

Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
June 5, 2025
2:00pm – 3:30pm
Public Service Center
6th Floor Training Room #679
& Remote Participation via Microsoft Teams

Board members in attendance: Ryan Wilson, Seth Halling, James D. Howsley, Dan Wisner, Andrew Gunther, Eric Golemo, Houston Aho, Terry Wollam, Les MacDonald

Board members not in attendance: Sherrie Jones, Mike Odren

County Staff: Victoria Abram, Brent Davis, Maya Bunch, Michelle Finley, Shannon Nashif, Oliver Orjiako, Naomi Patibandla, Dianna Nutt, Michelle Monaghan, Rod Swanson, Maureen Patronaggio

Public: Justin Wood, Paul Wirfs

Call to Order: 2:00 pm

- **Administrative Actions:**
- Introductions
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB website.
- Review/adopt last month's minutes (adopted)
- Review upcoming events:
 - COUNTY COUNCIL Work Sessions:
 - July 9, 2025, 9:00am
 - PacifiCorp Presentation re: Proposed Transmission Line
 - Fairgrounds Master Plan
 - July 16, 2025, 9:00am
 - Comp Plan - ADA Transition Plan
 - July 23, 2025, 9:00am
 - Code Update - 2026 Environmental Public Health Fees
 - Vancouver Lake Management Plan
 - July 30, 2025, 9:00am
 - Comprehensive Plan Update - Housing Code
 - Annexation Discussion with the City of Vancouver
 - COUNTY COUNCIL Meetings:

- July 15, 2025, 6:00pm
 - Spring Biannual Code Updates
 - PLANNING COMMISSION Work Sessions:
 - July 10, 2025, 5:30 pm
 - Comp Plan Policy
 - Housing Element (Chapter 2)
 - Transportation Element (Chapter 5)
 - PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearings:
 - No public hearings scheduled as of July 9, 2025.
 - DEAB MEETING:
 - August 7, 2025, 2:00 pm
- DEAB member announcements:
 - Maya Bunch to be full-time in the interim Community Development director position. DEAB items will be addressed across the leadership board and county procedures will remain steady. There is currently no open recruitment for the role.
 - DEAB would like to revisit with the Road Mod Committee. There have been ongoing issues; engineers that have worked with the committee have struggled with the process. DEAB feels that there have been a lot of road modifications denied when before the current process they would have been approved.
 - The follow-up is tentatively scheduled for the September DEAB meeting.
 - There were questions on when post-decision reviews were required and associated with final engineering submittals. The concern was that often there are modifications between the preliminary design and the final design, and if a post-decision review is required every time, it adds a lot to process. DEAB would like to figure out how to make things more efficient.
 - *Determined to be a future agenda item.*

EV Charging Requirements

Presenters: Ms. Finley & Mr. Wilson

- Follow up to discussion during May's DEAB meeting.

- [WAC 51-50-0429.2: Electric vehicle \(EV\) charging infrastructure](#). Buildings and accessory structures shall be provided with EV charging stations, EV-Ready parking spaces, and EV-capable parking spaces in accordance with Table 429.2. Calculations shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number. Where a building contains more than one occupancy, the electric vehicle charging infrastructure percentages of Table 429.2 shall be applied to the number of spaces required for each occupancy.
 - **Exceptions:**
 - 2. Group A, Group E, and Group M occupancies shall comply with one of the following, whichever is greater:
 - 2.1. The provisions of Section 429.2 shall apply only to designated employee parking spaces.
 - 2.2. One of each 200 parking spaces or fraction thereof shall be EV Ready. One of each 200 parking spaces or fraction thereof shall be an EV Charging Station.
- If there are fewer than 10 designated employee parking spaces, they are exempt from providing EV charging stations.
- If there are greater than 10 and up to 200 designated employee parking spaces, then 10% of those parking spaces would need to be designated as EV charging stations.
- If employee parking spaces are not designated, you would comply with 2.2 – one of each of the 200 parking spaces or a fraction thereof would be designated as EV charging stations.

