

## MEMORANDUM

To: Jacqui Kamp, AICP  
Planner III  
Clark County Community Planning

From: Steve Faust, AICP  
*Community Planning Director*

Date: November 4, 2020

**Project: Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan**  
**RE: Stakeholder Interview Summary**

---

Clark County and other communities across Washington are struggling to provide the variety and quantity of housing options that residents need. The State of Washington is encouraging cities and counties to take measures to facilitate the development and retention of moderately priced housing, such as duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, courtyard apartments, and town homes. These housing types can offer greater variety and affordability than single family detached homes.

The Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan will identify housing challenges within the unincorporated Vancouver Urban Growth Area (UGA) and opportunities to encourage development of housing options that are affordable to a variety of household incomes through the removal of regulatory barriers and/or implementation of other strategies. These strategies are needed to help ensure future generations have access to affordable, quality and diverse housing opportunities.

The first step in the Housing Options Study and Action Plan process is to identify the full range of issues related to housing within the unincorporated Vancouver UGA and understand the different perspectives among key stakeholders and community leaders that represent a variety of expertise on housing. To gather this information, the project team conducted stakeholder interviews through a mix of video conference and phone calls. In addition, an online questionnaire was distributed between April 28 and July 8 to provide stakeholders another opportunity to participate. In total, approximately 70 stakeholders participated.

To identify initial stakeholder interviewees, County staff internally discussed potential interests and identified groups that represent those interests. Staff prepared a preliminary list that was reviewed by the consultant team, adding additional interest groups as needed. The consultant team conducted three rounds of interviews, each building upon the last, so as to reach the greatest number of interest groups. Each interview the consultant team



conducted concluded with a question about who else should be interviewed. Responses included both specific people and organizations, and more general interests. Everyone recommended as a potential interviewee was reached out to and invited to participate. While not everyone responded to the interview invitation, most did. A complete list of interviewees and online questionnaire respondents can be found in Appendix A. The interview questions and online questionnaire instrument are included as Appendix B.

Upon completion of the stakeholder interviews, the project team wished to further extend the team's understanding of housing issues in relation to people's needs and preferences. A focus group was convened with real estate brokers to discuss the needs, desires and resources of buyers currently looking for housing within the unincorporated Vancouver UGA. To identify focus group participants, the project team coordinated with the Clark County Association of Realtors (CCAR) to reach out and invite out any interested members. In total, six brokers participated in the focus group, conducted September 9. A list of focus group participants can be found in Appendix A. The focus group discussion instrument is included in Appendix B.

## SUMMARY OF ISSUES

The following is a summary of the issues raised through stakeholder interviews, questionnaire responses and the focus group discussion. These issues relate to the development of a greater variety of housing options in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA, and the various perspectives within these issues. A complete compilation of interview comments is included in Appendix C. A compilation of online questionnaire responses is included in Appendix D. A compilation of the focus group comments in included in Appendix E. Following the summary is a list of interests the project team recommends be represented on the Project Advisory Group (PAG), based on the key issues and perspectives identified during this process.

### *Issues*

- **Housing types.** Trends in housing development over the last 5 to 10 years have been predominantly large-lot, single-family housing, almost entirely driven by the private market. Most development is targeted for above 100% Area Median Income (AMI), and in 2018, Clark County's AMI was \$71,636.<sup>12</sup> Meanwhile, demographics are shifting towards an aging population and young families, a common trend both

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates.

<sup>2</sup> Area Median Income (AMI) is the midpoint of a region's income distribution – half of families in a region earn more than the median and half earn less than the median. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines and calculates different levels of AMI for geographic areas across the country by household size. These income levels are a way to assess housing affordability. We say that a housing unit is "affordable at 80% of AMI" if a household whose income is at or below 80% of AMI can live there without generally spending more than 30% of their income on housing costs.



regionally and across the county. The county's rising land values and regulatory system only provide a narrow range of housing types. As median incomes levels are eclipsed by what the market is providing, fewer housing options are available to a greater proportion of the population.

