

**CLARK COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, May 15, 2014**

**Public Services Center
1300 Franklin Street
BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA**

6:30 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER 6:30 P.M.

MORASCH: Well, good evening, and welcome to the hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission on May 15th, 2014. I will call the meeting to order. And can we get a roll call.

II. ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

BARCA: HERE

BLOM: HERE

GIZZI: HERE

JOHNSON: ABSENT

QUIRING: ABSENT

USKOSKI: HERE

MORASCH: HERE

III. GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

MORASCH: Okay. Moving on to general and new business, has everyone had a chance to review the agenda? Are there any changes? Then can we get a motion to approve the agenda.

A. APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR MAY 15, 2014

GIZZI: I make a motion we approve the agenda.

USKOSKI: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 20, 2014

MORASCH: Then the motion carries, the agenda has been approved. Moving on to approval of the minutes, has everyone had a chance to review the minutes from the March 20, 2014 meeting? Can I get a motion to approve the minutes.

USKOSKI: Motion to approve the minutes.

GIZZI: Second.

BLOM: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

MORASCH: All right. The minutes have been approved. Moving on to communications from the public. This is the time in our meeting where we invite members of the public to come up and talk about any matter that is not on our agenda tonight. So is there anyone from the public that would like to speak to a matter that is not on the agenda?

IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Seeing none, we will move on to the public hearing items. And the first public hearing item is open space and timberland applications. And it looks like Mr. Vandling is moving up to the microphone. So when you're ready, please give us your staff report.

A. OPEN SPACE & TIMBERLAND APPLICATIONS

VANDLING: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. Jim Vandling, Department of Environmental Services, County Forester.

BARCA: Jim, microphone a little closer to you. Thank you.

VANDLING: I'm bringing to you the current use approval requests for the 27th year as required by RCW 84.34 and Clark County Code Chapter 3.08. This year we had 23 total requests, 18 of those were for the timberland classification of open space, and 3 were for various or 5 were for various open space designations, soil, streams and historic, we had 1 historic this year.

And so I've summarized all of those in Exhibit A which is the last page of your packet. So you can see where the spread of the properties is zoning-wise. The ones that were reclassified from one designation to another, there's three of them this year, and they were all farm and ag to timberland. And the open space classifications were all new open space classifications. One actually could have been a reclassification, but the parcel had been fully removed and withdrawn from the program prior to the sale of the land and the new owners came in and filed a new request.

So if there are any questions from the Commission, I'm here to address any questions you might have.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. Are there any questions from any of the members of the Planning Commission? Well, seeing none, we will open it up to public testimony on this issue. And I have a sign-in sheet. The first person on the sign-in sheet is Dan Wyatt. Dan, did you want to come up and give any presentation to the Planning Commission?

WYATT: I don't think so unless I'm needed to. I don't really have anything prepared unless you have questions. Is it necessary?

MORASCH: Okay. No, it's not necessary. Thank you. And just for the record, Mr. Wyatt indicated that he didn't have any testimony unless there were questions. Susan Rasmussen, do you wish to come up and give any testimony to the Planning Commission?

RASMUSSEN: Yes, please.

MORASCH: Okay. Please come down here and have a seat at the mic and give your name and address for the record, please.

RASMUSSEN: Susan Rasmussen, 30301 NE Charity Road, La Center, 98629. I'm giving testimony on behalf of Virginia Pick-VanBreemen. Her property is item on Page 6 under Riverview Asset Management, review for open space applications.

Ms. VanBreemen was not aware that the trustee that she appointed, Riverview, issued a change to the current use status of her property taking it out of timberland and into open space and she wishes to remain in timber like she has been I believe since 1994.

Last year she transferred the trust from California up here to Riverview. And we believe inadvertently her name, Virginia Pick, Virginia Ruth Pick Trust was left off of the County documents. So it retains the same ownership, just a different trustee.

But she had Fred Pickering file her timber management report back in 1994. She's planted thousands of baby trees over the years and she's maintained it in timber and forest land and she'd like to do so.

MORASCH: Have you talked to Mr. Vandling about this?

RASMUSSEN: No. All communication has been between Mr. Vandling and Riverview, and Virginia has been left out entirely. And we've been talking to Riverview about this and they are in the process of putting her name back on the County documents.

MORASCH: I might suggest, you know, you talk to County staff if the property owner doesn't want to be open space and would rather be timberland, I think that's something that you would want to work with staff on.

VANDLING: Yeah. This is fascinating. This is probably never happened where an applicant is representing themselves as the true landowner and with no supporting documents, and it also matches what the Assessor has on record. So we need to get something straightened out between the Assessor and the Auditor as to who is going to be on title with that land, and whether it's going to be in the trust that is managed apparently by Riverview.

RASMUSSEN: Yes. We had a conversation with Coleen Sisson at Riverview Monday and she said told Virginia today that she's in the process of putting her name back on the County documents. There has not been a change of ownership at all. She wishes to maintain the current use status of forestry.

