

**From:** [Jenna Kay](#)  
**To:** [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#); [Jeffrey Delapena](#)  
**Subject:** Climate Element  
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 4:22:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [Planning letter IF.docx](#)

---

For record

---

**From:** Irene Finley <finley.m.irene@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 1:38 PM  
**To:** Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>  
**Cc:** Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; megan.filippello@leg.wa.gov; Megan.Walsh@leg.wa.gov; Brent Davis <Brent.Davis@clark.wa.gov>  
**Subject:** Climate Element

**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.

Sounds like a very complex job organizing all these entities for input to the Climate Element. I understand that it is different from the regional effort and I was glad to receive the link to that from Jeffrey.

When you say that tree loss is not in the County's control, I do not understand. **What is the reason the County is not including tree retention/protection in the Climate or Nature sections?**

Obviously you care about the Climate as does Michelle. Thank you both.

You may not have the time to read it but I am forwarding to you the letter I wrote long ago in response to the SEPA notice regarding the development at 3707 NE 60th Street. We had no idea what the notice meant nor how to respond at the time. It is a daunting system that could be made more public friendly.

I want you to know that we feel passionately about the environment and our place in it. I doubt you will find a household more environmentally sound than ours, even though we do drive our car a few times a week to get groceries, etc. Our large organic garden and fruit trees routinely feed neighbors, friends and frequent donations to the food bank with figs, apples, lettuce, arugula, potatoes, pears, persimmons, raspberries, gooseberries, kiwi. We use, reuse, refuse, recycle and repair everything. Our chickens and sheep eat the food scraps that are not composted. We hang our clothes to dry. Our yard is nature-

scraped with 100 blooming plants right now for the enjoyment of the hummingbirds and bees. During the course of most years, we temporarily share our house with friends in need of housing. We barter for goods & services.

If we buy something, we buy used. We donate metal to a neighbor who cashes it in to build homes in Mexico for his church. He has made 80 trips since he retired. I give the people living on the street by our house our cans to recycle. Guy left after one haul, got a bath and a hair cut. Had a few days of shelter before returning to his spot. We host a community cider party every fall. Everyday I risk the street crossings to walk to the Ellen Davis Trail or Burnt Bridge Creek Trail and talk to my neighbors doing the same.

Last year after the trees were decimated, I bought a heating/air conditioning system that cost \$20,000. I put an ad on Next Door to sell the window air conditioner I never used, \$500 value. I bought it used at Habitat. A guy installed it in his neighbor's trailer. He was worried about her, he said, in her 80's with no family around and no air conditioning in the heat of the summer. He offered to pay for the device but I told him it was free with his good labor donated.

The good news is that our orchid bloomed for the first time with more light in the kitchen. We can install solar panels now that we have so much sun on the house. We don't lock our doors. We have gates instead of fences. We have shelter and food and neighbors who take care of each other.

Irene Finley  
360-608-6938

**TO: Clark County Development, [developmentcomments@clark.wa.gov](mailto:developmentcomments@clark.wa.gov)**

**From:** Irene Finley <[finley.m.irene@gmail.com](mailto:finley.m.irene@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Saturday, January 28, 2023 1:58 PM

**To:** Marilee McCall <[Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov)>

**Subject:** PSR-2022-00205

RE: Cottage Development Proposal on 60<sup>th</sup> Street

I am writing to provide comments on the pending Development Review application PSR-2022-00205. The notice I received does not provide enough information for me to fully understand the proposed development and its impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore my comments may be specific in regards to some aspects of the development and general to others. Please put my name on the list to receive future notices.

I would advise that someone come out and look at the property before going forward. On a flat map, the topography is misleading, the trees are not represented, the street and drain gutter on 60<sup>th</sup> St. do not seem to be well considered.

**Access to 3707 NE 60<sup>th</sup> Street would be dangerous.**

1. The retaining walls that appear to be placed on the 60<sup>th</sup> Street frontage seems inadequate to support a 12.5 foot wide driveway angling all the way across the property and bearing the weight of vehicles, including some large service vehicles. I have seen the kind of retaining wall that Beau put in at a four-plex property in Ridgefield, huge blocks of cement like those that support highway bridges. This is not appropriate type of retaining wall in a residential neighborhood. If you need that level of retaining wall, the site is not appropriate for the planned development.
2. It is not clear from the plan provided but it seems that the driveway would have slopes of 20% or more in some places. While this might be adequate for a single house it would be difficult to provide adequate access for 10 units and all the associated service vehicles which would come to the site. Service vehicles which cannot maneuver the steep narrow driveway and difficult turnaround area at the top would be forced to park in the adjacent street causing negative impacts on 60<sup>th</sup> St.
3. Our property is next to the planned development. It has a curved driveway from one corner curving around to the far side of the property to the top of the hill. **Our property is wider than 3707 NE 60<sup>th</sup> Street.** Our driveway is at most a 15% grade. When you make the curve at the top of our driveway, you cannot see the ground in front of you. I cannot get up our driveway if it is wet and has leaves on it, if it is icy or snowing without a 4-wheel drive. In which case, I park my car on our driveway at the bottom and walk up. The result would be that these 15 proposed cars would not have a place to park in bad weather.
4. Getting down the driveway poses another substantial risk. Once a vehicle went off our driveway, down the hill, across 60<sup>th</sup> Street and landed in the neighbor's driveway below us. The proposed driveway would be elevated by a retaining wall, which would make the vehicle coming off the driveway airborne. It might be high enough to fly over a car on the street, but the momentum would likely take the car into the neighbor's house below it.