Interviewees identify a variety of housing types they would like to see be built within the Vancouver UGA that could alleviate rising housing costs and cater to buyer preferences and desires. The range of options includes:

- Small, single-level homes with wide doors and ADA-compliant bathrooms for the aging population,
- Single-family and/or single-level homes with separate but attached living spaces to accommodate multi-generational housing and telecommuting habits.
- Small-lot single-family detached homes
- Large-lot single-family detached homes with acreage to convert a garage or build an ADU
- Smaller multifamily complexes (10-15 units). Some interviewees point to issues of economies of scale when building apartment complexes with less than 30 units, and for others, less than 100 units.
- PUD developments and master-planned neighborhoods.
- Townhomes, rowhomes, duplexes, fourplexes.
- Studios apartments.
- Cottage housing. Interviewees point to the County's cottage housing code as an opportunity to expand the availability of senior living communities and assisted living facilities in creative ways.
- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Some respondents note that ADUs and "Tiny Homes" are a part of the picture but cannot represent the entire solution.
- Condominiums
- Prefabricated and modular housing
- Courtyard apartments
- Permanent supportive housing (combination of housing, health care, and supportive services to help individuals and families lead more stable lives)

Beyond a variety of housing types, focus group participants noted the overall importance of functional floor plans to accommodate flexible living arrangements and styles, especially due to COVID-19 and the need to work/school from home.

- **Zoning.** Discussion focused on the restrictive nature of zoning, and zoning that doesn't necessarily reflect existing development patterns. Some interviewees note that unincorporated Clark County is unique in that it is zoned more urban than rural. Some also describe the county as dense in areas where it shouldn't be, and empty in



places it should be dense, stretching the County's ability to support development. Many comments reference the oversaturation of single-family zoning, while some point to the confusion from overlapping residential density ranges in urban zones, and misplaced minimum and maximum average lot size standards. Some sentiment points to a lack of high-density zoning along major transportation corridors, and poorly located commercial zoning. Related code issues include restrictive height limits in certain zones, citing the Hazel Dell area as an example, and the requirement for ground-floor retail for residential development in mixed-use zones, which can become prohibitively expensive for affordable housing development. The HWY 99 overlay was cited with a mix of opinions. Some see the overlay as having good intentions and ultimately resulting in higher quality development. Others felt the form-based code was hindering the feasibility of much-needed development because of the amount of time to implement, ultimately driving developers away.

- **Land Supply.** Land availability is referred to as one of the most difficult challenges in Clark County. For-profit and nonprofit developers must compete for what is perceived to be a significant scarcity of land. Further out in the unincorporated areas, parcels exist but are not necessarily contiguous. Many comments note that most of what is out there is encumbered, expensive to develop, and often hindered by wetlands and other environmental constraints.
- **Infrastructure Priorities.** While not unique to Clark County, infrastructure is often cited as a huge barrier to development. There are few resources available to address infrastructure needs, particularly roads. There are many parcels in the UGA that can't easily be served, highlighting a disconnect between infrastructure investment and where housing is expected to develop. Interviewees mentioned significant lag times between new development and infrastructure to adequately serve the development. Others cite the difficulty of reaching consensus when it comes to discussions about proportionality with developers. The County is aware of a code interpretation that allows private roads to serve a large number of lots, but with no requirement for a sidewalk. Some interviewees lament that sidewalks are often the first concession to be made, while others feel too much of the County's funds go towards gutters, sidewalks and curbing rather than actual housing units. Other infrastructure issues include on-site stormwater facilities that require significant amounts of developable land and increase costs. Finally, it was noted that the prevalence of wetlands in the County and increasing buffer requirements are reducing developable land.
- **Review and Permitting Process.** The land use and development process is perceived as heavily siloed, with communication lacking between County departments. The County's current permit tracking system is often cited as underfunded, piecemeal and inefficient. Many comments point to the lack of



concurrent review for plans, which creates conflict between planning, engineering, code, environmental, etc., and causes lengthy and costly delays. Some interviewees note that while land costs and utility costs are relatively fixed, development review process durations and costs are some of the biggest variables and could result in significant cost savings. Other interviewees express the desire for clear and objective housing goals that are shared and understood across all departments in order to create a culture of streamlined review. Some note that a lack of a clear, county-level policy, results in limited capacity to engage in a “plan-check-adjust” exercise.

