typically residential or commercial development is where we see the most conversions.

Also when an application comes in to the State for forest practices in that outside of the urban growth boundary, the County Code requires that a development moratorium is placed on the property so that it's not converted within a six-year period, and so the County's ordinance also has provisions for lifting those waivers or lifting those moratoriums or waiving portions of those moratoriums in certain situations. Next slide, please.

So, over the last few years Hunter and I have been reviewing the Forest Practice Ordinance against sections of Title 40 including the Critical Areas Ordinances and then the Revised Code of Washington and 76.09 which is the forest practice rules, and the Washington Administrative Code concerning forestland conversions and identified some changes that needed to be made. Next slide, please.

The primary emphasis for pursuing these code changes are related to Class I Forest Practices. So, the County has in County Code provisions for Class I Forest Practices, these are kind of the lowest level of forest practices and just there were no provisions in the code for how we were to implement those forest practice permits and so we've added those provisions into the code.

We've also developed a clear list of when someone doesn't need a permit from the County for forest practices, so those are in a section of exemptions. And then there's also an update to Title 6 which is the fees section which just to consolidate those small Class I Forest Practices and site inspection fees. And the next slide, please.

And the other changes that we proposed are mostly updates to be consistent with Revised Code of Washington and Washington Annotative Code, Washington Administrative Code, and the County's Critical Area Ordinances, so making sure that our critical area standards in County Code are consistent with what the forest practice rules are and so and back and forth. Providing current references to County Critical Areas Ordinances because some of those have changed recently with updates to the Shoreline Management Act and wetland habitat buffers.

And then lastly clarifying the requirements for vesting of what's called a conversion option harvest plan, so that's when someone wants to harvest timber on their property, they want to develop maybe residential or commercial development in the future they just aren't sure when and they don't want the moratorium on their property, so there's another option in the County and State codes that allow for that, so there's a bit of vesting that goes along with that and we need to make sure that our vesting in this section of the code is consistent with other sections of Title 40 so we don't have a conflict.

And then lastly there were some additional provisions needed for what we call single-family moratoria waivers, so that's out in the rural area, somebody might have 80 acres and they want to harvest timber and there's a six-year development moratorium but they might also want to carve out a small area to build a single-family residence, which is allowed, so there's a process to go through waiving the moratorium just on that small section of two acres, and again, we just needed additional provision so it was clear in the code how we do those permit processes. That's essentially the changes that we've proposed and we're here to answer any questions that you might have.

Questions from the Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Gentlemen, questions?

FADNESS: So, I just wanted to ask I guess in general.

JOHNSON: Would you state your name for the record.

FADNESS: Oh, Kyle Fadness. I just wanted to ask kind of in general, do these forestry policy revisions make it easier for a landowner to receive a Class I or Class IV permit and then kind of the same question, does it simplify those conversions over all these changes?

TYLER: I don't think it makes it easier or harder, I think it just makes it more clear, so I guess in that sense it might be easier for someone to interpret the code, and it makes it easier for us to implement the code.

FADNESS: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. To me like clarifying probably does make the process easier just on in my experience with working with permitting and the State.

JOHNSON: Any more questions?

HARROUN: This is Commissioner Harroun. A question on the, I'm just trying to understand the backup parking issue and so I was trying to understand how I guess visually is this for any lots or is this -- was this -- there was a specific type of road.

DAVIS: So, in certain types of development are under the new middle housing code, our compact lots development it's also part of our narrow lot standards where the lots are so narrow there's not really room for much, if any, on-street parking because of the driveway spacings.

We require a certain amount of guest parking, and we've had some developments proposed to provide that guest parking in a head-in fashion directly connected to the right-of-way.

So imagine head-in parking along the right-of-way that's not technically part of the public road and we've had some of those proposals carry their sidewalk route straight through along the, adjacent to or within the right-of-way so that we have people parking head-in and the pedestrians are walking behind the parked cars as opposed to carrying that sidewalk around the outer edge of the parking so that the pedestrians don't have to potentially interfere with the movement of the cars.