5. With the very steep and narrow driveway, exiting from and entering the driveway would pose a risk to other traffic, especially since you would be adding the traffic of another twenty or thirty more cars on this narrow, formally country road. Since the last several developments on this street, traffic has become heavy, people drive too fast, the roadway is dark, all resulting in significant risk to pedestrians.
6. This proposal adds ten units and allows for only 15 parking places. Even if the street can be widened to have a few street parking places, it would not be enough. The street parking would need to be some distance from the driveway so that oncoming traffic or pedestrians could be seen. It is dangerous to have cars parked along the roadway where there is not designated parking. The sheriff's office would have constant calls about people parking in areas where there is no room to park. I cannot tell you how many times people have parked in the drain gutter in front of these four properties and had to be pulled out.
7. Emergency vehicles, fire trucks, utility trucks of most types would not be able to navigate the driveway. I understand that the developer would put in a sprinkler system to mitigate the issue of not having fire truck access but this does not provide any fire safety to the properties to either side or the back of this development.

**Tree removal is a major environmental concern to me. At least 8 huge evergreens and 2-3 very large deciduous trees would need to be removed for this plan to work.**

1. In this era of global warming as a result of the use of fossil fuels, the proposal adds to the problem. The trees pull carbon from the air. The trees provide us considerable shade. We use less electricity because we do not need air conditioning. This small grove is a favorite spot for migrating species, since so few groves remain in this part of Clark County. Last summer a friend counted 26 different varieties of birds coming to our property in a single month.
2. Removing all the big evergreen trees puts our few remaining trees at risk. Our few huge trees in the front of our property would be destabilized without the protection of the grove. We have 2 or 3 huge trees on the back slope of the property line. This proposed development would destabilize the root system of our trees. It could take years before the damage to these trees becomes obvious. Because they are on our property, we would be liable if they fall.

**This plan does not seem to adequately address storm water runoff and erosion control onto adjacent properties.** We have experience in our neighborhood of problems with storm water runoff from a development that does not have houses on it yet. Every storm brings the soil down from their slope. It covers the sidewalk and goes onto the street.

1. All public sewer and storm water systems are to the north of the property and most of the proposed units are on the downhill sloping south side of the property. This would necessitate a collection, storage, and pumping system with an adequate backup system to handle emergency and weather related issues such as power outages.
2. Currently there is a drain ditch along the four properties, including this one, that do not have sidewalks. I cannot tell from the materials provided if there is drainage to either side of the driveway to take water off the roadway. I do not know what effect that would have on the remaining drainage ditch but it seems like there would be an impact.
3. I think an Environmental Review is needed to test the theory that French drains adjacent to each of the ten units would manage storm water runoff to the back side of the slope.

**This proposal does not meet the defined purpose of Cottage Housing, to foster community or a sense of ownership.**

1. The proposed plan does not provide sufficient access to the units. There is no vehicle access to the back of the property. There is no vehicle access for at least 6 of the 8 units on the back slope. I see no plan to cover the cars in the parking lot. There does not seem to be space for storage units and since there are no garages, this would result in accessory structures being built, within code or not.
2. Residents would have to walk up a steep slope to the parking lot, where I expect the garbage and recycling station would be located. Residents would have to walk down the steep driveway with the garbage and recycling once a week. Moving in and out would be difficult. For these reasons, No one would buy these lower units, except as cheap rentals. I am concerned about the environmental impact in having cheap rentals where concern for disposing of garbage may not be of high interest as it would to an owner.
3. The Cottage Housing rule says that the private open space shall be usable, not encumbered by steep slopes or other physical limitations and oriented toward the common open space as much as possible, with no dimension less than ten (10) feet. **The entirety of the eight units to the back of the property is encumbered by a steep slope.** Were the developer required to meet this expectation, a lot of dirt would need to be moved and retaining walls provided on one or more additional sides of the project.
4. There is nothing about this plan that meets the Cottage Housing purpose of maintaining the character of existing residential neighborhoods and ensuring compatibility between cottage developments and their neighbors. From the entrance to our home, we once had a full view of MT Hood, now partially blocked by new subdivision. These ten units would block our view of MT Hood, leaving us with a view to the east of a parking lot and garbage and recycling dumpsters.

Thanks for your consideration of our above comments.

Irene Finley  
3617 N.E. 60th St.  
Vancouver WA 98661  
  
360-608-6938