



Clark County Planning Commission

Steve Morasch, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice Chair
Robin Grimwade
Bill Wright
Karl Johnson
Richard Bender
Matt Swindell

CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017

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

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

BARCA: Good evening. I'm going to call this meeting of the Planning Commission to order for June 15th, 2016 --

I am the acting chair for the Planning Commission, as you can see acting is the key word at the moment. I have a procedure that we are going to go through this evening. This is a beta test for our new policy and procedure. So we're going to begin the hearing with a staff report. The Planning Commission members will ask staff questions if they have any questions to the point. Then I'm going to open up the hearing for public testimony. Members of the audience who wish to testify regarding the hearing item that we're hearing at that moment, they should have signed in on the sign-up sheet and I would be able to call them back from that sign-up sheet. Members of the public wishing to give oral testimony will come forward to the podium and face the Planning Commission.

After public testimony is complete, I will close public testimony. The Planning Commission will deliberate. We may ask staff additional questions or there may be rebuttal, then the Planning Commission will vote on the decision. Our recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of County Councilors who have final decision-making authority.

So members of the public, when you testify, you must testify at the front table here in front of the microphone so the court reporter can record your testimony. State your name, please slowly spell your name so the court reporter has it in our meeting minutes. Try and be relevant and concise and please don't repeat testimony if others have given it before you.

The chair, me, has the discretion to make the following statement if reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances. Testimony on this matter is limited to, and then I get to

fill in a particular period of time. This evening we're not going to have a period of time. Your testimony should relate to the applicable standards for the hearing items. The relevant standards are set out from the staff report which is what we have our discussion based on.

If you have any exhibits that you want us to consider such as copies of your testimony, photographs, petitions or other documents, please hand it to the staff. This information will be included in the record for the hearing item. We will consider it to the best of our ability as part of our deliberation. And quite honestly, anything that we get while we're in the middle of deliberation, it's going to be very difficult for us to look at.

Conflicts of interest. So I am going to ask the PC, is there anyone who would like to disclose any conflicts of interest for any item under the agenda this evening? Hearing none, that concludes my introduction, and we'll begin in just one moment for the hearing.

Well, Commission, I don't know how you feel about that, but I thought that was kind of wordy, so I think we should talk about this a little bit further when we have our next hearing or our next work session.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for June, 15, 2017

BARCA: We are going to start with the agenda and that is starting with approval of the agenda for this evening, June 15th, 2017.

JOHNSON: Make a motion to approve the agenda for this evening.

GRIMWADE: I second it.

BARCA: Motion and second. All those in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

BARCA: Okay. Remember, you have these little small microphones so we have to be very close to them.

B. Approval of Minutes for May 18, 2017

BARCA: Approval of the minutes for May 18th. Can I get a motion to approve.

BENDER: I make a motion we approve the minutes of May 18th, 2017.

SWINDELL: I'll second it.

BARCA: It's been motioned and seconded. All those in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

BARCA: Okay. Now, this is the time in the agenda for communication from the public not related to any of our agenda items this evening. If anybody would like to come forward and bring some item to the Planning Commission unrelated to tonight's agenda, this is your opportunity. And seeing none, we're going to go ahead and go forward then. Let's start with CPZ2017-00019.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. CPZ2017-00019 Wiard: A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map from a designation of Mixed Use (MX) to Industrial (IL) on the following parcel: 200105000.

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Councilor Barca. My name is Jose Alvarez, Community Planning for the record.

The first item as you mentioned is CPZ2017-00019, Wiard. The proposal is a comprehensive plan and zoning amendment from mixed use with a mixed use zoning to industrial with light industrial zoning. It's approximately three acres, one acre's already industrial, so it would be for two acres. I'm just going to give you a brief overview of the proposal looking at the --

BARCA: Excuse me, Jose. We have no screen in front of us.

ALVAREZ: Oh. Let me look into that.

BARCA: So we don't get the screen, is that what you're saying? I understand. That's so old school. There we go. Something happened, look at that. Well, they can see it. We can work off the papers. Is it on the screen up here?

ALVAREZ: Yeah.