VANDLING: Okay. So for the record, when the applications go counter complete, they go counter complete in the Assessor's Office and the Assessor verifies that the applicant is the rightful owner of the land and they have to sign that document as owner of the land. And whether it be in a trust or trustee, they have to have supporting documentation that they have that capability to do so. So in this case, there's something that apparently is not meshing very well together.

RASMUSSEN: Yes, there is. Riverview did this without any consultation. In fact, they did this despite Virginia telling them not to. We don't know why they prompted to do this, but they did. And the fact that they left her name off of the County documents is concerning also. So we were promised that they're correcting that and we see that they did not withdraw the application as they were told to.

VANDLING: No, they haven't withdrawn it.

RASMUSSEN: Yeah.

VANDLING: And we have had no communication with them since actually right after they made this application.

RASMUSSEN: Well, yes. They communicate with Virginia very little, that's another concern of hers.

VANDLING: Well, the approvals are what we're here for tonight, and so this is approvable, and that I move this forward to the Board of -- I move the planning staff's -- the Planning Commissions' recommendations on approval to the Board of Commissioners. All right. So now in between the two hearings, this hearing with the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners' hearing, we're going to need to get something straightened out.

Because when the actual lien on the property gets sent out, and the lien is the agreement to be in

the program for the deferred taxation, when the lien gets sent out, then in fact Riverview would not be able to actually sign that document if they are not in fact owners of the land. All right. So we have to get the chain of ownership straightened out between now and June 17th. And so I'd like to get your information from you and your contact information after this portion of the hearing.

RASMUSSEN: Sure.

VANDLING: And so I've got at least a liaison to -- now let me get this right, Ruth Pick VanBreemen.

RASMUSSEN: Virginia Ruth Pick-VanBreemen Trust is the owner. Virginia's been living on the land since about 1983.

VANDLING: Okay. Okay, that's good, and that's where we'll be starting. And so I'm sure there's going to be quite a chain of communication between the County and Riverview Asset Management Corporation.

MORASCH: Yeah.

RASMUSSEN: Yes.

MORASCH: And I would recommend that you follow up with Mr. Vandling after this hearing, like tomorrow, and stay in contact with him and try to work this issue out with him. Because I don't know that there's much we can do about it here as the Planning Commission, but you can definitely get it worked out with him. And I would urge you to do that before the Board of County Commissioners' hearing.

RASMUSSEN: Well, we're sorry that it proceeded this far, but they just aren't abiding by Virginia's wishes.

MORASCH: Well, it didn't sound like you've talked to the County directly about that, and I guess that's what I would urge you to do is talk to the County directly and, you know, about that offline. It's not something we can deal with here in the hearing tonight, but it's something you can work out with Mr. Vandling.

RASMUSSEN: Okay. Can I -- this is Virginia's written testimony --

MORASCH: Yeah, you may pass that in.

RASMUSSEN: -- can I put this in the public record?

MORASCH: And if you have anything else to say to us, we'd be happy to hear it.

RASMUSSEN: This is fine. Thank you. Just that --

MORASCH: Does any member of the Planning Commission have any questions for Ms. Rasmussen?

BARCA: So, Ms. Rasmussen, what I heard you say was the land is already in a current use taxation as timberland?

RASMUSSEN: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. Which is another item I guess I look at from our records this would be put in as a new open space application. So would we have a record of it already, this same parcel being --

VANDLING: It had been withdrawn from the timberland classification, it had been withdrawn, it was no longer in the program.

BARCA: Do we know approximately how long ago it was withdrawn?

VANDLING: It was actually according to what I've got on record, it was done before this application was made, and this application was made around sometime in the first quarter of 2013, so we're

talking about something that could have been done a year and a half ago and it was -- it sounded like it was a unilateral request from Riverview Asset as the trustee.

And so we're going to need to get down to that too because I mean it may be something under the circumstances the withdrawal could be reversed if there was up-to-date documentation on the management plan.

BARCA: Yeah. And I'm wondering if there's any kind of potential tax implication from the withdrawal that is layered in on top of this.

VANDLING: There could very well be, yeah. And so there would be some onus of responsibility for whoever initiated, you know, that process. So we need to get some facts, and it really is going to have to, you know, clear through the Auditor's Office. If we're going to have the ownership changed, and if there was a request and the ownership is going to revert back to Ms. VanBreemen, then there's going to have to be some documentation of that so it shows up on the Assessor's records.

RASMUSSEN: Sure. She's never harvested any of the timber. She's proud of her stewardship of the land and she's been a clean water commissioner for Clark County for the last 12 years. So this was really disturbing to her to see that this was done without any of her knowledge.

VANDLING: It's actually surprising to me too.

RASMUSSEN: Yeah, it is to us.

VANDLING: Okay.

MORASCH: Yeah. I would encourage you to work directly with Jim. It sounds like working through Riverview hasn't worked, so I think going straight to the County would be the best way to --

RASMUSSEN: Straight to the County?

