

From: [Susan Ellinger](#)
To: [Jeffrey Delapena](#); [Janet Easley](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Hearing on August 20
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 4:23:10 PM
Attachments: [5 chapter-1-land-use-element 2026-0722 councilws 0.pdf](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[-6 chapter-2-housing-element draft-7-16-2026 0.pdf](#)

Hi Janet –

My apologies. There are two additional attachments to this email that show proposed comprehensive plan changes related to MHPs. Changes in the land use element (chapter 1) are highlighted in green on page 17. Changes to the housing element (chapter 2) are highlighted in green on page 33. Sorry I forgot those in the first email. Thanks!



Susan Ellinger
She/her/hers
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4516



From: Susan Ellinger
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 4:13 PM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>; Janet Easley <easleyhj@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Hearing on August 20

Hi Janet –

There is a large package of proposed comprehensive plan, code and other related changes that will be discussed at the planning commission meeting on 8/20/2026. One part of that package includes new code that addresses Manufactured Home Parks (MHPs). I have attached two memos and the two main code sections that address MHPs, as follows:

- The first attachment (named mhpconceptsmemo...) describes the issues related to MHPs that the county is trying to address. This was presented to County Council on 7/1/2026.
- The second attachment (named residentialcodedraft_memo...) gives an overview of the housing code changes that are currently proposed. It includes code related to MHPs as described in the next two bullets. This was presented to County Council on 7/22/2026.
- The third attachment (named CCC40.250.120_MHP Overlay...) includes a new comprehensive plan overlay that would apply to existing parks. The primary purpose of the MHP overlay is to permit manufactured home parks, and to limit redevelopment pressures from other residential or commercial uses.
- The fourth attachment (named CCC40.260.140_MHP Standards...) outlines changes to the standards that would apply to new MHPs, if proposed in the future.

You can also view the full package of proposed housing code and comprehensive plan changes under the 8/20/2026 meeting materials on this webpage: [Planning Commission Hearings and Meeting Notes | Clark County](#)

The county may perform outreach that is specific to MHPs, but we have not made any final decisions on that yet. Please feel free to check back with me in the next few weeks to find out more about that topic.

Thanks so much and have a great weekend!



Susan Ellinger
She/her/hers
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4516



From: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 11:55 AM
To: Janet Easley <easleyhj@gmail.com>
Cc: Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Hearing on August 20

Good day, Janet,

Thank you for your interest. For your reference, I am attaching the decision table (Exhibit 1) to be used at both the Planning Commission Hearing beginning on August 20th and the Council Hearing on October 6th.

Item 29 is the Mobile Home Park Overlay which will be voted on for recommendation, is to "Create a Mobile Home Park Overlay on existing Mobile Home Parks within the unincorporated Vancouver UGA that would be subject to new development regulations."

I am including Staff Contact Susan Ellinger in case you had any further questions that I may not be able to answer.

Best,



Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Janet Easley <easleyhj@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 11:34 AM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: Planning Commission Hearing on August 20

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.

Good morning,

I was wondering if there will be any manufactured home issues discussed during the Comprehensive Plan Hearing on August 20. I am very interested in manufactured home issues.

Thank you.

Janet Easley
360-244-3188
easleyhj@gmail.com

40.250 OVERLAY DISTRICTS

40.250.120 Manufactured Home Park Overlay District (MHP)

A. Purpose.

The Manufactured Home Park Overlay District (MHP) is intended to preserve existing manufactured home parks, protect long-term affordability, and prevent the displacement of existing residents. The district promotes community stability by limiting redevelopment of manufactured home parks while allowing the continued repair, replacement, and expansion of manufactured housing in accordance with the standards of this title.

B. Applicability.

The MHP Overlay District shall be applied to existing and new manufactured home parks within urban growth areas of Clark County. Once a property has been developed as a manufactured home park, a docket is required to change the zoning to apply the MHP Overlay District.