BARCA: We can proceed with our paper then.

ALVAREZ: So sorry for the technical difficulties. So these maps are under Tab 3 and they're just before you get to the first blue tab. Go in reverse order. So this is kind of the general vicinity. It's 503 running north/south. It's along 117th Avenue between 99th Street to the

south and 119th Street to the north. I'd like to give you the zoning map.

So this property when the mixed use designation was created in 1994, we did something kind of unique where the mixed use comp plan designation kept the industrial zoning designation. So the property owners had the ability to either keep the existing industrial zoning; if they wanted to go to mixed use, they could apply for a zone change. The only zone change they could go to was mixed use. That's what happened with the property to the south, and this was a conditional use application that was approved for a church and two acres that were bought by the property owner to the north were part of that development. So subsequently, the property owners to the south sold two acres. The property owner to the north then did a boundary line adjustment and it's all one parcel now, but it is split zoned.

And so we are recommending approval of this proposal and it meets all of the criteria that are required and laid out in the staff report. The environmental analysis, SEPA, comment period closed on the 13th. We haven't received any comments related to SEPA issues.

If you have any questions, I'd be glad to take those now.

BARCA: Any questions for staff? Okay. Seeing no questions for staff, we're going to go ahead and open it up for public testimony.

We have Stacy and Kurt Olson. Are you both coming forward?

STONEX: Probably not, just me.

BARCA: And are you Kurt?

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

STONEX: I'm Kurt Stonex with Olson Engineering representing the property owner and the applicant. I really don't have a lot to add. I think the staff report and application tell the story.

So it's sort of a logical map amendment that he -- you know, like Jose had mentioned, we've got a split zoned property that's surrounded by a transfer station and this would clean up the split zoning and allow him to proceed with the light industrial development, and I'm just here to answer questions if you have any.

BARCA: You're representing the applicant?

STONEX: Yes.

BARCA: Are there any questions for the applicant?

WRIGHT: Is the transfer station to the south of this parcel?

STONEX: No, it's north and west.

BARCA: Bill, you got to get closer. Okay. Thank you so much.

STONEX: Thank you.

BARCA: Is there anybody from the audience that did not sign up on the sign-up sheet that wishes to testify on this particular application?

Okay. Seeing none, we're going to bring it back to the Commission for deliberation.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

JOHNSON: Seems straightforward to me.

SWINDELL: Yeah, straightforward. It makes sense to me.

BARCA: Okay. If we have no deliberation, open to a motion.

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION** to accept staff recommendations for CPZ2017-00019, Wiard.

SWINDELL: I'll **second** it.

BARCA: Motion has been moved and seconded. Any more discussion? Roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE

BARCA: AYE

SWINDELL: AYE

JOHNSON: AYE

GRIMWADE: AYE

BENDER: AYE

BARCA: Okay. It's been approved and we can move on. We are moving to CPZ2017-00020, Mill Plain Commercial.

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Mr. Barca.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

- B. CPZ2017-00020 Mill Plain Commercial:** A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map from a designation of Urban Low (R1-6) to Commercial (C-3) on the following parcel: 200124000.

ALVAREZ: The next item is a proposal to amend the comprehensive plan from urban low R1-6 zoning to commercial with community commercial zoning. This is approximately on three-quarters of an acre, 35,000-square feet. The parcel to the south is zoned commercial. It's located at the northwest corner of the intersection of NE 99th Street and this is 117th again. Staff is recommending approval of this.

The parcel to the south is losing some acreage for the expansion of 99th Street. It doesn't seem like it's a large expansion of commercial. The residential is not terribly viable with the access, the limited access that you can get from the State route, so we are recommending approval. It meets all of the approval criteria. Also the SEPA comment period for this application closed on June 13th and we have not received any comments on that, so the comment period's over. I'd be glad to take any questions, if you have any.

BARCA: Questions for staff? It appears none. We will open it up for public comment.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

STONEX: For the record, Kurt Stonex with Olson Engineering representing the applicant and property owner.