MORASCH: Yeah.

RASMUSSEN: Okay, great. Thank you.

MORASCH: Yeah, thank you for coming. Okay. Next on our list we have Virginia VanBreemen.

VANBREEMEN: Yes, but I think everything has been said.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. We don't have anyone else on the sign-in sheet. Is there anyone else who wishes to present testimony on this matter? If not, I will close the public comment section and turn it over to the Planning Commission for discussion. Ron, do you want to start? Do you have any discussion?

BARCA: Well, we've been doing these a long time. Normally they're pretty cut and dry. Either we have recommended approval which everything is in order, or we have a denial. And, once again, that's the staff recommendation that we can review. Short of this one item, 2014-00010, the Riverview Asset Management, everything else looks like we should be able to just approve in mass.

MORASCH: John.

BLOM: I would agree with that. I'm at a bit of a loss as what the best way to proceed with this one parcel is and what is going to be protecting the owner's rights in the interim between now and the County Commissioners. Obviously there's time to get it resolved between now and then. But as to what our recommendation would be, I'd be curious to hear what the rest of the Commission, their thoughts are, whether we remove the approval and send our recommendation be as a partial approval pending this being sorted out or a denial.

VANDLING: I think you can see why there is since 1993 why the State and the State statutes put a level of redundancy into this process for GMA counties like us. Where first the staff takes the recommendations to the Planning Commission, and then the Planning Commission's recommendations to the Board of Commissioners for ratification and resolution whereby then it becomes an agreement to be signed by the applicant, and so we are in between step one and step two.

And so whatever is resolved from the VanBreemen's issue, and actually it's a complaint not having anything to do with staff's recommendation or decision, that needs to be resolved and it needs to be resolved before the Board of Commissioners. And if it is to be resolved before the Board of Commissioners, then it becomes actually a quasi-illegal application and it's going to be withdrawn. It will be withdrawn by staff at that point because it will become a no point for us to take an illegal action to the Board of Commissioners even though it has been previously supported and approved by the, you know, the Planning Commission. So if that makes any sense.

I would think that voting an approval on that one case number is appropriate, but it could be squashed before the Board of Commissioners. And I think actually in process-wise, the Board of Commissioners after we give them the supporting documentation, they would actually have to deny the application if it was in fact an illegal application just to take it off the record.

MORASCH: So what if we recommended approval, but added a caveat to that one item that with respect to that item it was approval subject to whatever further action was deemed appropriate after staff has had a chance to sit down with the property owner and go over options?

VANDLING: Correct. And just by reading that into the record as you just did, then that is an appropriate action.

MORASCH: Right. Okay. Is there any other discussion? Valerie, did you have any comments?

USKOSKI: No. I think you just echoed what I was thinking that when we look at this purely from what we need to under GMA, and take the ownership, assuming that it's correct based on what's on file with the Assessor's Office, that we do give this approval. But knowing now that there's a issue with who has the legal right to do this, that we move it forward with the approval and add that caveat on there that ownership needs to be resolved. And if it's --

VANDLING: Absolutely. Yeah.

MORASCH: Okay. Jim, any comments?

GIZZI: No. I agree. I think we approve with the caveat to establish ownership, and all the rest of them are pretty straightforward.

MORASCH: Okay. Does someone want to make a motion to that effect?

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

USKOSKI: I will make a motion that we approve staff's recommendation for the new timberland applications, and the transfer from farm and ag classification to timberland, and then the new open space applications. And also with a caveat in there for Number 2014-00010, Riverview Asset Management, that the ownership on that be resolved prior to the Commissioners' hearing.

GIZZI: I'll second that.

MORASCH: Okay. Motion has been made and seconded. Can we get a roll call, please.

BARCA: AYE

BLOM: AYE

GIZZI: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

MCCALL: 5 in favor.

B. CPZ2014-00003 NE 10TH AVENUE

MORASCH: Okay, the motion carries. Thank you very much. Moving on to the next item. This is CPZ2014-00003, NE 10th Avenue, a proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning designation from R-5 to CR-1 on four parcels. And we have Mr. Alvarez to give us the staff report.

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Commissioners. Jose Alvarez with Clark County Community Planning. The proposal is like you mentioned. Let me bring up the maps. This should look familiar to the Planning Commission. Some history.

Last year we came forward with an annual review for the 15 acres here at the corner of NE 219th and NE 10th Avenue to go from R-5 to CR-1. The Planning Commission approved that, and also made a recommendation to include the four parcels, 20 acres approximately to the north.

The Board of County Commissioners determined that there hadn't been sufficient notice to the neighbors, and there was no environmental analysis done on this property. So they asked us to bring this back as a docket item for 2014.

We have done the SEPA, issued a determination of nonsignificance which was final today. We sent out notice to all of the property owners within 500 feet and haven't received any comments other than in the staff report there's a comment from WSDOT regarding the number of trips on NE 10th and the potential for stacking and making left-hand turns on the property as it develops.