C. Uses.

Permitted uses in the MHP Overlay District are limited to the following, and shall supersede the use standards for the underlying zoning district:

1. Manufactured home parks, subject to Section 40.260.140.

2. Transitional housing.

3. Permanent supportive housing.

4. Accessory uses and structures normal to a residential environment, subject to Section 40.260.010.

5. Family day care providers, subject to Section 40.260.160.

6. Adult family homes, subject to Section 40.260.190.

7. Home business – Type I, subject to Section 40.260.100.

8. Garage sales, subject to Section 40.260.090.

9. Temporary uses, subject to Section 40.260.220.

10. Utilities, other than wireless communications facilities, subject to Section 40.260.240.

11. Wireless communications facilities, subject to Section 40.260.250.

12. Electric vehicle infrastructure, subject to Section 40.260.075.

D. Development Standards.

1. Manufactured home parks shall be subject to the development standards for the underlying zoning district and Section 40.260.140 (Manufactured Home Parks – Standards and Requirements).

1 **2. All other uses shall be subject to the development standards for the underlying zoning**
2 **district and any applicable special use standards.**

3 **E. Use Exception.**

4 **A property owner within the MHP Overlay District may seek a comprehensive plan map and**
5 **zone change for the property pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 40.560.020 (Changes to**
6 **Zoning Districts and Code Amendments). The applicant must demonstrate that:**

7 **1. The existing MHP Overlay District does not allow for reasonable use of the property;**

8 **2. The uses permitted in the MHP Overlay District are not economically viable due to the**
9 **property's location, site conditions, or surrounding development; or**

10 **3. The applicant proposes to redevelop the site with affordable housing, and proposes to**
11 **assist existing residents to minimize displacement including relocation assistance, right to**
12 **return policies for the proposed affordable housing, or other assistance.**

13

40.260 SPECIAL USES AND STANDARDS

40.260.140 Manufactured Home Parks – Standards and Requirements

A. Use. Uses within a manufactured home park permitted outright include:

~~— A manufactured home park may be placed or located on any parcel of land in any multifamily (R-12, R-18, R-22, R-30, R-43, OR-15, OR-18, OR-22, OR-30 and OR-43) district upon approval of the responsible official, and provided such manufactured home park is for residential use only.~~

1. Manufactured homes.

2. A Recreational vehicles, (camper, camp trailer, recreational coach, park models, and similar uses) may be placed in a manufactured home park provided the unit has an applicable Washington State Department of Labor and Industries (L&I) tag for the use.

3. Normal accessories for manufactured homes, such as awnings, patios, carports, ramadas, cabanas, or storage buildings, shall be allowed.

4. Accessory structures supporting the primary residential use, including community buildings, recreational facilities, and commercial uses.

(Amended: Ord. 2018-10-02)

B. Criteria for Locating a New Manufactured Home Park.

The following criteria must be taken into consideration in the establishment of new manufactured home parks:

~~1. Adequate buffering or screening may be required in order to make the manufactured home park compatible with adjacent surrounding residential uses. Buffering and screening shall be required when such parks abut commercial and industrial zones.~~

~~2. Manufactured home parks should not be located within areas less than five (5) acres nor more than fifty (50) acres in area, unless it is demonstrated to the responsible official that lesser or greater concentration of the use would be compatible with the surrounding property and its use, and that such variation is in the interest of the public health, safety and general welfare.~~

3 1. The park must have its primary direct access to a county or public road, which shall have a minimum right-of-way of sixty (60) feet, as shown on the master plan.

(Amended: Ord. 2018-10-02)

C. Manufactured Home Space Requirements for New Manufactured Home Parks.

1. Coverage. A manufactured home and all accessory structures shall not occupy more than fifty percent (50%) of the area of the manufactured home space.

2. Density. Manufactured homes shall not exceed the maximum density of the zoning district. Density shall be calculated on the gross area of the park. No minimum density shall apply to manufactured home parks.

3. Setbacks. No manufactured home or accessory thereto shall be located any closer than twenty-five (25) ten (10) feet from a park property line abutting on a public street or road, five (5) feet from

all other park property lines and five (5) feet from any such areas as a park street, a common parking area, or a common walkway.