Compact Lots Memo

Presenters: Mr. Davis

Applicability of Narrow Lot Standards to Compact Lots Developments

- Any lot and compact lot development is subject to the narrow lot standards. This means that regardless of the number of lots less than or great than 40 ft. wide, if they're part of a compact lot development, they'd still be subject to the narrow lot standards.
- Mr. Davis is suggesting a code amendment to clarify the references to the narrow lot standards and to add specific language to have those standards only apply to lots that are 40 ft. wide or less within a compact development. The standards were not written with the concept that lots that are wider than 40 ft. would occur in compact lot

development. The main difference would be that in compact lot development, any narrow lot would be subject to those requirements, but in standard lot development, 25% or more lots would have to be narrow lots to trigger those requirements.

- **Motion #2:** Motion by Golemo, seconded by Gunther
To recommend staff apply the intent of the narrow lot standards, which is to require guest parking spaces for lots that are 40 ft. wide or less in a compact lot subdivision, as an interim measure before code can be amended.
Vote: Unanimous consent, Motion Carries
- Mr. Davis is willing to explore management interpretation with the Community Development Director – that we would only apply the narrow lot standards to lots that are 40 ft. wide or less – to clarify the intent.
- SB 5184 gives local governments 18 months from July 27th, 2025, to implement compliant parking standards with new state legislature. Title 40 has many references to parking standards, and there are also triggers for site plan reviews based on increased parking requirements. There is currently no set date for when the county plans to adjust their parking standards as outlined in SB 5184.

Discussion – Code Concerns

- [Title 40.220.010 - 4. Density Transfer for Single-Family Detached Dwellings](#)
- Only applies to single-family detached, even though townhouses are allowed in the zones outlined. There's no benefit to density transfer when developing townhouses in these zones.
- [Title 40.220.010 – Table 40.220.010-2 Lot Requirements](#)
- The maximum and minimum density is for the purpose of calculating densities for planned unit developments, cottage housing and compact lot developments. Densities shall be calculated based on the gross area of the site minus any public rights-of-way, private road easements, or street tracts. For developments that include middle housing, the maximum density shall be calculated on an equivalent lot area basis as follows: The adjusted gross area, in acres, times the maximum density times the minimum lot area for single-family detached dwellings in the zone shall equal the total maximum allowed lot area, which may be divided into any combination of middle housing lots, each meeting the applicable minimum lot size for the housing type proposed, including single-family attached (townhouse) dwellings subject to Table 40.220.010-4.

- *Mr. Wisner: It can be argued that each lot has to meet the minimum size, which means there's no benefit of doing a PUD in the new code, or trying to implement the missing middle housing – duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses or cottages.*
- [Title 40.260 – Special Uses & Standards](#) – typo/incorrect references to FR-40 code
- Standards for shared driveways for duplexes/triplexes are treated the same as driveways for a single-family home.
- HWY 99 Overlay development standards conflict with the housing options study. There are restrictions that make attached structures difficult to develop in the overlay. There were many residential standards that were omitted from the HWY 99 Overlay standards but there is still language that conflicts.
- Mill Creek Overlay – if you do a density transfer or a PUD, it has to be a 9000 sq. ft. lot in an R1-10 zone, but code now allows an 8500 sq. ft. lot.
- Determined to be future agenda item(s) once DEAB would like to forward concerns to the committee for review. Mr. Davis to keep a running list of concerns.

Public Comment

- James Clark has a project that is affected by the narrow lot standards and the stress-testing of the new code. He asks if the county charges an additional fee for the additional site plan for narrow and compact lots – if the goal is to drive density to underdeveloped parcels, additional fees can kill projects. He suggests to revise the compact lot code.
 - *Mr. Davis: The site plan requirement for narrow or compact lots is a submittal requirement; there is no additional review fee. It's built into the land division fee, whether it's a short plat or subdivision.*

Meeting adjourned 3:00pm

Meeting minutes prepared by: Mariah Shandra

Reviewed by: Victoria Abram