We are in agreement with the staff report. It's another fairly logical map amendment. There's an isolated residential parcel that has limited access to SR-503 and the applicant also owns the property to the south, so they can combine this into a viable commercial corner. That's all I have, unless you have questions.

HOLLEY: Would you spell your last name.

STONEX: Stonex, S-t-o-n-e-x. Sorry, I mumbled.

BARCA: And that is the intention to combine those two properties?

STONEX: That's correct.

BARCA: Okay. Any questions for the applicant? Thank you.

STONEX: Thank you.

BARCA: And I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission. Deliberation?

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

SWINDELL: Again, seems pretty straightforward. It just makes sense.

BARCA: All right. Then I'll entertain a motion.

BENDER: I make a **MOTION** that we accept staff's report and recommendation for CPZ2017-00020, Mill Plain.

GRIMWADE: I'll **second** it.

BARCA: Okay. It's been motioned and seconded. Let's go ahead and do roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SWINDELL: AYE
WRIGHT: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
GRIMWADE: AYE
BENDER: AYE
BARCA: AYE

BARCA: Motion passes.

And we are moving to CPZ2017-00022, Riverview Estate or Asset Management & Trust.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS, continued

- C. CPZ2017-00022 Riverview Asset Mgmt. & Trust:** A proposal to amend the comprehensive plan and zoning map from a designation of Industrial (Business Park) to Urban Low with R1-6 zoning and one acre of Commercial with Neighborhood Commercial zoning on the following parcel(s): 200305000; 200326000 and 200355000.

ALVAREZ: Thank you, Councilor. This proposal is a request to amend the comprehensive plan from industrial with a BP zoning designation to urban low density residential R1-6 zoning on approximately 80 acres. This is along 152nd Avenue between 99th Street and 119th Street. You should have received a letter from the Columbia River Economic Development Council and also the City of Vancouver, and this morning, the -- well, you should have received something from the applicant in response to the staff report and I think both of the letters from CREDC and the City.

We are recommending denial of this application. Primarily it's a policy issue in terms of balancing industrial versus residential land. While we're cognizant of the need for residential land and the cost of land, we think that the preservation of industrial land is paramount at this point. We don't have a policy in place that requires us to look at adding additional industrial land if it's removed from our inventory. The only way to protect industrial land that we currently have is to not change the designation to it. So we don't feel that the application meets the applicable criteria for change to urban low density residential.

Are there any questions you have at this point?

BARCA: Questions for staff?

JOHNSON: Jose, just for clarification, didn't Battle Ground School District own it after this?

ALVAREZ: Yes. So there's a 20-acre piece on the southwest corner of this 60-acre piece that was purchased by the Battle Ground School District last September. So taking that out, that still leaves you with 60 acres of business park that's not -- that wouldn't have the school on it.

There's also a 20-acre piece of business park to the north that's not part of this application, but if this was changed, that would just be kind of an isolated 20-acre piece. It wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to just leave that there.

WRIGHT: This isn't a question of staff, but I am pointing out that on Page 8 of 8 pages of the staff report, there's a nice little table that summarizes five different points of compliance or not with the criteria and similar to what was on the two prior, but...

ALVAREZ: Right.

WRIGHT: I found this to be pretty interesting and useful information.

GRIMWADE: Is there any consultation with Battle Ground School District?

ALVAREZ: We did not, no. We did recommend when we had a pre-application with the applicant originally, the Battle Ground School District wasn't part of the proposal, we suggested they include it so that similar to the parcel to the north, you wouldn't leave that strip of 20 acres out. If you were going to change it, you might as well change it all.

BARCA: Are we done with Jose? Questions for staff are complete?

BENDER: Yeah, I have a question. How long has Riverview Asset Management owned the property?

ALVAREZ: I'm not sure. It's in trust. The applicant can probably answer that question. It seems like it's been in trust for a while.

BARCA: Okay. Seeing no other questions for staff, I'm going to open it up to the public.

And public testimony would start with Kristin French.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

FRENCH: Good evening. Kristin French with the firm Jordan Ramis here on behalf of the applicant. The last name is spelled French, F-r-e-n-c-h, and the business address is 1499 SE Tech Center Place, Suite 380, Vancouver, Washington.