Had conversations with the cities of Ridgefield and Battle Ground regarding a Memorandum of Understanding that was adopted several years ago that requires us to consult with those cities regarding any changes in this area. The City of Battle Ground has a representative here that will testify. I haven't heard anything from the City of Ridgefield for the record.

Staff has made a recommendation of approval, and I'll be willing to answer any questions if you have them.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. With that, I'll turn it over to the Planning Commission. Does the Planning Commission have any questions for staff at this time?

BARCA: So, Jose, concerning the WSDOT letter, I believe they're asking for an update on a traffic impact study to take in some additional concerns that they enumerated. Most of what I see it appears like we would normally handle at the time of application.

ALVAREZ: Correct. Yeah. So what we did was relied on the traffic study that was done last year and essentially prorated the number of trips by the acreage because there was a difference of 15 to 20 acres. So the number of trips essentially doubles, but we've determined that there's sufficient capacity. And, again, we would review that when a development application is filed at the time.

MORASCH: Are there any other questions? Okay. Well, with that, we will open the public hearing, and I have the first person on the list is Erin Erdman from the City of Battle Ground. Would you like to come up and give us some testimony?

ERDMAN: I'm Erin Erdman, Community Development Director for the City of Battle Ground.

MORASCH: Welcome. Thank you for coming.

ERDMAN: Thank you. The City of Battle Ground feels that there needs to be a little bit more discussion on this topic prior to making a recommendation to the Board. There was the MOU that Jose had referenced earlier that was entered into by Clark County, the City of Battle Ground and the

City of Ridgefield back in May of 2012, that was meant to serve as a blueprint for a guide to this planning process around this area.

There's language in there that states the County will consult with the cities prior to the expansion of any rural commercial zones and we just don't feel like we've had the opportunity to sit down and collaborate that. Also, talking with the City of Ridgefield, they weren't able to be here today, but they are on the same page with that understanding. We just would like to take the time to sit down and have a little bit better understanding of what the purpose of this is before moving forward.

And also just want to, you know, questioning the County's in the process of doing their overall comprehensive plan update right now for the 2016 update, and we were wondering if this would be better served as part of that overall update so we could get a little bit more in-depth analysis on that. So we'd just like to request that we take a step back --

MORASCH: Are we having a technical problem?

MCCALL: Technical difficulty. I apologize.

ERDMAN: Okay. So we're just requesting we take a step back and just give us a little bit more time to coordinate between all of the entities involved and either coordinate a little bit more, have a better understanding before moving forward, either that or roll this into the overall comp plan update. That's all I have.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. Does any member of the Planning Commission have any questions? No? Okay, thank you for coming. Okay. The next person on the list, I'm having a little trouble reading the handwriting, but I think it's Ronnie Cook. Good evening.

COOK: Good evening. I'm Ronnie Cook and I live at 809 NE 224th Circle in Ridgefield, 98642.

MORASCH: All right. Welcome to the Planning Commission.

COOK: Thank you very much for having this for us and giving us a chance to speak about this zoning proposed change as well. I actually live in the neighborhood that borders the proposed rezoning change. And I'd like just for point of clarification to ask up front, do any of you know what that neighborhood is or have you ever seen it? Okay.

As you know it's a gated community. We took the roads private ourselves, so we maintain all the roads ourselves, we maintain the actual wastewater; we maintain everything, so... It's got 22 homes in it and there's close to 30 children that live in that neighborhood.

We already have a problem with traffic coming off of 10th that miss the intersection and they try to turn around in our neighborhood. And of course with the gate being there, we've got the concrete post in the middle with the key pad, so we already have a problem with traffic turning in and realizing it's a gated community. And then there's really no place to turn back around, so they back out onto 10th as we know which is a 50 mile an hour highway. So we've had some pretty near close calls with traffic accidents there.

The other thing is that with the kids, they catch the bus right there on the corner outside of the gate. And so our concern is with the additional left-hand turns at peak hours, which Washington State DOT brought up, you know, we don't want, you know, the kids being dropped off with the school bus there and people, you know. We're just worried about the additional traffic and safety of not only the kids, but the people driving up and down 10th Avenue.

It's, you know, that's where we are as a neighborhood is that, you know, it really borders the first lot that you see above where the property is is actually one of our neighbors, and so that property would be directly behind one of the neighbors that live in our community.

So we're here just as a neighborhood to say that we are concerned. We're concerned. We're all about growth. I own two businesses in Clark County and generate plenty of revenue, and we all support growth and want to see it happen, but we're just concerned and agree with the Washington State Department of Transportation recommendation that that could cause additional traffic concerns. And we're concerned about the kids and the bus stops and what that would do ultimately, you know, to our property values with whatever ends up being there.

MORASCH: Okay. Well, thank you very much. Is there anybody on the Planning Commission that has any questions for Mr. Cook? All right. I guess you're free to go.

