

From: [Susan Ellinger](#)
To: [James Kessi](#); [Elizabeth Decker](#)
Cc: [Jose Alvarez](#); [Amy Wooten](#)
Subject: RE: Updates for code forum meeting this week
Date: Wednesday, January 10, 2024 11:09:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi James –

No decision has been made about if the proposed changes will need to go back to PC. This will be discussed at the work session on the 17th. Dates for hearings for the PC (if needed) and council will be scheduled following the work session. We do not yet have the proposed code for distribution, we are working on drafts of this information. Thanks!



Susan Ellinger
She/her/hers
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4516



From: James Kessi <james.kessi@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2024 10:53 AM
To: Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>; Elizabeth Decker <edecker@jetplanning.net>
Cc: Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Amy Wooten <Amy.Wooten@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: Updates for code forum meeting this week

Hi Susan,
Does that mean that the latest proposed changes to the code will not need to go back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration?
and that the County Council can review and approve the code as they see fit?
Can you send any available updated proposed code changes info available?

thanks
James

James Kessi P.E.
Kessi Engineering & Consulting
Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning
T (360) 991-9300 E James.Kessi@gmail.com

On Wed, Jan 10, 2024 at 10:03 AM Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Helo again James –

I wanted to give you a heads up that we recently learned that we are on the schedule for a work session on January 17 at 9 am with County Council regarding the updated housing proposal. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!



Susan Ellinger
She/her/hers
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4516



From: Susan Ellinger
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2024 3:07 PM
To: James Kessi <james.kessi@gmail.com>; Elizabeth Decker <edecker@jetplanning.net>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Amy Wooten <Amy.Wooten@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Updates for code forum meeting this week

Hi James –

Thank you for checking in with us. We are currently working on documentation of the two additional Technical Housing Code Forum meetings to prepare for a work session with council. We are also working to determine if the proposed code changes will need to go to Planning Commission. We had tentatively set a work session date but unfortunately it had to be rescheduled so we are working to get a new date scheduled soon. Thanks!



Susan Ellinger
She/her/hers
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4516



From: James Kessi <james.kessi@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2024 2:54 PM

To: Elizabeth Decker <edecker@jetplanning.net>; Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Amy Wooten <Amy.Wooten@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: Re: Updates for code forum meeting this week

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.

Hi All,

What is the status and schedule of the next Middle Housing staff and Council meeting? or progress point?

thanks

James

James Kessi P.E.

Kessi Engineering & Consulting

Civil Engineering - Stormwater - Planning

T **(360) 991-9300** E James.Kessi@gmail.com

On Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 4:46 PM Elizabeth Decker <edecker@jetplanning.net> wrote:

Hi James,

I wanted to share the updated project materials for the middle housing code updates that we developed to incorporate feedback from the October forum meeting and from public comments, including your write-up. Thank you for framing the issues so specifically, and you'll see that most of them are addressed in the memo for this week's meeting. <https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/housing-options-study-and-action-plan> and memo at https://clark.wa.gov/sites/default/files/media/document/2023-11/CodeForumMemo231109_FurtherRefinements_Final.pdf

One of your comments was about the language in a footnote to Table 40.220.010-2 about calculating density, and how townhouses should factor in. I did not address this in the memo because it's not related to further code changes, but wanted to give you a little more background explanation. First, you had commented about including townhouses in the calculations, however, townhouse lot sizes and densities are regulated separately in Table 40.220.010-4. There could still be a combination of these plex housing types and townhouses in a single development, provided the applicable standards were met.

As a side note, you've helped identify a small technical correction that I need to make, to change the footnote reference from 'middle housing' to specifically duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes for greater clarity. I could add language about townhouses being subject to Table -4 and explicitly allowing the combination of housing types.

There was also a note about the proposed formula being unclear, and here's an example of how

to apply it that might help with interpretation:

Density Calculation Example

5-acre lot in the R1-6 zone, excluding any public rights of way, private road easements, or street tracts (adjusted gross acres).

1. The maximum density permitted for single family is 7.9 units per acre, so the first portion of the calculation is:

$$5 \text{ acres} \times 7.9 \text{ units per acre} = 39.5 \text{ units}$$

2. The allowed minimum lot size for single-family detached homes in R1-6 is 5,500 SF so the second portion of the calculation is:

$$39.5 \text{ units} \times 5,500 \text{ SF} = 217,250 \text{ SF of allowed lot area for middle housing in total.}$$

The 217,250 SF could be divided up in any mix of middle housing lots meeting the minimum lot sizes, such as:

- a. 39 duplex lots (same as single-family)
- b. 36 triplex lots
- c. 27 quadplex lots
- d. Some combination like 4 quads (4 x 8,000 SF = 32,000 SF), 10 triplexes (10 x 6,000 SF = 60,000 SF) and 22 duplex or single-family detached lots (22 x 5,500 SF = 121,000 SF), for a total of 213,000 SF allowed lot area, less than the maximum 217,250 SF permitted.
- e. Townhouses are regulated separately in Table 40.220.010-4, but a portion of the site could also be designated for townhouses and density for that portion calculated according to that table, up to 21.8 units/acre for the R1-6 zone.

The reason the language is proposed around 'equivalent lot area' rather than dwelling units per acre is to avoid needing to specify density maximums for each different kind of middle housing proposed, and to make it easier to combine a variety of different middle housing types in the calculations. We've talked with County staff about incorporating this in an informational handout to guide application of the code.

Thanks,
Elizabeth

--

Elizabeth Decker (she/her)
503.705.3806
edecker@jetplanning.net