

From: [Noelle Lovern](#)
To: [Oliver Orjiako](#)
Cc: [Susan Ellinger](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: RE: {External Email} RE: HOSAP Questions
Date: Wednesday, July 12, 2023 4:36:01 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Thanks, Oliver.

I will review the PC recommendations online as a source for the answers our members are seeking.

Best,

From: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Noelle Lovern <Noelle@biaofclarkcounty.org>
Cc: Susan Ellinger <susan.ellinger@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: {External Email} RE: HOSAP Questions

WARNING: This email originated outside of the BIA of Clark County Network. Caution should be taken when opening attachments, clicking on links or taking action.

Hello Noelle:

Thank you for your email. Staff provided the DEAB memo to the Planning Commission and the Council. The Council will be considering the recommendations of the Planning Commission. It will be within the Council discretion to make any further changes or amendments to the PC recommendation. The PC recommendation is on the project web page.

Thanks.

Oliver

From: Noelle Lovern <Noelle@biaofclarkcounty.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2023 12:20 PM
To: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: HOSAP Questions

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.

Good morning, Oliver.

I am not sure who to direct these questions to, but I am sure you will steer me in the right direction. I am seeking some clarity re: the HOSAP and the concerns expressed in DEAB's memo. Any help you can provide is much appreciated. Below are the proposed code updates and my questions.

1. UDC 40.220.010 Low-Density Residential Districts-
 - a. Will the final code reflect DEAB's concern that as lot sizes decrease that lot coverage should be allowed to increase as long as setbacks are met?
 - b. On section 220.010 (C)(5), regarding Density Transfers, will the final code address the need to remove the word "Detached" as attached homes are now allowed in the zone and the reference to detached dwellings unintentionally limits the applicability?
 - c. Will the County be changing the names of zones to reflect the new densities?
2. UDC 40.260.020 Accessory Dwelling Units – Urban
 - a. Will the final code adjust the "total gross floor area" to exclude garages and patios? Most jurisdictions throughout the county including Vancouver exclude the garage area from gross floor area.
 - b. Is it likely that the language "gross floor area" might be changed to "conditioned space"?
 - c. In the HOSAP, building height for ADU's is set at 25 feet. A common design option for ADU's is placing them over a garage which is impossible to occur in the 25 ft height limit. Is it possible that this height limit might be moved to 35 ft?
3. UDC 40.260.072 Compact Lot Developments
 - a. 40.260.072 (B)(1.) declares a 3-Acre minimum. Is it possible to eliminate the size limit and allow other applicable codes including setbacks, etc. to determine the design/development?
 - b. Is it possible to reconsider the 50% front façade limitation for garages ? The product pictured below is very marketable and a great option for families who have children and all the things families need to store. It also provides safe loading and unloading space out of traffic. In the current iteration of the HOSAP, it appears that this particular product will not be allowed. Can you please clarify if this product will be allowed? Or will the front façade only allow a single car garage and very narrow driveway? Will this concern be addressed in the final code?
 - i. Is it possible to remove the 50% front façade limitation for garages in all the proposed code updates within the HOSAP? This design standard does not seem to align with the priority of offering more affordable housing options. Design standards in general tend to resolve through marketability. Our industry has already proven that this product is desirable (see below) and practical for an affordable option. I would hate to see this type of home be precluded from available stock.



4. UDC 40.260.073 Cottage Housing

- a. Will final code include an exemption for garage space?
- b. If not an exemption, is it possible to set the threshold at 500 sq. ft.?
- c. It appears that proposed cottage housing code does not allow for attached garages. Is that correct?
- d. Would it be a better use of small lots to allow attached garages? We know the market demand prefers attached garages.
- e. For this type of development, heights under 35 ft will extremely limit the design options for this type of product. Is it possible that the final code will might increase the height limit to 35 ft?

Thanks for your patience with all these questions. I am trying to obtain the clearest picture so I can inform our members of any movement your department is making to integrate the industries concerns. We do not want to continue to press our concerns if the HOSAP is already being adjusted.

Thanks for all you do.

Noelle Lovern | Government Affairs Director
BIA of Clark County - a Top 30 NAHB Association
Protecting and promoting the building industry.

Address: 103 E 29th St., Vancouver, WA 98663

Phone: (208)602-3423 **Web:** www.biaofclarkcounty.org

[Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Pinterest](#) | [Members Group](#)

Join our email list for weekly industry updates > [CLICK HERE](#)