- **Fee Structure (Impact/Development).** Impact and development fees are identified as being some of the highest in the state. Some indicate that they are often inappropriately scaled to development and don’t result in any savings from building footprints that are much smaller than the typical single-family home. Some interviewees feel that the County relies overmuch on fees to pay for infrastructure development (see above) and many suggest exploring state, local or even federal funding streams to support certain types of infrastructure as a means to reduce impact fees and promote development. Some interviewees disagree that impact fees are stymieing development, noting that while the County continues to raise fees, the inventory is still turning over rapidly in almost all of the price segments and this is mostly due to the housing supply and demand of the Portland Metro region. Some note that development fees are directly passed on to housing consumers in terms of housing costs, thereby exacerbating the high costs of housing, but others note that reducing fees doesn’t necessarily reduce the sale price, rather, the market sets the sale price.
- **Design Standards.** Discussion around design standards focused on developing a better urban design framework for developers, as they are the ones to come in at the start of development in the community and set the tone for how the rest is going to look. However, while some feel that the level of detail required by the County regarding landscaping and lot standards at the land use entitlement stage is extraordinary and unfair. Others feel that the standards are fine but need to be carefully balanced so as to not detract from the project outcome. Some note that the of impact of design standards on housing costs often feel like a response to certain project that didn’t work well, mentioning that individual problems are generally so specific that it is difficult to identify causations between cost-savings and design standards.
- **Location Criteria for New Housing Types.** Emphasis on the location of new housing development is focused on areas where there are fewer housing opportunities. The availability of public transit was consistently noted as one of the most important location criteria for new housing types. Other important location



criteria include schools and grocery stores, parks, and employment hubs. Focus group participants noted that buyers often look for housing near schools, family, parks, libraries and community centers, as well as housing that has access to high-speed internet, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic. While some interviewees suggest building in denser areas to take advantage of existing amenities, others caution against the risk of pushback from communities in older, established neighborhoods. Many dissuade against the development of high-density housing in only one area, preferring lighter infill and pocket development to mitigate low-income enclaves and promote diversity of housing types and income groups within existing neighborhoods. There is interest in converting the county's perceived oversupply of commercial land to multifamily residential. Comments point to the significant amount of strip commercial that feels expired, given shifts in shopping habits, and the desire to reimagine those areas, possibly for more affordable housing options.

- **Parking.** Some developers cite parking requirements as being too high, especially for low and very low-income housing development. While some argue that there is no need to have upwards of 1.5 parking spaces for each unit, others caution against reducing limits and putting a strain on available street parking with neighbors already jockeying for curb space. While there is a desire to push better transportation options and access to transit, many feel that neighborhoods still remain very auto-centric, even with increases in density. Some cite the challenge of denser housing that simply replicates driveway and garage configurations of single-family homes, which limits available curb space with more units. However, others note that there is no demand for housing that are walkups with detached parking areas.
- **Affordable Housing Incentives.** Many interviewees mention a lack of regulatory incentives to build affordable units, which is particularly important to mission-driven developers and opens up land that otherwise would be unaffordable to build. Tools mentioned include density bonuses, transfer of development rights and land-banking models. Some mention the need for inclusionary zoning so that affordable housing strategies do not concentrate poverty and thwart economic mobility. Although the rural areas of the county are outside the project area, others indicated the need to lessen restrictions on ADU development, like allowing ADUs to be unattached on rural properties. One interviewee recommended developing an annual report that measures progress toward increasing affordable housing to Clark County residents.
- **Public Perception of Non-Traditional Housing Types.** Some interviewees feel community perception has shifted towards a more acute, anti-density push across the region. The perception of housing that deviates from traditional single-family,



