

**From:** [Bob Cosgrove](#)  
**To:** [Jose Alvarez](#)  
**Subject:** [Contains External Hyperlinks] Re: Reconsideration of CPZ2019-00002 NE 152nd Ave.  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 8, 2020 7:58:20 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Jose, I live just north of this property at 15006 NE 93rd St. I am strongly in favor of this change. Residential is a better fit since this property is bordered primarily by residential and a grade school. My only request would be that the new lots on 93rd Street be the same width as the existing lots on 93rd St. Thanks for your consideration. Bob Cosgrove

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 6, 2020 11:11:13 AM  
**To:** Bob Cosgrove <bob.cosgrove@countryfinancial.com>  
**Subject:** Reconsideration of CPZ2019-00002 NE 152nd Ave.

**CAUTION:** This email is from outside of the organization. DO NOT CLICK a link or open an attachment unless you know the content is safe and are expecting it from the sender.

Attached is a legal notice for a public hearing to reconsider CPZ2019-00002 NE 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave.



**Jose Alvarez**  
Planner III  
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4898



---

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.

**From:** [Chris and Amanda Pemberton](#)  
**To:** [Jose Alvarez](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: CPZ2019-00002 NE 152nd Avenue Proposal  
**Date:** Thursday, January 16, 2020 2:05:56 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

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

**From:** **Chris and Amanda Pemberton** <[msupemby@gmail.com](mailto:msupemby@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, Jan 16, 2020 at 2:03 PM  
**Subject:** CPZ2019-00002 NE 152nd Avenue Proposal  
**To:** <[rebecca.messinger@clark.wa.gov](mailto:rebecca.messinger@clark.wa.gov)>  
**Cc:** <[jose.alvarz@clark.wa.gov](mailto:jose.alvarz@clark.wa.gov)>

Dear Clark County Council,

I am unable to make it to the public hearing on January 21st so am writing try recommend that you reject the CPZ2019-00002 NE 152nd Avenue Proposal. I have read through all the original documents and meeting minutes from your previous meeting and feel that the proposal to change it from commercial to residential is a bad idea. I have a couple reasons for this.

The first reason is the traffic on 152nd Ave and around the new residential development would be very detrimental to the area. I have read through the traffic impact reports that say the traffic is well within criteria for the area and that 152nd Ave will be revised within the next few years along with a traffic light at 152nd Ave/99th Street. I disagree with the county traffic reports. The traffic on that road is very heavy and vehicles travel at much higher speeds than what is warranted. By adding a center turn lane and allowing traffic to flow North & South freely will just make that worse in my opinion. There is a large amount of traffic that flows North and South from all the new developments North of 99th St and along 99th ST East & West. Because of all that traffic, it makes it very hard for people to pull out into the traffic lane because of the steady stream of vehicles. A stop light at the intersection will not fix that. It also makes it very dangerous for pedestrians to cross 152nd Ave to get to the school or other neighborhoods. My wife is a teacher and walks to and from home most every day. There are many times that she has to wait several minutes for a driver to actually see her and stop to let her cross the street. I can only imagine when kids try to cross the street when the crosswalk guards are not there. Pretty much impossible and very dangerous. Even more dangerous when it is dark in the mornings/evenings. By adding a residential neighborhood to the property, it will just add more vehicles pulling in/out onto 152nd and the possibility of more kids trying to cross the street to get to the school or the playground/park areas.

The other reason I feel this proposal should be rejected is that the proposed lot size is too small and the property should stay Commercial. The proposal is to change it to Urban Low (R1-6) which would mean small square footage lots (6-8000 sq ft) and a lot of houses in a small area(approx 35-40 houses in prelim plan). That is too many houses in that small of an area. I live in the neighborhood to the North/Northwest of the property where all the houses are on at

least 10k sq ft lots. If it were lot sizes that were similar to the neighborhood to the north, I would feel more comfortable with it being residential. But as it stands now, it is too dense. Another small development was just put in to the North of this property at 152nd Ave & 99th St with larger lots and those lots have been sitting empty with no houses going in. There are also large housing developments going in on 99th St & 137th Ave that will accommodate a large amount of houses. We do not need another housing development going in to the neighborhood and all the traffic and neighborhood issues it brings along with it. I would rather it stay Commercial and the already approved storage unit business go in there than a high density housing development go in. Less traffic and neighborhood issues. As you said in your previous meeting, you would hate to miss opportunities for jobs in an already approved Commercial area. By staying Commercial, it also makes it more reasonable for the private air strip to function. There are planes that fly in/out of that air strip all the time and putting houses so close to it (even though there is an amendment to add a "buffer" zone") would make it very undesirable to live in house so close to planes taking off and landing.

Thank you for your time in listening to my concerns about this.