COOK: Thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you for coming.

COOK: Sure.

MORASCH: Next on our list we have Kevin Kelly.

MCCALL: Just a reminder, we need to have them up close to the mic, almost eating the mic, rather than sitting so far away.

MORASCH: Okay. I think the problem is when they sit close to the mic, they get feedback and start that buzzing, so...

BARCA: Let's try it.

MCCALL: Well, because I'm turning it up because they're too far away and I'm getting a low audio level.

MORASCH: Okay. We'll try that then. Good evening.

KELLY: Good evening. Can you hear me okay?

MCCALL: Get a little closer to the mic. That would be great.

KELLY: All right. Hi. Is that okay?

MORASCH: Yeah.

KELLY: Okay. Thank you for having this meeting and giving me a chance to express my concerns about this project. My name is Kevin Kelly. I live at 827 NE 224th Circle, Ridgefield, Washington 98642.

A few concerns I have is the density of this being so close to our neighborhood where we have valuable homes that we take pride in and keep up. There is a concern about decrease in the property value having a commercial zone so close. The noise of having commercial properties in our immediate backyard.

The biggest concern of mine is safety. 10th is a 50 mile an hour road, and there are many people that cruise even faster down that road, and they either have to stop or turn at 219th, but many people buzz by the entrance to our neighborhood already. With the Department of Transportation's concern and estimation of the amount of traffic of adding a 20-acre commercial zone next to an already approved I believe that one that's marked RC -- is that 20 acres or 15 acres?

ALVAREZ: About 15.

KELLY: 15 acres. -- and then adding another 20 acres in such a short distance of 219th, the amount of volume that the Department of Transportation has projected there is very concerning for accidents, pedestrians and us also exiting our neighborhood. There is about three miles north on 10th up in Ridgefield at that Ridgefield exit quite a bit of land that's already manufacturing and commercial that there are not a density like we have of homes, an area where there's residences

that would be more suitable for, you know, approval for commercial and manufacturing than right there at that intersection where it is going to be so busy. That intersection has already been expanded with the Battle Ground highway project, but I think it would clog up quite a bit pretty soon with the thousands of new cars, the new trips that Washington Department Transportation estimates.

So, again, my concern is making certain that safety, the volume of traffic and potential accidents and congestion, people trying to turn, you know, people getting turned around. I've also seen some close calls of people backing out onto 10th on that 50 mile an hour road making, I don't know if they're lost or whatever, pulling into our neighborhood and actually backing out onto that road. I can see that being disastrous with another the thousands of cars a day using that road.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you.

KELLY: That's all.

MORASCH: Does anyone on the Planning Commission have any questions? All right, thank you very much.

KELLY: Thank you for your time.

MORASCH: It looks like Tom McDonald.

MCCALL: We're going to switch out the mics, there's longer ones on the floor.

MORASCH: Okay. We'll give you a new mic, Mr. McDonald, and hopefully we'll all hear you better.

BARCA: Closer.

MCDONALD: Thank you. Tom McDonald. I also live at March Estates.

MORASCH: We're getting a little bit of that feedback again.

MCCALL: I have to turn it down.

MORASCH: Okay. Try it again.

MCDONALD: Thank you. Tom McDonald. I also live at March Estates. And I'm a bit concerned about reading the document that was well done. I would just reiterate the traffic issues which I assume --

MORASCH: Excuse me, we usually ask that people give their address at the beginning. I didn't think you did that. Can you give your address for the record?

MCDONALD: Yes. 603 224th Circle NE, Ridgefield.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you.

MCDONALD: And I echo the previous two speaker's comments, but won't repeat. But I have a concern about the principle that I read in a document that was prepared which is that to add more acreage into commercial space, one must demonstrate the need for the commercial space. We have just added 15 acres in the past 18 months. To my knowledge, I see no signs up on that acreage that says that somebody is putting in a business or going to do something or the future home of, and the buffer zone is now the 20 acres is being asked to be added between a fairly high density housing area with traffic issues.

And I would propose to the Planning Commission that a prudent concept would be based upon the testimony from the representative of Battle Ground that this needs to be studied a bit more, and this proposal to add these 20 acres should be tabled and looked at and be very careful in the analysis. Do we really need this commercial space?

We have in the area hundreds of square foot of commercial space unused for lease just down 10, and the new 15 acres which has no stated public plans at this point, and the other businesses at that corner that this affects, one, from a business standpoint would look at it and say it's very underutilized. So my point is, we're violating the planning principle of need before we add more commercial space, please table. Thank you.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone on the Planning Commission that has questions for Mr. McDonald? All right, thank you very much. We have one more name on our list, that's Carolyn McDonald. Carolyn, would you like to add anything?

MCDONALD: No, thank you. It's been said.

MORASCH: It's been said. Okay, thank you. With that, I'll take it back to Mr. Alvarez. Do you have anything to add?