detached homes is noted as one of the biggest barriers to the development of more affordable housing options, or even a greater variety of housing types. Focus group participants noted that in light of changes to living styles and increased telecommuting due to COVID-19, the desire for traditional, single-family detached homes is widespread and these types of housing are still perceived to cater best to these new habits. Comments suggest that conversations around housing affordability must center on the stories of people, rather than focus on data trends. Some interviewees point to the politics and policies of the county, both jurisdictionally and within the community, and how they have shifted quite a bit over the 5 to 10-year timeframe. Coming out of the recession, many residential projects were welcomed with open arms, but the predominant culture has been shifting towards more of a “no development” attitude. Some believe that Clark County hasn’t been as friendly toward multifamily and affordable/mixed-income development as Vancouver, lacking policies like commercial zoning incentives and parking reductions. Others share the sentiment that the County’s planning policies do not have enough teeth to ensure each jurisdiction takes on its “fair share” of housing development that includes some higher density options besides single-family detached.

- **Displacement Concerns.** Although rising housing costs are consistently emphasized, some do not view displacement as a significant challenge for the county. Much of the development occurring is cited as greenfield development (land that has never been developed), with some minimal remodeling of single-family homes, though redevelopment trends are not prevalent enough to create displacement. Others comment on the significant loss of units from rehabbing practices and reselling units at higher prices. Some point to the advantages of removing substandard housing, while others note the loss of this supply of low-income housing. Many interviewees point to the importance of manufactured home parks as one of the largest sources of housing that is affordable to lower income households, yet most vulnerable to redevelopment and in need of protection in zoning and code. Some interviewees noted the importance of working towards equity when reviewing policy and regulations for change to ensure no group is disproportionately affected.





**RECOMMENDED INTERESTS TO INCLUDE ON PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)**

The summary above illustrates the spectrum of issues related to providing more housing types that are affordable to a variety of household incomes and the variety of perspectives within these issues, as well as the range of stakeholders and interest groups involved with housing in Clark County. Interviewees included elected and appointed officials, real estate professionals, housing developers, employers, and neighborhood associations, among others. To ensure project success, the PAG should represent the full spectrum of balanced interests and perspectives related to more affordable housing options in Clark County. Based on the summary of issues and perspectives above, the following interest groups are recommended to fill up to (20) positions on the PAG:

<b>Representation</b>	<b>Perspective</b>
County Council	<i>Elected leaders with decision-making authority</i>
City of Vancouver	<i>County seat and largest city in Clark County</i>
Public housing developer	<i>Affordable housing development through federal and state aid</i>
Nonprofit developer	<i>Housing development through public-private partnerships</i>
For-Profit developer	<i>Market-based housing development</i>
Innovative Builder	<i>Builder of innovative housing types, cutting-edge practices and funding mechanisms</i>
Schools	<i>Planning for student/community growth</i>
Feasibility and financing	<i>Housing financing and development feasibility</i>
Real estate	<i>Understanding of housing market, buyer needs and preferences</i>
Older adults	<i>Housing access for populations aging-in-place or with shifting housing needs</i>
Community/neighborhood group	<i>Local, neighborhood-based interest groups</i>
Houseless community	<i>Housing access for most vulnerable/at-risk populations</i>
Communities of color	<i>Housing access for populations disproportionately affected by systems of racism and oppression</i>
Persons with disabilities	<i>Housing access for populations with special needs and accommodations</i>
Youth	<i>Future housing access for first-time homebuyers, new workforce</i>
Large employer	<i>Driver of regional wages and housing needs for employees</i>