And I think I'd like to start off on a point that Jose brought up, which was the balancing of interests in this case. And so he mentioned the balancing of residential and industrial, and I would like to reiterate that in addition, we're looking at balancing issues that relate to the siting of a school, and that is a really big issue and it's a current issue that the legislature is really focusing on and, in fact, our own comprehensive plan here in Clark County speaks to that. And the supplement that we submitted, I believe you've got that in hand, my plan would be to first just walk through briefly the content in that and how that relates to the school district analysis.

So we understand and appreciate the CREDC comments and those from the City, but what we've really focused on is the difficulty that school districts have in identifying and acquiring appropriate acreage for their school facilities. And so in this case, we do have a piece of property that has actually been purchased and committed for school district development that causes us to look at the immediately surrounding lands that are adjacent to and particularly within one-half mile of that property. We've cited for you in our supplement a number of sources that really focus on the current emphasis on getting children to school through safe walking routes and bicycling routes and the particular emphasis that's being placed on integrating communities with the schools to serve as sort of a community feature and kind of the hub of a community, serving more than just school purposes but those of the surrounding houses. And so you'd find that we attached several example photo sets, and I don't know if you have the hardcopy packets in front of you, but just to walk you through that.

The first is Exhibit A and we provided that just as a quick snapshot of the history of this parcel. This Riverview parcel was originally included on a list. There was a 2016 employment lands study that was completed and the exercise included coming up with a list of properties that might be focused on for employment lands purposes, and so you'll see this master list at Page 1 of 1 on Exhibit A and we highlighted that the subject Riverview parcel at that time was noted as a possible candidate.

Then we at Exhibit B, Page 1, and if you flip to Page 2, we highlighted our particular Riverview

site was actually then strategically cut from that list and this was a process of vetting lands and they noted that it was being cut because it would be used for public schools. So at present, this subject acreage is not included on the employment lands list of the most significant parcels and we thought that beared noting.

If you could flip to Exhibit C, Page 15 of 18, I also think that this is a good visual representation of what we're talking about tonight. You'll see our subject parcel labeled Riverview Asset Management and then just slightly to the northwest, you'd see some large parcels, the 45 and 44 numbers. So just to briefly touch on the question of available acreage, that is the property that's known as the Lagler industrial bank land and we had pointed to that as a better and more viable industrial lands acreage possibility and staff did raise concerns about the status of that given our Growth Management Hearings Board complications.

So we wanted -- one thing we thought would be relevant to consider is the Senate Bill 5517 that's now made great progress through the legislature and is anticipated to pass and that would essentially ensure that this subject substitute Lagler acreage will be available to the extent that it's adjacent to the Short Line Railway and that would accomplish a significant acreage that we could count on knowing that it would be available as a better situated substitute that would alleviate the school compatibility concerns.

And then the exhibit set D, we wanted to provide some visual representations to kind of frame up the school compatibility points that we're making. Exhibit D, Page 1 of 6, is a school that we found to nicely illustrate how housing is being integrated with schools, and particularly if you flip through this, you'll see walkability and bicycling is better served by compatible residential development surrounding the schools than to contrast it with the last two examples.

Those last two examples are F and G, and you'd see, for example, Exhibit F, Page 2, you can see the wire fencing at Orchards Elementary, and that wire fencing is what you see when you look at a school site that abuts a commercial development and the traditional pattern is that you'll see this fencing and even barbed wire fencing with a big sort of dead space where they're trying to separate the business or the industrial type uses from the school type uses. And it would be our hope that the acreage that's in the immediate vicinity of the school piece could be more compatibly developed than what we saw on those sites.

In terms of the acreage to the north, the Davis parcel, we did speak with Planning staff and we understood that there was a goal, if we were to be redesignated, they would appreciate that that northern piece be redesignated to ensure compatibility, and we did reach out by several mailings to that family. We didn't receive a negative response. We just didn't receive any response at all. And our thought on that would be if this were deemed to be an appropriate redesignation, the County would be positioned to initiate that with respect to that piece to the north in a way that where as a private applicant, we're not. So to the extent we deem it a fit, it could be a fit for the entire chunk there.