4. Spacing. A manufactured home shall be separated from an adjacent manufactured home by a minimum of ten (10) feet.

~~5. Overnight Spaces. Not more than five percent (5%) of the total manufactured home park area may be used to accommodate persons wishing to park their manufactured home or camping vehicles overnight.~~

~~6 5. Parking. Two (2) Off-street parking spaces shall be provided for each manufactured home space consistent with Section 40.340.010, either on the manufactured home space or within one hundred (100) feet thereof, in the manufactured home park. Each parking space shall not be less than nine (9) by twenty (20) feet in size.~~

(Amended: Ord. 2018-10-02)

D. Manufactured Home Park Requirements for New Manufactured Home Parks.

1. Park Streets and Walkways.

a. Park Streets. A park street shall connect each manufactured home space to a public road. The park street shall be a minimum of thirty (30) feet in width, with a paved surface width of at least twenty-four (24) feet.

b. Walkways. Walkways of not less than forty-four (44) inches in width shall be provided from each manufactured home space to any service building, recreation area, and parking area.

c. Paving. Park streets shall be paved with crushed rock base asphalt or concrete surfacing.

2. Buffering or Screening. Buffering or screening, ~~if required to make the manufactured home park compatible with its adjacent surrounding uses, is required around the perimeter of the property to make the manufactured home park compatible with its adjacent surrounding uses.~~ Buffering or screening shall be a sight-obscuring fence, wall, evergreen, or other suitable planting. Where walls or fences are required along boundaries or public roads, the walls or fences shall be set back from the property lines to conform with setbacks for structures in the basic zone. Evergreen planting shall not be less than five (5) feet in height, and shall be maintained in a healthy living condition for the life of the manufactured home park. All walls and fences shall be a minimum of five (5) feet in height and shall be approved by the responsible official.

3. Landscaping. There shall be landscaping provided within the front and side setback areas and all open areas in the manufactured home park not otherwise used. Landscaping shall meet the requirements of Section 40.320.010 for developments zoned multifamily.

4. Signs. Signs shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 40.310, specifically Section 40.310.010(I).

5. Recreational Area. A recreational area shall be a contiguous, improved area, and be suitably maintained for recreational purposes. The recreational area shall contain a minimum of two hundred (200) square feet of space per manufactured home. It may contain a mix of landscaping, lawn area, pedestrian paths, and/or paved courtyard area, and recreational amenities. Impervious elements shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the total recreational area. Such land shall be determined on a gross area basis. The amount of land to be established

~~as recreational shall be determined by dividing the number of dwelling units into the gross development area. The following minimum areas shall be required:~~

Dwelling Units per Gross Acre	Recreational Area Required
5 to 6	0%
7 to 9	3%
10 to 11	5%
12 and over	8%

6. Accessories. Structures located on a manufactured home space, in addition to the manufactured home, shall be limited to the normal accessories, as set forth under Section 40.260.140(A). No other structural additions shall be built onto or become part of any manufactured home, and no manufactured home shall support any building in any manner.

7. Manufactured Home Pads. Pads, stands, strips or rails adequate for the support of the manufactured home shall be installed.

8. Manufactured Home Skirting. All manufactured homes within the manufactured home park shall be skirted on their lower perimeter by fire-resistant siding, if occupied for a period of more than ninety (90) days.

(Amended: Ord. 2009-03-02; Ord. 2018-10-02)

E. Repair and Replacement Within Existing Manufactured Home Parks.

The repair or replacement of existing manufactured homes within an existing manufactured home park, including nonconforming parks, shall be allowed as provided in this section.

1. Repair of existing units. The repair or rehabilitation of an existing manufactured home shall be permitted outright.

2. Replacement of existing units. The replacement of an existing manufactured home with a replacement manufactured home is permitted outright.

3. Placement of new accessory structures and replacement manufactured homes in existing manufactured housing parks shall be subject to the dimensional standards in effect when the parks were approved, provided, that the current maximum density of the zoning district shall apply. Where internal setbacks are not specified, the average of the prevailing setbacks on the pads to either side of the proposed new or replacement structure shall apply.

F. Expansion of Existing Manufactured Home Parks.

Existing manufactured home parks may be expanded through the addition of additional manufactured homes or the expansion of their existing area.

1. The addition of a manufactured home to an existing manufactured home park development is permitted outright.

2. The expansion of an existing manufactured home park is allowed subject to site plan approval by the responsible official.

3. Additional manufactured homes and expansion areas shall comply with all applicable development standards of this section as well as the underlying zoning district.