Chris Pemberton  
Vancouver, WA



January 17, 2020

Honorable Chair Quiring  
Councilor Blom  
Councilor Lentz  
Councilor Medvigy  
Councilor Olson

**Subject: City of Vancouver testimony for the January 21, 2020 public hearing in opposition to the revised 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue/TSR Investments rezone proposal located at 9000 ne 152<sup>nd</sup> avenue in the Vancouver Urban Growth Area (CPZ2019-00002)**

Honorable Chair Quiring and Councilors Blom, Lentz, Medvigy and Olson:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised rezone proposal. As we testified to at the September 2019 hearing where the Council denied the original proposal, the City of Vancouver's primary concern is that it is premature to convert one of the last remaining opportunities for providing commercial services in an area that lacks those services, and is still adding houses. There are a few commercial opportunities south of the proposal site, but none in the larger VUGA area to the north and east.

We appreciate the applicant's willingness to retain some commercial zoning at this site in the revised proposal. However, this is only appropriate if the new commercial portion is able and reasonably likely to develop with commercial services needed by the surrounding neighborhoods now and in the future.

The original rezone application last fall included an economic analysis which posited that the full 7.7-acre site was too small to attract market capital for commercial investment. The revised proposal would remove 80% of the current commercial zoning on the site, leaving a 1.5-acre strip with 140 feet of frontage along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. There is no analysis about the strip's commercial viability, or potential users. A quick informal scan of VUGA mapping does not reveal any examples of recent development of comparable commercial properties that combine narrow frontage with a similarly deep lot.

We respectfully request the Council not approve the revised proposal without an analysis clearly demonstrating its viability to provide commercial services to the surrounding area. It seems most likely that the commercial strip will remain vacant, or be developed with low intensity uses providing little employment or commercial services.

Further, if commercial or employment lands are to be rezoned in areas of the VUGA where they are needed, we would suggest that such rezones only occur where there are significant offsetting benefits. Those don't appear to be present in this case. As we noted in our letter last fall, 6,000 to 7,000 square foot detached single family homesites as proposed in this case showed a median value of approximately \$416,000 in the VUGA last year according to assessor records. By contrast comparable newer homes on lots in the 3,000 to 4,000 square foot range as could be provided by the R-18 or R-22 zone had a median of \$296,000 in the VUGA, a reduction of about \$120,000. Some attached multi-family housing could also be incorporated to facilitate needed rental options. This particular site appears better suited than most to explore these type of options, as it is buffered by roads on three sides and an airport on the fourth to lessen conflict with abutting properties. It is primarily served by 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, which is planned for road improvements and already includes bus service. The size of the property allows for a range of internal configurations.

In conclusion, we respectfully recommend that the Council not deviate from the course it set this past fall. Please feel free to contact us if there are questions about our analysis or comments. Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner, is our primary point of contact, and he may be reached at (360) 487-7946 or at [bryan.snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:bryan.snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chad Eiken". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Chad Eiken, AICP, Director

Community and Economic Development Department

[chad.eiken@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:chad.eiken@cityofvancouver.us)



**Washington State  
Department of Transportation**

Aviation Division  
7702 Terminal St SW  
Tumwater, WA 98501  
360-709-8015 / FAX: 360-709-8009  
Toll Free: 1-800-552-0666  
TTY: 1-800-833-6388  
[www.wsdot.wa.gov](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov)

January 21, 2020

Jose Alvarez  
Clark County Community Planning  
1300 Franklin Street  
Vancouver WA 98660

Dear Mr. Alvarez,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed development and changes to the Clark County Comprehensive Plan to develop the property adjacent to the Fly-For-Fun airport.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) recognizes public use general aviation airports as essential public facilities and requires cities and counties to **discourage** incompatible land uses adjacent to them through their comprehensive plan policies and development regulations (RCW 36.70.547 and RCW 36.70A.200). The encroachment of incompatible land uses upon Washington state airports diminishes their ability to function as essential public facilities and often leads to operational impacts and closures.

WSDOT feels that the current impacts of residential development in close proximity to the Fly-For-Fun airport have had detrimental effects on the airport and any future development could impede the full functions of the airport and pose a hazard to the public. Although the airport owner does not have an issue with the proposed development, it is still within our best interests to protect the public from incompatible land uses. If the proposal is adopted, then it is suggested that an aviation easement is placed on the title for the property to inform the buyer of the existence of aviation operations near the property.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to offer written comments and am available for any questions or concerns you may have. Please don't hesitate to contact me at 360-709-8019 or [wrightp@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:wrightp@wsdot.wa.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Patrick T. O. Wright', with a long, sweeping underline.

Patrick T. O. Wright  
WSDOT Aviation Division