

From: [Daniel Wisner](#)
To: [Jacqui Kamp](#)
Cc: [Elizabeth Decker](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Susan Ellinger](#); [Steve Faust](#)
Subject: Re: Tuesday, February 28 - Technical Housing Code Forum Meeting #4-Middle Housing/Single Family
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 4:40:31 PM
Attachments: [HOSOP Comments Meeting 3.docx](#)

I just realized I totally forgot to send over the notes. I think much of this was covered in the meeting but I only went thru about 2/3 of it.

If there are any questions let me know, the notes are a bit cryptic

Daniel Wisner

Songbird Homes and Visionary Property Development
Chair 2021 Clark County Developer/Engineer Advisory Board
Email: Wisnerdan@gmail.com
Cell: 360.607.7849

Mailing Address:

10013 NE Hazel Dell Ave. PMB 504 | Vancouver, WA 98685

On Tue, Feb 28, 2023 at 2:37 PM Jacqui Kamp <Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Hi Dan,

Sounds good. Feel free to send them over when ready and I'll get them distributed to the group.

Thanks!

Jacqui

From: Daniel Wisner <wisnerdan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2023 2:29 PM
To: Jacqui Kamp <Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: Tuesday, February 28 - Technical Housing Code Forum Meeting #4-Middle Housing/Single Family

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

I will be unable to attend today but have some notes that I will send

On Wed, Feb 22, 2023, 7:49 AM Jacqui Kamp <Jacqui.Kamp@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Hello,

The fourth meeting of the Technical Housing Code Forum on **Middle Housing/Single Family strategies** is scheduled for **Tuesday., Feb. 28 from 3-5 p.m. via Zoom.**

I'm sending this email to ALL that wanted to participate in either forum series to continue to keep you in the loop.

Those that signed up specifically for the **middle housing/single family forum series** will receive a Zoom invite from Steve Faust. Please reach out if you don't receive it by Friday.

The meetings will be open to the public to observe. Written comments from the public can also be submitted to staff at any time.

Meeting materials, including the agenda, can be found on the housing project page under **“Project Events, County Council, and Planning Commission Meetings”**:
www.clark.wa.gov/housingoptions

Thank you for your flexibility in rescheduling this meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I look forward to seeing you all next week!

Jacqui

March 12, 2023

Comments to 3rd HOSOP meeting

Comments specific to the ADU 40.250 Special uses

Cottage clusters – increase max number of cottages allowed in a cluster to 16. Allow ADU in the cottage but not a duplex.

Item 7 c Having pedestrian paths being required in the common area is a bad idea. 1) limits flexibility 2) reduces the ability to have larger recreation areas and 3) increases impervious area.

I am doing a cottage project with 2 common areas, 1 area is set up to be community garden space and the other is target for pet/play area.

Narrow lots – Developers are creating nice plans for homes 18 ft wide. But a narrow lot can be up to 39 ft wide. So there needs to be more flexibility. A 10 ft driveway and garage door at 50% of max works when it is a single car garage on a 18 ft wide building but does not work well when the (town) home is 26 ft wide and the desire is for a 2 car garage. These design restricts are in conflict with market forces

Other Comments –

Table 40.220.010.2 reduce R1-10 width min to 65 feet. I have built nice 3 car garage homes that are only 50 ft wide so they would fit on a 65 ft wide lot with 7.5 side setbacks. 65 wide by 130 deep is about the new average size proposed.

R1-20 go to 90 ft min wide.

Increase lot coverage by an additional 5% over currently proposed. Allows for more flexibility in design so that homes do not have to be a box to stay under current lot coverage.

Increase max building height by 3 ft in all zones due to how height can be interpreted. . This allows for a bit more flexibility in roof design, some buffer if the lots have any slope and could require a pony wall or there is a desire to have 10 ft main floor height.

40.220.010-4 Max density needs to be clarified that it is gross area minus EXISTING ROW and easement and DOES NOT include PROPOSED

40-220.010-5 Density transfer – I recommend reducing lot width min by 5 ft in the R1-5 & 6 zones. Pretty easy to design great looking and living homes at 20 wide with side entry

40-220-020-2 Again increase lot coverage by 5% R12,18, 22 min lot depth s/b decreased to 60 ft. We have done short and wide and it works. Building depth was 35 and had 1500 sq ft.

Notes # 9 , 10 of this table And there has been some very lengthy debate about the landscaping and recreation space requirements being exclusive of each other as the current code is not clear. So a note should be made that they can be inclusive or an area can count for both.

Since there are so many changes there needs to be a preamble that directs that if there are different interpretations then the most favorable interpretation should be used.

On compact developments/PUDs – I think that it is a great idea to reduce the size of a PUD and increase the size of compact developments (old infill) There should probably be some overlap between the 2 such as 3.5 acres max for compact and 3 min for PUD.

Common open space requirement is a bad idea on compact developments. That would require and HOA to maintain and manage and in small projects can be an expense that limits affordability. There is also a negative perception around HOA.

Another bad idea is design standards such as door placement, garage door size, driveway max width. Design requirements limit response to the market at best and can create restrictions that make projects not feasible or only feasible if they are done in a multi-family design. This can have the unintended consequences of reducing the missing middle homeownership step that many families need for the first step to economic stability.

And transitions to more dense infill is probably a bad idea. Needs to be incentives to do those projects as the very high development costs get spread over small lot counts.

ADU notes – allowing an ADU in front would be ok as long as it follows setbacks

Allow ADU in cottage projects.

Detached ADU – increase the height as an ADU can be above a garage. So 28 ft max height.