ALVAREZ: Staff wouldn't object to folding this into the comp plan for 2016 to look at it more comprehensively. In addition, the commercial uses that would be allowed in the zone are the more restrictive commercial, this is commercial outside of a rural center. For retail commercial it's a conditional use for anything up to between 5 and I think it's 25,000-square foot, there's no nothing beyond that would be allowed, but having a better policy or agreement among the jurisdictions.

The other issues, this is this area is in an industrial urban reserve overlay which would signal that when it gets brought into an urban growth boundary, the idea was that it would have -- it would be served -- it would be to serve as an employment area. But it is at a junction where commercial just seems to make sense, but it won't probably be built out fully until it becomes urbanized, but I can see both sides.

BARCA: So, Jose, for the record and understanding I think for the audience that's here, would you explain if it remains in industrial urban reserve, what the potential is for that and what actions would have to take place for it to convert.

ALVAREZ: So there's two issues. The industrial urban reserve overlay has its own set of uses that are not commercial. So if you keep the urban, the industrial urban reserve overlay, that will be the uses will be very similar to what an R-5 would allow. In order to remove the industrial urban reserve overlay, the area would have to be brought into one of the urban growth boundaries.

The Vancouver urban growth area currently extends to 209th Street, and to the north is the Ridgefield urban growth boundary. It hasn't been determined whose urban growth area this area would go into, that's still sort of a point of contention. I'm not sure that it would be addressed, but we could discuss that as part of the 2016 comp plan. It really kind of depends if there's a demand for expanding urban growth boundaries whether it would fall into one, and I can't say for certain at this time if it would.

MORASCH: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Okay. Well, seeing none, I will -- well, before I close the public testimony portion, is there anyone in the audience that has anything else they'd like to add? Yes. Please come down and state your name and address for the record.

CURRIE: My name is Leslie Currie. Our address is P.O. Box 2051, Woodland, Washington. We're one of the owners of a five-acre parcel there that is in the review, and I testified before the Planning Commission the last time when you were here.

We purchased our property about 11 years ago -- and shortly -- with the intent to build a house on it on the five acres, and a few months after we purchased the property and had the plans for the house, the State of Washington said they were going to put the off-ramp through the property, so that stopped us from doing that portion of it.

We waited ten years. We found another thing. We came back and we were going to build on it

again, and the zoning to the south of us now is light industrial. So we're really stuck. We can't build on it. We can't build a house on it because it's kind of a no man's land. We can't sell it because we don't know if it's going to be commercial or zoned or how it's going to be zoned. And so we've been sitting on this piece of property, and I think that's where the Planning Commission said you're right, this is at an intersection and it makes sense to be commercial.

I certainly understand the concerns of the neighborhood to the north of us, but it's a gated community. It really should have -- no matter what we do with that property, it shouldn't have a lot of impact on their neighborhood.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. Does the Planning Commission have any questions for Ms. Currie?

BARCA: No. I think it was valuable for you to come forward again and remind everybody about your previous testimony. Thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak before we close the public testimony? We see one more person. Please come down and give your name and address for the record.

RANDOLPH: Good evening.

MORASCH: Good evening.

RANDOLPH: James Randolph, 604 224th Circle, Ridgefield. I live in the same community. My wife and I have only lived here a year. And I wasn't going to speak, but then when I heard other testimony, there doesn't seem to be a clearly demonstrated need for making this change. And when you have the City of Battle Ground and the City of Ridgefield haven't even been thoroughly brought into the process, I agree with their recommendation that this at least be postponed and be considered as part of the 2016 development process.

Because right now what I've read so far and what I just sat here listening to, I can't see where anybody's demonstrated a clear need to take rural land and convert it into light commercial given what's going on in that area. Plus what's going on north of that area where there's a big commercial development, which is from what I can tell has not been developed to its fullest potential at all, much less converting another 20 acres to commercial and taking away the rural environment. And thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Okay. Is there anyone else out there that would like to speak on this matter? I see one more person. Okay. Good evening. Please give your name and address for the record.

HAIDER: My name is Susan Haider and I live at 505 NE 224th Circle, so same community.

MORASCH: Welcome.

HAIDER: Thank you. Thank you for having this meeting. I would just like to reiterate, I'm not going to repeat what everyone else has had to say from our neighborhood, but I totally agree that there is definitely a safety issue with having the additional traffic and having the additional people turning in and out of an area so close to our community.

The other thing that I think hasn't been mentioned that I think is also important to consider is it is a two-lane highway, as it is with it being a 50 mile an hour two-lane highway. There is often times that I come up to turn left onto my street and I have to be stopped, because there's oncoming traffic and there's people coming up behind me too fast and want to zip around me to the right where there isn't room. To add to the traffic and to add to more people turning, it's going to cause more of an issue and there's ultimately going to be an accident there. And that's really all I wanted to say. It really is a safety issue.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. Are there any questions? All right. Thank you very much. Okay. Is there anyone else who would like to say anything? Going once. Okay. I don't see anyone else raising their hand. With that, I will ask staff if they have any final thoughts before I turn it over to the Planning Commission for discussion.