I think that I kind of opened by saying school siting really is a big, a big deal. If we look at our current legislature action, we've got the Senate Bill 1017 which will become effective this July 2017 and it's titled School Siting and it's speaking about the difficulties that school districts have in identifying the appropriate ground for their school facilities. And in relevant part, it's trying to say when would it be appropriate for a school district to site outside of the UGA and they have a laundry list of sort of criteria that you'd work through, but they're saying school districts need to be integrated into the annual -- into the periodic update process and they need to be identifying school sites where students can safely walk and bike to school from their homes.

And so that is just a very current example of a law that's coming into effect here in the next month that's been the result and culmination of a great, sort of -- it's not that it's been a new attention paid, but it's a real strong current public recognition of the fact that our schools play an important role and how we situate them with respect to where their students live is as equally important as the other somewhat competing interests that we're balancing in terms of the industrial land analysis.

So I think I'd wrap up, we did provide a lot of written material that you would be able to leaf through, but credible sites that we wanted you to see your own, the Clark County comprehensive plan and what it provides particularly finding that districts have to compete with private developers in trying to acquire these sites, under the current growth conditions, land speculation driving the cost of land up, and so the fact that here we do have a school district that did secure a viable site, it's not something to take lightly. We talked about the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and their school siting suggestions and guidelines and we also referenced a good EPA manual that talks about the social and economic and policy considerations that go into school siting. So that's really I think something we would really hope to focus on.

And to wrap up, I wanted to touch on the question of housing and the need for additional residential zone to acreage. The County, the Planner had expressed some concern about a showing on that, so we did include in the supplement several references to address housing demand and we did that on Page 5 of our summary. So a couple of on-the-ground measuring sticks that we cited to, two residential developments in that immediate vicinity were completely purchased, 100 percent bought out immediately upon them becoming available to the public. Those were the Dunning Meadows and Urban Oaks developments. We've recently had the opportunity to look at 2016 census data, so we included a reference there and that data shows growth rates that exceed for this area. They exceed projected growth rates. And then we have the local reporting in the news that you see on a frequent basis and we just picked one current article that emphasizes the lack of housing stock and the need for that in the area.

So we, I guess, we would close by saying the industrial lands policy discussion does invite a bigger discussion and I think staff correctly alluded to that. We would hope that could happen, and that in the meantime, this uniquely situated acreage with the school district

development could be treated for what it is, which is somewhat uniquely situated. Thank you.

BARCA: Questions for the applicant?

JOHNSON: I have one. Have you met with Battle Ground School District specifically?

FRENCH: We have. We've worked with their facilities manager and we've worked with their counsel out of Seattle to review as we've worked through the application process.

JOHNSON: So have you asked them is there a specific plan or long-term plan to actually place a school on that property?

FRENCH: That's absolutely my understanding, and I wouldn't want to speak for them, but that's absolutely my understanding.

JOHNSON: Because I know that they -- they own lots of properties and many of the properties will never be used for schools.

FRENCH: Right. And, in fact, I can say that there's been a request that we place signage on the right-of-way to alert the public to the future development for a school site on that property, so I know that it's seriously contemplated.

BENDER: Did you ask Battle Ground to attend the meeting tonight?

FRENCH: No.

SWINDELL: Can I ask how long has that 80 acres currently been zoned the way it is now? How long has it been zoned that way?

ALVAREZ: I believe since 2004.

FRENCH: I was going to say 2004.

SWINDELL: 2004. And when did the school district purchase the property?

FRENCH: '15.

SWINDELL: 2015?

FRENCH: Yeah.

SWINDELL: So when they purchased it, they knew the zoning was industrial.

FRENCH: That's correct. And the zoning, that particular zoning does allow school district development within that zone.

SWINDELL: Yeah. And they knew that it would be adjacent to an industrial by purchasing that land; is that accurate?

FRENCH: Theoretically, yes. Yeah.

JOHNSON: Jose, just for clarification, then, that was purchased in '16.