**APPENDIX A. INTERVIEWEES AND SURVEY RESPONDENTS, FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Interviewee/Respondent</b>
Area Agency on Aging & Disabilities of Southwest Washington	David Kelly, Executive Director
Building Industry Association (BIA)	Ryan Makinster, Government Affairs Coordinator
C-TRAN	Shawn Donaghy, Executive Director
City of Ridgefield	Steve Stuart, City Manager
City of Vancouver Long Range Planning	Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner
Clark County Association of Realtors (CCAR)	Terry Wollam, Chair of Government Affairs
Clark County Community Development	Susan Ellinger, Land Use Manager
Clark County Community Planning	Oliver Orjiako, Director Jose Alvarez, Planner
Clark County Community Services	Michael Torres, CHAD Program Manager
Clark County Food Bank	Emily Kaleel, Director of Programs
Clark County Parks Advisory Board	Jay Chester, Co-chair
Clark County Parks Advisory Board	Dave Weston
Clark County Planning Commission	Commissioner Ron Barca Commissioner Matt Swindell Commissioner Bryant Enge
Clark County Public Health	Roxanne Wolf, Community Health and Safety Director David Hudson, Manager, Healthy Communities Programs Manager
Clark County Public Works	Rob Klug, Transportation Engineering Division Manager Matt Hermen, Planner III
Clark County Veterans Assistance Center	Judy Russel, President
Clark Regional Economic Development Council	Jennifer Baker, President
Clark Regional Wastewater District	John Peterson, General Manager
Commission on Aging	Commissioner Marjorie Ledell
Community Organizer	Roben White
Community Roots Collaborative	Dan Whiteley, Team Member



<b>Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Interviewee/Respondent</b>
Council for the Homeless	Kate Budd, Executive Director
County Council	Councilor Gary Medvigy
County Council	Councilor Julie Olson
County Council	Councilor Temple Lentz
County Council	Councilor John Blom
County Council	Councilor Eileen Quiring (Chair)
Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB)	Eric Golemo, Vice Chair Jamie Howsley
Evergreen School District, Silver Star Elementary	Michelle Tribe, Family Resource Coordinator
Evergreen School District	Jey Buno, Executive Director Special Services
Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association	Bridget Schwarz, Fairgrounds NA
Faith Partners for Housing	Denny Scott
Felida Neighborhood Association	Barbara Anderson
Friends of Clark County	Sue Marshall, President
Ginn Development	Patrick Ginn, Owner Phill Wuest, Chief Legal Officer
Housing Initiative	Sierk Braam, Manager and CEO
Latino Community Resource Group	Rosalba Pitkin, Diversity Outreach Coordinator
Maple Tree Neighborhood Association	Alexandra E Luna
Middle Class Alliance	Tim Probst Kathy Neary
NAACP	Carol Collier
NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association	Doug Ballou
Olson Engineering	Kurt Stonex, Principal
Pahlisch Homes Inc.	Mike Morse, Regional Project Director
REACH CDC	Alma Flores, Director of Housing Development Melissa Baker, Asset Manager
ReNew Creations	Dave Myllymaki, Founder
Southwest Washington League of United Latin American Citizens	Ed Hamilton Rosales, President



<b>Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Interviewee/Respondent</b>
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association	Judy Bumbarger
Truman Neighborhood Association	Cheryl Burkey
Washington State University (WSU)	Lynn Valenter, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations
West Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association	Ila Stanek
Vancouver Housing Authority	Andy Silver, Director, Housing and Health Innovation Partnership Victor Caesar, Development Manager Terry Harder, Construction Manager
Vancouver Housing Authority and Vancouver Affordable Housing Nonprofit	Saeed Hajarizadeh, Finance Deputy Director
Vancouver School District	Nicole Daltoso, Facility Planning Manager
Wolf Industries, Inc.	Derek Huegel, President
Youth Commission	Valerie Shoker
No affiliation	Heidi Cody
Affiliation unknown	Name not provided
Affiliation unknown	Name not provided

<b>Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Focus Group Participant</b>
Clark County Association of Realtors	Connie Bovee
	Shelly Schmitz
	Jeff Mayer
	Carrie Cunningham
	Vikki Jensen
	Rian Davis



---

## **APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW, QUESTIONNAIRE AND FOCUS GROUP TOOLS**

### **General**

1. What are your observations of housing development in Clark County and in the unincorporated Vancouver Urban Growth Area specifically over the last 5-10 years in terms of options and affordability?
  - Can you think of examples of specific recent projects that worked well, or didn't? What types of obstacles did projects encounter, regulatory or otherwise?
  - What types of housing and housing needs are being served by recent development? Who isn't being served?
  - How is recent development being located relative to existing or planned daily goods and services, including safe parks within a comfortable and safe walking distance, bicycle route, or transit ride?
  