ALVAREZ: I have no additional thoughts.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. With that, we will close the public testimony portion of our hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission for discussions. Ron, do you want to start us off?

BARCA: I know from our previous work and other comp plans, we have struggled to protect major intersections that are utilized for the sake of on and off-ramp activity. It becomes a very valuable commercial node, and when we do a poor job of planning that node, we end up in sub-optimizing the area.

I think our concern before with this area was really based on the idea that we didn't see it converting during the 2016 comp plan review. That leaving it in the R-5 designation appeared to leave it vulnerable to have it continue to develop at an R-5 standard and missing the opportunity for the node to become a job generating center.

That was part of why I recommended that we bring it forward and at least do what we could within our limited capacity, which at this point in time was we could not turn it into industrial outright, we could turn it into commercial. And then if it remained undeveloped and we ended up in an urban growth situation where the boundaries got to there, we could consider the industrial application for it.

When we look at this right now, I think we have already seen that the Board of County Commissioners has a very aggressive jobs agenda that's going to be before us and they're going to be looking for opportunities to have employment lands developed and employment lands designated. So I would say that there isn't anything that we have before us tonight that would change this other than the fact that the City of Battle Ground and Ridgefield appear that they have not had an opportunity to weigh in on this discussion.

I know they both have their own commercial lands that they'd like to get developed, and they certainly don't want to have another set of acreages put out there in competition, but we do have to have an understanding that without an urban reach to this intersection, this commercial node is in jeopardy and I think we need to be able to clarify our long-term position on wanting to get the highest and best use out of this intersection. I'm done.

MORASCH: All right, thank you. John.

BLOM: Just one quick question for Jose, and you may not be able to answer this. In your experience looking at once it got to the next stage, if someone put it in a plan for that 15 acres or that 20 acres, would that likely trigger an expansion of 502 where they'd add a northbound left-turn lane in there based on those trips? I mean would that -- would some of those traffic concerns be alleviated if it were developed at the next point, or it's just impossible to say?

ALVAREZ: I will let Laurie take a shot at that.

LEBOWSKY: Laurie Lebowsky, Community Planning. Typically what happens in this process is that through development review the applicant would come in with a traffic study, a detailed traffic study and look at trip generation, look at the impacts to the intersection. Since WSDOT is under, this is under WSDOT jurisdiction, they would be consulted, but typically the developer is required to improve the intersection.

BLOM: Okay.

MORASCH: Thank you. John, does that answer your question and do you have anything further?

BLOM: I think it's as good as it can be answered without having an application.

LEBOWSKY: Well, I think the bottom line is that in the application process through a traffic study they show what are their impacts, the impacts from that development.

BLOM: Right. Okay.

MORASCH: Okay. Valerie, do you have any comments?

USKOSKI: Yeah, I do. Well, just first of all to kind of follow on to what John's question was, they will be required to maintain the current level-of-service in that area. If they cause any safety issues, they'll have to fix those before they're able to move forward with the development. So whatever safety upgrades they have to make that -- and like you mentioned, it's hard to say what those might be without the actual application in front of us.

Going back to the RC zone that we have right now, I see that we've got the stormwater facility there in the corner of that 15-acre block. Didn't WSDOT also own a couple of other parcels right in there that -- and then along with that habitat area that maybe we didn't have the full 15 that was developable? Am I remembering that correctly?

ALVAREZ: So the idea was, I think at the corner there's a stormwater facility here, there were some wetlands in here, so we didn't anticipate the whole 15 acres being developable. And that they own, WSDOT owns the property abutting I-5, that was the other issue.

USKOSKI: Okay. Well, my inclination is to go more along the lines of where Ron was thinking. That we do need to protect this land as a jobs producing intersection, and that if we're not careful looking ahead, we will lose that opportunity. And what we have now, although it does look like a fairly good sized chunk when you look at it without the environmental constraints, when you add those on, there's really not a lot of developable land in there. And my inclination would be to protect that land that's before us now.

MORASCH: All right, thank you. Jim.

GIZZI: Well, I start with what Ron said, and it was that when we look at these intersections and we just expand them without the proper amount of planning, we end up with problems. And here having been involved in the first hearing and knowing how easy and quick it was to expand the 15 acres to 20 with basically just an inadvertent discussion concerns me that moving that 20 into RC would be compounding the problem.

We have processes. The comprehensive plan process is coming up. When we all agreed to look at that 20-acre piece, we had no idea that there were agreements in place between the County and Ridgefield and Battle Ground that it sounds like we might be violating.

So, you know, we looked at the word jobs, and it is a I'll say a common sense place to think that we could create jobs on that property, but... Well, we all know that sometimes common sense doesn't pan out. So I know we did it quickly. I think we did it for the right reasons, but I'm inclined to feel that maybe a little more planning and thought would be a good idea on this parcel.