ALVAREZ: The record I saw that it was last year in 2016, September of 2016. That's when the recording -- that's the recording date.

BARCA: Other questions?

WRIGHT: I have a question for staff.

ALVAREZ: Sure.

WRIGHT: If part of this is timing, when your analysis of this site was prepared and these recommendations submitted, was that in contemplation of the Lagler site would not be approved for industrial? I guess, let me rephrase that another way.

If the Lagler site is available for industrial development, would that change your thinking as far as meeting GMA and countywide policies as far as this site being necessary to be retained for industrial purposes?

ALVAREZ: So we didn't do that analysis. And just to remind you that when we adopted the comp plan last year, the Lagler piece wasn't considered part of the inventory. It's outside of the urban growth boundary still. Even if it is approved for a rural industrial land bank, it will still be rural, so it's not really counted in our inventory of industrial land.

WRIGHT: So is it fair then to say, regardless of what happens with the Lagler, your opinion is still the same?

ALVAREZ: Yes. We would keep the same thing, that's correct.

BARCA: I have a question for Ms. French. You alluded to the idea of the adjacent housing developments selling out so rapidly. Would you think, then, that if this converted, we would be able to see that inventory of land open up and sell out as rapidly?

FRENCH: Absolutely.

BARCA: So there really isn't a required amount of property that's this size that would really have an impact on a housing as far as shortages go. The market being what it is, you would anticipate whatever parcel size we could put on, the market would sell out?

FRENCH: If I understand your question, this could theoretically supply about 239 new single-family residences, and we see the demand is there for those in that location.

BARCA: Yeah, I would think it's every bit of that, wouldn't you?

FRENCH: Yeah, absolutely.

BARCA: Yeah. Okay. Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you.

FRENCH: Thank you.

BARCA: I only had one name on the sign-up sheet. If there's anybody else from the public that would like to come forward and speak on the Riverview Asset Management property, then we're certainly welcoming you up.

Okay. I'm not seeing anybody from the public. We're going to bring it back to Planning Commission. Deliberation.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

BENDER: Yeah. One of the things that I attest to is there's a housing need, but there's also a need for industrial land so we don't send our citizens across the river to work over there and pay Oregon taxes. So I think the need for industrial land is just as vital as it is for residential.

BARCA: Other comments?

WRIGHT: Well, I'll be going with the staff recommendation on this, but it is still somewhat troubling. We have all these sites, but I don't see the world beating a path to develop them out. I would think at a certain point in the future if that continues to be the case, we might be open to rezoning on that parcel, but certainly stay the course at this point.

BARCA: Karl.

JOHNSON: You know, I'm -- we have two needs, but I'm not sure that one overrides the other, and I agree that we do have a lot. I'm not seeing a lot of industrial development, but I -- and I understand that we have a perfectly honest biased side to say that these would be sold rather quickly, so that begins to question staff's analysis of this and so I don't have the answer yet. I'm leaning towards no, just for the fact that there's a school coming in there, what type of

industrial that would look like next to a school. It's surrounded by -- somewhat surrounded on three sides by a residential area and so I'm not sure that the industrial need outweighs the residential need.

BARCA: Okay. So I think for my two cents on this matter, Battle Ground School District bought the 20 acres in good conscious that it was business park land. The compatibility to the 20 acres on the north side, I think, is completely put in jeopardy, and when we think about these zoning changes, we have to think about the impact and compatibility with the surrounding area and I think we completely isolate and gut that other 20 acres by making a choice of that nature. I think we would need thousands of acres to put even a dent in the idea of what the demand is for residential housing right now, and housing is going to trickle in in little bits and the demand is going to remain high and we're not going to swing the market and change that with 80 acres or 50 acres.

I think the most important thing we can do is try and get businesses willing to develop the business park model and keep that industry in Clark County rather than build the houses and send them across the river. So I think I will follow staff recommendation myself. And if there's no more deliberation.

BENDER: I have one other thing to say. Speaking from the Evergreen School District, which I'm familiar with, they really don't want more housing. They cannot handle the students they have now. I think maybe Battle Ground might be in the same position.

