From:

Rebecca Messinger

To:

Jose Alvarez; Sonja Wiser

Subject:

FW: Comments on Housing

Date:

Monday, April 22, 2024 4:39:19 PM

Attachments:

Comments on Housing April 2024.pdf

image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

Please see the attached comments re: tomorrow's hearing. Thank you.



Rebecca Messinger Clerk to the Council COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE

564-397-4305







From: Ann Foster <annfoster5093@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 4:14 PM

To: Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; Karen Bowerman

<Karen.Bowerman@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Glen Yung

<Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>; Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Kathleen Otto

<Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Rebecca Messinger

<Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: Comments on Housing

EXTERNAL: 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.

Hello,

Please accept our comments regarding Housing as part of the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Best regards, Ann Foster Friends of Clark County

April 22, 2024

TO: Council Chair Medgivy, Councilors Belkot, Marshall, Bowerman, Yung, County Manager Kathleen Otto, Community Planning Director Oliver Orjiako

This letter is intended to give thoughtful and productive comment to the Clark County Council's Housing Allocations as part of the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

We wish to emphasize two points:

1) Nothing in the current studies, reviews, or discussions justifies any urban growth area (UGA) expansions.

This position has been echoed by Clark County's cities and by Community Development. Although both the Department of Commerce and Community Planning have emphasized the need over the next 20 years for thousands of new homes, with intelligent land use planning there will be no need for Clark County citizens to suffer the loss of the priceless, productive open space that not only do we all cherish, but that our county must keep intact to mitigate and adapt to the climate crisis at the scale and urgency required to best protect our children and grandchildren. The positions of Commerce and Community Planning merely convey the requirement for communities to "provide housing affordable to families and individuals with incomes between zero to fifty percent of the adjusted median income" and to stay within existing UGA's.1

Furthermore, this county has already run the experiment of gobbling up and paving over productive agricultural parcels for housing, which resulted in the production of UNaffordable housing, as well as a decline in public services and facilities as cities are stressed to serve uncontrolled growth within their boundaries.

Moreover, it is evident that smart planning within existing urban areas in order to accommodate housing growth is key to providing affordable dwellings for the next 20 years. Despite the claims of the building and construction industries in southwest Washington, increasing development into expanded growth areas will result in more expense, weakened transportation and other infrastructures that are already strapped for funding, and will continue to negatively impact this region's ability to reduce climate emissions and adapt to climate change.

We insist on smart planning to identify sufficient land within existing urban growth boundaries for the types of housing as listed in RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c).

2) We support all efforts to develop plans for Affordable Housing Types.

¹ Washington State' Department of Commerce, Local Government Division Growth Management Services, Guidance for Updating Your Housing Element: Updating your housing element to address new requirements p. 33 (Aug. 2023)

It is critical that staff and councilors craft solutions and make decisions that accommodate the stated need: to provide affordable housing; that is, "over half of the new units needed over the next 20 years will need to be affordable at 80% or less of the area median income (AMI)."2 This includes: "government-assisted housing, housing for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income households, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, group homes, foster care facilities, emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing within an urban growth area boundary" as listed in RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c).

Furthermore, FOCC believes it is the responsibility of Clark County's government to hold developers and builders accountable for following the law and working productively to produce a healthy, sustainable, and affordable community for Clark County citizens.

Best regards,

Friends of Clark County, Ann Foster, President

² Clark County Community Development Comprehensive Plan 2025 Update, Issue Paper 5, p. 5