MORASCH: Okay, thank you. Well, I guess my thoughts, I'm finding myself agreeing with Ron and Valerie. I think there is potentially more planning that could be done on this property, but I'd hate to lose an opportunity to preserve it for commercial/industrial type use. Also, with the 2016 comp plan coming up, whatever we do here today, it may not be the last word because it could always get tweaked through the comp plan process. So I guess those are my thoughts. If anyone else has anything to say, say it now or else we'll ask for a motion. All right. Does anyone have a motion?

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: I'd like to make a motion that we go ahead and accept staff recommendation for the proposed action CPZ2014-00003, NE 10th, with it being subject to adequate review between Battle Ground and Ridgefield and County staff prior to going to the County Commissioners.

BLOM: Second.

MORASCH: Okay. The motion has been made and seconded. Can we have a roll call, please?

BARCA: AYE

BLOM: AYE

GIZZI: NO

MORASCH: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

MCCALL: 4 in favor, 1 against. Motion passes.

MORASCH: All right. The motion carries. Thank you everyone. And don't forget to go to the Board of County Commissioners' hearing which is upcoming on this matter.

PUBLIC: Nice job. Thank you.

MORASCH: Thank you.

PUBLIC: Nice job.

MORASCH: Okay. Well, I guess you can stay put.

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

C. CPZ2014-00004 CLARK REGIONAL WASTE WATER DISTRICT

MORASCH: We will move on to the next item on our agenda, CPZ2014-00004, Clark Regional Wastewater District. And, Mr. Alvarez, can we have the staff report, please.

ALVAREZ: Yes, you may. So this proposal is to amend the comprehensive plan text to reflect the agreement between the City of Ridgefield and Clark Regional Wastewater District transferring ownership and operation of the city's local wastewater collection system to the district, and that happened January 1 of 2014. This is a summary of the proposed text changes. There are five proposed text changes, three of them are in Chapter 6 of the comprehensive plan. They're all very minor changes that just essentially change the wording from Ridgefield to Clark Regional Wastewater District just to reflect the agreement that was made. And if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer those.

MORASCH: All right. Does anyone have any questions? No questions. Do we have a sign-in sheet?

MCCALL: There is no one signed up.

MORASCH: No one signed up. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to testify on this matter? No one coming forward. With that, we will close the public hearing portion and turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberation. We'll start with you, Jim, this time. Do you have any deliberation on this matter?

GIZZI: No, I don't. Thanks.

MORASCH: All right. Valerie.

USKOSKI: I'm good.

MORASCH: John.

BLOM: Good.

MORASCH: Ron.

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

BARCA: Motion to approve staff recommendation.

GIZZI: Second.

MORASCH: All right. We have a motion made and seconded. Can we have roll call, please.

USKOSKI: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

GIZZI: AYE

BLOM: AYE

BARCA: AYE

MCCALL: 5 in favor. Motion passes.

D. CPZ2014-00007 WASHOUGAL UGA REMOVAL

MORASCH: All right. The motion carries. That concludes Item C on our agenda. Moving on to item CPZ2014-00007, Washougal UGA removal. Mr. Alvarez, can we have the staff report, please.

ALVAREZ: Okay. This is to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map to re-designate certain properties. There's two totaling about 116 acres in the Washougal urban growth area as Agricultural 20 and to remove these properties from the urban growth area. This was a result of the last -- this will conclude the appeals of the 2007 comprehensive plan.

MORASCH: Any questions? Is there anyone from the audience, there's no one in the audience, but is there anyone from the audience who wishes to testify on this matter? Hearing no one, we'll turn it over to the Planning Commission for discussion and/or a motion. Jim.

MOTION & ROLL CALL VOTE

GIZZI: I make a motion that we accept staff recommendations and move those two pieces out of the Washougal urban growth boundary.

BARCA: I second that motion, Jim.

MORASCH: All right. It's been made and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion? No discussion? Roll call, please.

BARCA: AYE

BLOM: AYE

GIZZI: AYE

MORASCH: AYE

USKOSKI: AYE

MCCALL: 5 in favor.

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

MORASCH: All right. The motion carries. Another 5/0 motion. That concludes the public hearing items. Is there any old business? Is there any new business? Is there any comments from the members of the Planning Commission?

VII. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

BARCA: I just want to say that that was a brilliant motion that you brought forward, Jim, on the Washougal agricultural land. I so appreciate you being here to do those kinds of things for us.

GIZZI: Yeah, thanks, Ron.

MORASCH: Yeah, thank you, Jim, that was awesome.

GIZZI: Yeah, you guys are awesome.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MORASCH: Okay. Well, with that, the meeting is adjourned.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html>.

Proceedings can be viewed on CVTV on the following web page link:

<http://old.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/cvtvindex.ask?section=25437&catID=13>.

*Minutes Transcribed by: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.
Marilee McCall, Administrative Assistant/Clark County Community Planning*