HARROUN: So completely makes sense now because it's just it's like the additional parking to the side but it really in effect is no different than somebody's driveway, right, because you would have let's say six parking spots in a row and then you'd start your compact subdivision where you have driveway, driveway, driveway, driveway, driveway and that's all head-in parking so how is this, I guess it makes sense from a safety standpoint for those six spots but it's, but when you go past those six spots and then you get to the driveways, you're back in the same situation. So, are the driveways considered safer mode than the head-in parking?

DAVIS: Well, I think that, you know, with driveways you're talking about I guess generally one or two cars wide and also those are the residents whereas your guest parking are people visiting that are -- may not be there for as much duration so there's likely to be more in and out movement from those parking spots and the more of those you get in a row, the more risk you have just because of the number and, you know, the distance that that pedestrian has to move to get past all of those cars.

HARROUN: Yeah, makes sense. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Go ahead, state your name.

BERGTHOLD: Commissioner Bergthold. So, I'm trying to visually lay this out. So normally the sidewalk would be straight because you have parallel park. So, is the sidewalk still going to be straight and if you have diagonal or in parking will it go like this around or is the intent to make it all straight?

DAVIS: So, if a developer is going to propose head-in or potentially angled in parking adjacent to the right-of-way the intent is that they would, the sidewalk would have to essentially go on the outside of that parking, so it would go around it and have so --

BERGTHOLD: To the front?

DAVIS: Yes. So, it would require them to dedicate a little bit of additional land in their tract that they're doing this in to account for that sidewalk space.

BERGTHOLD: I just -- I just hate to see it. I mean, I can't imagine a designer doing that, but, you know, take it up and around each one depending on how much space there is, so...

DAVIS: Well, and again, we, you know, as of last week we have new State statute regarding our parking requirements and those, these guest parking requirements are ultimately likely to go away because of that new statute, but there's going to be a period of time where it's still going to be required.

BERGTHOLD: Okay. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Go ahead.

WOGEN: I have two questions. This is Commissioner Wogen.

JOHNSON: Pull your microphone a little closer.

WOGEN: Can you hear me? Okay. Sorry. Are the school districts now calculating the student factor annually?

DAVIS: They are not. They're calculating it when they do their capital facilities plan updates every four years.

WOGEN: Every four years. So really the change in language is basically to reflect what's actually being done?

DAVIS: Correct.

WOGEN: Okay. And then the other question on the expenditure of impact fees, they're currently being spent in six years; correct?

DAVIS: Correct.

WOGEN: Okay. Has there been an issue with that?

DAVIS: Sherry Villafane is on remotely and she can probably answer that question better than I can.

VILLAFANE: Good evening, Commissioners. Sherry Villafane, I am the Public Works Finance Manager.

We in Public Works do not manage these impact fee accounts, it's actually handled by the County Treasurer's Office (inaudible), the County Auditor's Office and Treasurer's Office, so...

Just to clarify some of the questions you guys had earlier regarding the purchasing power of those impact fees over time, the County Treasurer holds these monies into their investment pool earning interest, so that would offset some of the loss of purchasing power in those impact fee funds, so I wanted to get that clarified first.

As far as issues in the impact fees, yes, they -- they are -- we are actually entering this conversation with the Auditor's Office, they do present the impact fee accounts to Council annually and I think they had addressed some concerns at the last Council meeting in November, and I could get you more information on that, but that was already presented and I think it was the growing balances in those accounts that were not expended, so we're trying to identify those projects and because there are limitations in the way you can spend those impact fees, so they're really for acquisitions and development rather than the ongoing maintenance, so...

In essence, yes, there are issues, but the County Auditor's Office and Public Works are working towards any of those issues becoming bigger, so we -- we are just addressing a growing balance in the impact fee funds.