2. Do the county's development regulations help implement goals to encourage more diverse and affordable housing types? If not, what are the primary barriers to developing more diverse and affordable housing? What concerns or obstacles do you hear about from developers or experience in your own work?
  - Zoning in particular (density, allowed use, annexation, land division, environmental regulations, design standards, infrastructure requirements)
  - The development review process including permit fees
  - Impact Fees
  - Other non-regulatory factors outside of the County's control, like financing or land availability
  
3. In addition to single-family detached residential development, what types of residential development would you like to see within the Vancouver Urban Growth Area in the future? Which non-single-family detached options seem the most promising to you, in terms of how they meet needs of County residents, regulatory requirements, and/or development economics and financing?
  
4. Are there development regulations, tools and practices from other jurisdictions that you would like to see the County consider adopting? Non-regulatory approaches that would be worth consideration?
  
5. What kind of impacts on existing naturally affordable housing stock and/or displacement of our most vulnerable community members, such as renters, people with disabilities, lower income populations, immigrant communities, and other disadvantaged groups are you seeing? What are the opportunities and barriers to preserving affordable housing and avoiding displacement?



6. Should new housing opportunities be narrowly focused or more widely dispersed? If focused, in what areas and/or types of areas should expanded housing opportunities be encouraged? For example, does it make sense to prioritize locations near certain amenities, such as schools, jobs, parks, transit, etc.? Should we prioritize areas that currently have fewer housing options or areas that have had success with these housing types?
7. Are there any other factors that we should consider?
8. Is there anyone else that we should speak with?

### **Developer**

1. How have zoning and other regulations affected the cost and timing of your developments and the types of projects that you have pursued? (Listen for general reactions, and probe further about specifics as needed.) Are there particular aspects of the following that create obstacles for your work:
  - Zoning districts applied to available land, whether low, medium or high density residential
  - Dimensional standards, such as minimum and maximum density, setbacks
  - Allowed uses, including types of housing allowed, single-family, townhouses, manufactured homes, etc.
  - Design standards, including building design, historic compatibility requirements or site design requirements like landscaping, parking ratios
  - Review requirements, including land use application types, fees, review times, building permit review fees and times
  - Environmentally sensitive land use restrictions, such as limited development on steep slopes
  - Engineering requirements, specifically infrastructure required for streets, water, sewer, stormwater
  - Building code requirements
2. Of the concerns you mentioned, what has been the most significant regulatory impediment impacting your projects?
3. What has been your experience working with the planning and development review process in Clark County (or cities within Clark County), from staff to fees to timing? Are there any areas for improvement? (Be specific; projects can have multiple reviews)



- 
4. Are there development review regulations, tools and practices from other jurisdictions that you would like to see Clark County consider exploring through this project?
  5. What kinds of obstacles outside of county control, such as financing, consumer preferences, land availability, or others, impact your work on housing development? How do those obstacles compare to obstacles around county regulations, what are the biggest drivers in whether and what types of development get built?
  6. What are your assumptions for soft costs building in Clark County (as a percent of hard costs)? Are there specific requirements that inform this number?
  7. How do you anticipate the economic repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic to impact your development activity in Clark County?
  8. For the building types you would consider developing in Clark County, what would be the rental rate (in \$ per square foot) you would assume in your financial modeling for [insert applicable building types, pending further discussion]? How are you forecasting rent growth into the future?
  9. Are there resources that the County could provide to support your development work?
    - What types of resources would be most helpful?
    - Would things like educational materials on zoning, building, engineering requirements; information on fees; site-specific information about development requirements; more staff time be useful?
    - How useful are more generalized resources such as a template of fees or design requirements, compared to site-specific materials?
  10. In addition to the (fill in the blank) type of residential development you are doing now, what types of residential development would you like to be involved with in the future, or what opportunities do you see for other residential developers? What does the community want and need, and what kinds of housing could feasibly be built to meet those needs?
  11. Are there any other factors that we should consider?
  12. Is there anyone else that we should speak with?