JOHNSON: Well, I mean, I'm not sure that a school district looks at, you know, students are always there and districts are always growing and I think it's the other way around. You try to meet the needs of those people. We've talked for many times about our issues with the housing. And, again, I'm not -- I'm like this -- I don't want to put too much emphasis on that, other than those needs to me, in my mind, are the same, and if we don't try to change those thousand households or thousands of needs for residential property, if we don't start somewhere, we'll never have it. So I just think it's a good place.

And like I said, I don't want to diminish what staff's done, because I get what you're saying, Jose. I just -- I'm stuck on that with the school there and surrounding it and just looking at it, I think you could go either way, so at least I could.

SWINDELL: Well, I guess to add to that, just that thought of from the school district, being on the Ridgefield School Board for a short amount of time, understanding looking out for growth, actually having some industrial land there to help with the tax base kind of helps as well and keeps the taxes down for all those new houses coming in, so it does help.

WRIGHT: I wonder if I might add another fact or two. Although this certainly might be mitigatable, residential has a lot higher traffic demand than industrial and this area is a very troubled area for transportation. There's not a lot of east/west and north/south circulation

other than going on onto SR-503 which anybody who's driven that knows what a mess that is, so...

BENDER: Anything failing out there now?

WRIGHT: Pardon me?

BENDER: Anything failing in that area?

WRIGHT: I wouldn't be able to tell you.

BARCA: Now you did it.

LEBOWSKY: Laurie Lebowsky, Community Planning.

No, there's not in that area. There's no failing intersections. Also you need to consider that as that area develops, circulation roads will be built.

BARCA: Thank you, Laurie.

LEBOWSKY: One more thing. Per the traffic study, actually trip generation with the -- actually with the residential would be lower.

BARCA: Okay. Thanks for clarifying that.

Ms. French, you look like you have some rebuttal.

FRENCH: Just on that issue.

BARCA: On what issue? Wait until you're in the mic zone.

FRENCH: Okay. I did just want to point out that we submitted a very thorough traffic study analysis which did demonstrate that trip generation would be substantially lower with our proposal as it would be under the business park development model. Thank you.

BARCA: Right. Thank you.

GRIMWADE: Mr. Chairman, I think there's been some interesting points made tonight and certainly pedestrian accessibility is very important, the needs of school districts are very important, the needs of industrial land are extremely important as is residential land. I have yet to be convinced that you cannot provide good accessibility to a school through industrial land.

There are many examples in the world where there are excellent industrial developments providing excellent accessibility routes to schools. There's also different educational models that can be put together with industry and schools side-by-side. For those reasons, I would like to move a **MOTION** endorsing the staff's recommendation for this item.

BARCA: There's been a motion. Do I hear a second?

BENDER: **Second.**

BARCA: Okay. So we have a motion and seconded. Any final discussion? Roll call, please.

BENDER: Would you like to re-clarify the motion, please.

BARCA: Please.

GRIMWADE: The **MOTION** is that we move with staff recommendation for CPZ2017-00022, Riverview Asset Trust.

BENDER: Thank you.

BARCA: Does your second stand?

BENDER: It stands.

BARCA: Okay. Roll call.

WRIGHT: AYE, assuming that's for **denial**.

BARCA: Yeah, that's correct. The motion was to accept staff recommendation.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SWINDELL: AYE

JOHNSON: NO

GRIMWADE: AYE

BENDER: AYE

BARCA: AYE

BARCA: NO

BARCA: Karl wants his noted.

BARCA: Thank you. Okay. So that takes us through the active agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

BARCA: Comments from the Planning Commission? I really wasn't happy with that script, two pages of script. I would like to re-examine that as a group.

SWINDELL: You need to practice it at home more. It's better that you do it in front of a mirror a few times.

BARCA: The only saving grace to that is the next time Steve has to do it for the first time and then we'll find another standing acting chair and see how they - excuse me - give them an opportunity. All right. We'll take this into consideration.

ADJOURNMENT

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/planning-commission-hearings-and-meeting-notes>

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

<http://www.cvtv.org/>

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.

Sonja Wisner, Program Assistant, Clark County Community Planning