WOGEN: So, what you're saying is that you think that this is going to get worse over time, that the balance is going to grow, keep growing?

VILLAFANE: Well, they are growing, they have been growing, and we are addressing those based on development projects, so those have to be assigned projects that are building out or acquiring properties within those impact fee districts. So, it's currently a problem now without, you know, with that growing balance so technically it's already an issue.

WOGEN: All right. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Commissioner Harroun, you had some questions.

HARROUN: Well, talk about the impact fee thing, I guess my concern that we're giving, that staff is requesting a longer leash on the impact fees. So, the -- so in essence the request is allow us to have a much, much larger balance, but is that going to create an efficiency in the program to make it, so ultimately that is better for the community, I guess?

Is it -- I don't know, is it a staffing issue, is it a resource issue, is it we're creating problems for like if we have a bigger pool, we're able to do better stuff and so we actually need the bigger pool but it takes more time, I guess that's my, I'm trying to understand that.

VILLAFANE: Sure. Sure. I think the first question is why we're here and the update in the code is aligning County Code with State statutes that changed that limitation back in 2010 to ten years, so

County Code has not been in that written correctly in that we have been in that six years and the language in our County Code states six years and so we're just aligning that to State statute, so first that's the only reason. Your question was just on the impact fee funds, so I kind of elaborated a little bit more than that, so I hope that clarified your question.

HARROUN: Yeah. I think my question is, does it, is it going to help the County become more efficient if we give them more time?

VILLAFANE: We're -- is it more efficient to give them more -- it just allows that time, yes, it does become an efficiency because it does allow for more strategies in the way these areas are developed, so, yes, to answer your question that is true, it does provide that efficiency.

HARROUN: Thank you.

BERGTHOLD: This is Commissioner Bergthold. My career, my retirement was in public schools and fire department so let me just ask you this the lady that was just on, my experience is the school district, people come into the schools are actually the builders and the money that is raised by developer fees is to pay for the additional structures and backbone that's needed in the school district to educate the kids, just as you'd have the same type of a development fee for connecting sewer and all that stuff, am I correct?

VILLAFANE: That is correct.

BERGTHOLD: So, the school district even though the funds are maintained in the County Treasury, which is by law pretty much across the nation, are under the control, I mean as far as the spending and within the projects that are there approved, that's under the planning of the school district; correct?

So, in other words, there's no County involvement other than to make sure that the funds are being collected legally, and the school districts are doing the right calculation and that's all approved, but the school district itself is responsible for the plan to spend those monies to benefit the constituents in their district; correct?

VILLAFANE: What I -- these impact fees are specific to our county impact fees; I don't think the school district impact fees are the same.

BERGTHOLD: Okay.

VILLAFANE: They run align, I understand statutorily, yes, they probably have the same structure and fundamental to, you know, the fundamental basis and understanding, but completely separate. What we have at Clark County are the park impact fees and the traffic impact fees and that is what we are requesting as far as County Code updates.

BERGTHOLD: Okay. I guess I got confused with the schools having a calculation. The school

calculation is for theirs or does it have any relation with the County park, et cetera?

DAVIS: So, the school impact fee update is specific to the calculations that they do --

BERGTHOLD: For their impact fees.

DAVIS: -- for their impact fees.

BERGTHOLD: That I was talking about. I got it. Thank you.

JOHNSON: Any more questions? Okay. With that said -- oh, yeah, go ahead.

FADNESS: This is Commissioner Fadness again. So going back kind of to the school impact fees actually, I know you made a mention during the workshop that there was the potential to implement the fees differently based off of kind of the community make up or the development make up.

So my question is could that lead to a potential that building houses, building anything that's available for families would have to pay more to now subsidize the development of, you know, I think in your example you used 55 plus communities, and so could that lead to higher impact fees for those developments that are available to maybe younger families and people that can't be in an older community?