---

## Online Questionnaire

Think about your observations of housing development in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA over the last 5-10 years.

1. What types of homes are being built? Check all that apply.
  - Single-family homes
  - Manufactured home
  - Duplex/triplex/fourplex
  - Townhouse
  - Apartment/condominium
  - Other (please specify)
  
2. Who do you think is being served by recent housing development? Check all that apply.
  - Singles
  - Young couples
  - Families with children
  - Empty nesters
  - Older adults
  - Low income residents
  - Medium income residents
  - High income residents
  - Others (please specify)
  
3. Is recent development being located near daily services (shopping, safe parks, schools, etc.)? Check all that apply.
  - New development is a short walk or bike ride away from daily services
  - New development is being located along transit lines
  - New development is being located a short drive from daily services
  - New development is not being located close to daily services
  
4. What are the primary barriers to developing more diverse and affordable housing? *Do the county's development regulations (zoning, standards, review process, impact fees) encourage more diverse and affordable housing types? What about other non-regulatory factors outside of County control (financing, land availability)?*
  
5. Are there development regulations, tools, or practices from other jurisdictions that you would like to see the County consider adopting? Are there non-regulatory approaches worth considering?





---

6. In addition to single family detached homes, what types of homes do you think are needed in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA? Select your top three housing types.

- Mother-in-law unit/ADU
- Tiny home
- Manufactured home
- Cottage housing
- Duplex/triplex/fourplex
- Townhouse
- Courtyard apartment
- Live/work unit
- Mixed use
- Other (please specify)

7. What non-single-family detached housing options seem the most promising to you in terms of how they address housing needs? Select your top three housing types.

- Mother-in-law unit/ADU
- Tiny home
- Manufactured home
- Cottage housing
- Duplex/triplex/fourplex
- Townhouse
- Courtyard apartment
- Live/work unit
- Mixed use
- Other (please specify)

8. What are the opportunities and barriers to preserving existing affordable housing and avoiding displacement of our most vulnerable community members?

9. What are the most important factors to consider when deciding where to locate expanded housing opportunities? Select your top four factors.

- Near major roads/intersections
- Near transit service
- Near parks
- Near schools/institutions
- Near commercial/service centers
- Design compatibility with surrounding development
- Near jobs
- "Infill" sites within existing neighborhoods
- Dispersed widely throughout unincorporated Vancouver UGA
- Focus in a few areas
- Others (please specify)



10. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about housing in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA?
11. Who else should we be talking to about housing in the unincorporated Vancouver UGA?
12. Please provide your contact information so we know we are reaching our key stakeholders.
  - Name
  - Affiliation
  - Email address

### **Focus Group Discussion Questions**

1. Where are buyers looking to live in Clark County?
  - *proximity to work, school or daily activities*
  - *access to transportation options*
  - *proximity to nearby amenities*
2. What type of homes do buyers hope to be able to afford?
  - *number of bedrooms*
  - *number of bathrooms*
  - *type, amount of open space*
  - *type of housing (house, townhouse, apartment)*
  - *parking (attached garage, street parking, parking pod)*
  - *shared community spaces vs private spaces*
3. What is available to buyers on the market during their search?
4. Are there housing types buyers are searching for that are not being built in Clark County?
5. What do buyers ultimately buy or rent, based on available options and prices?
6. What are some of the trade-offs buyers make (if any) between home type, size and price relative to location, access to transportation, or other elements?