DAVIS: So the element that we're changing is the student factor which is essentially how they calculate how many students they can anticipate for the future, so it doesn't affect -- it doesn't affect how different types of development are charged, it's just calculating the amount of funds that they essentially need in order to support the anticipated increase or decrease in students.

FADNESS: Okay. Thank you. That clears it up a little bit. I think I misunderstood. Thanks.

JOHNSON: Yes, Commissioner Harroun.

HARROUN: Just to clarify that, but the impact fee is based on say the school needs \$100 million for their impact, that is the baseline is a per door baseline, and if you remove some of those doors, it would in fact increase the baseline for like the apartments or the affordable housing; correct?

DAVIS: Well, it would essentially change the calculation for all development, but it would still all be treated the same.

HARROUN: But if in the example of the 55 plus not being charged any school impact fees and housing --

DAVIS: That wasn't --

HARROUN: I guess that's my --

DAVIS: That wasn't the example. They would be excluded from or their influence in determining how many students the district can anticipate would be excluded but they were not being excluded from being charged impact fees.

HARROUN: Okay. That makes sense. So, you're looking at it from a student count standpoint not a, but the 55 plus would still be paying --

DAVIS: Correct.

HARROUN -- school impact fees?

DAVIS: Yeah.

JOHNSON: Any other questions? Okay, thank you.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

JOHNSON: With that said, we're now at the public hearing part of the testimony for tonight's hearing.

Oral testimony should be directed towards the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will consider all public comments as they deliberate and vote on the recommendation to the Council. Jeff, will you do your spiel again.

DELAPENA: Please note 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.

If written testimony or if written comments were received prior to May 15th, 2025, they were submitted to the PC members and posted on the Planning Commission website. Tonight's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter, so please spell your first and last name and speak slowly. Public comment is limited to three minutes.

We will now begin with those participants that have joined remotely via computer or telephone. Please raise your virtual hand or press star 3 on your phone to let us know you would like to provide comment. We have no raised hands online.

We will now begin with participants in the hearing room. Is there anybody in the hearing room who would like to provide comment? We have no one in the hearing room who would like to provide comments. That concludes public testimony.

Return to Planning Commission

JOHNSON: Thank you. We will now close the public portion of testimony, and we don't have any staff response to the testimony or applicants. With that said, let's bring this back to the Planning Commission and our deliberations.

Are there any Planning Commission comments? Seeing no comments, I would take a motion and a second, make sure we state who that is.

BERGTHOLD: I'll make the **motion** that we approve the Spring 2025 Biannual Code Updates as presented tonight. This is Commissioner Bergthold.

HALBERT: Commissioner Halbert. I **second** that motion.

JOHNSON: We have a motion and a second. Clerk, would you please provide a roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

HALBERT: AYE

BERGTHOLD: AYE

FADNESS: AYE

WOGEN: AYE

HARROUN: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

DELAPENA: 6/0.

JOHNSON: The motion passes and that will conclude the public hearing portion of our testimony. With that said, is there any old business? Any new business?

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: Are there any comments from members of the Planning Commission?

WOGEN: I actually have one directed, this is Eldon, directed to Jeff, which is the schedule coming up then for June and July?

DELAPENA: We will be holding a work session on June 5th, which is the first Thursday as normal. We will be -- we are -- we are going to be most likely holding our work session scheduled as follows on instead of our Thursday, our third Thursday in June, which is going to be on June 19th because of the Juneteenth holiday, we would be holding it on June 26th instead.

Due to the 4th of July holiday the following week, instead of our first Thursday, we would be holding our next Planning Commission work session on Thursday, July 10th. And then we are looking at the next work session due to staff would not be able to be in attendance as being Thursday, July 31st.

WOGEN: Thank you.

DELAPENA: You're welcome.

JOHNSON: Any other comments from Planning commission members? All right. With that said, we're adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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 CVTV on the following Web Page at:

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

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter – Holley Court Reporting

Jeffrey Delapena, Program Assistant – Clark County Community Planning