E.G. Manufactured Home Park Approval Criteria – Responsible Official Approval.

1. New manufactured home parks ~~may be permitted in any multifamily district upon require~~ site plan approval by the responsible official. The responsible official shall find that the internal design proposed shall separate traffic pattern from outdoor living or recreational areas, and will group the service facilities (such as the laundry and service buildings). Further, such approval shall be in the best interest of the public health, safety and general welfare. No manufactured home park shall be constructed without first obtaining site plan approval from the responsible official.

F.2. ~~Manufactured Home Park Site Plan Submittal Requirements.~~ In addition to the submittal requirements for site plan review, an application for a new manufactured home park shall include a plot plan of the proposed park.

(Amended: Ord. 2018-10-02)

MEMO

DATE: June 22, 2026
TO: Clark County Councilors
CC: Oliver Orjiako, Jose Alvarez and Susan Ellinger, Clark County Community Planning
FROM: Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning
SUBJECT: Manufactured Housing Park Code Concepts (HOSAP Implementation Package 3)

I. INTRODUCTION

Manufactured home parks (MHPs) offer a unique type of naturally occurring affordable housing that predominately serves families that are lower-income, older adults, and/or living on a fixed income, often in a tight-knit community setting. Clark County has 34 MHPs that are home to just over 2,000 households in both urban growth areas and rural areas. Similar to regional and national trends, many County parks are located on parcels that are eligible for redevelopment at higher intensity for market-rate housing that could be more profitable for property owners, leading to park sales, rent increases, and park closures in some cases. Aging parks may also be facing costly infrastructure upgrade costs that push owners to sell and/or increase rents. Park residents are uniquely vulnerable to displacement because while they own their homes, they rent the space where homes are sited; there are often few alternatives when space rents are increased or parks are closed because manufactured homes are difficult or prohibitive to relocate, and there are few available spaces to move them.

The County imposed a moratorium in August 2025, renewed through February 2027, to allow time to develop a zoning strategy and/or other regulatory approaches to better support preservation of existing MHPs, to ensure their continued provision of affordable housing and to minimize displacement. MHP study, preservation and support is also an adopted strategy in the County's Housing Options Study & Action Plan (HOSAP). MHP regulations will be integrated with broader housing planning efforts as part of the Comprehensive Plan update including implementing zoning code updates.

The primary recommendation is to introduce a new MHP overlay zone within urban growth areas that prioritizes MHP uses and limits other residential uses to reduce redevelopment pressure, similar to zoning tools used in several likeminded Washington cities including the City of Vancouver looking to preserve MHPs and minimize displacement of vulnerable park residents. **The intent of this memo is to determine County Council support for a similar zoning approach for Clark County and to solicit feedback on details of such an approach.**

II. CONTEXT

A. Existing Manufactured Home Parks Across the County

There are currently 34 known manufactured home parks (MHPs) within Clark County's jurisdiction that account for 2,033 homes, including parks in urban and rural areas. (Note: Parks are sometimes also called Manufactured Housing Communities (MHCs) or an older term, Mobile Home Parks.) Across these MHPs:

- **The size of parks varies significantly**, ranging in size from 4 to 171 homes on sites 1.9 to 30.2 acres, with an average of 51 homes and an average site size of 8.6 acres.
- **A significant majority of parks are located inside unincorporated urban growth areas, primarily the Vancouver UGA.** There are 25 parks or 74% within UGAs, totaling 81% of total homes.
- **MHPs are not zoned consistently which results in a majority of parks being nonconforming uses.** Less than 50% of parks, or 16 total, are located in residential zones that currently permit MHPs. All of the parks located outside of UGAs are nonconforming uses because MHPs and development at that intensity are not permitted in rural zones. Within UGAs, a plurality of parks is zoned Residential (R) where MHPs are permitted uses, but there are nearly as many zoned Low Density Residential (R1) and other commercial and employment zones (GC, BP, MX).
- **MHPs are developed at lower densities than other medium-density housing types.** The average density for County urban MHPs is 6.8 homes per gross acres—slightly higher in Residential (R) zones where currently permitted—however, the maximum density in R zones is proposed at 24-36 homes per acre with the Comprehensive Plan updates. There is a cluster of parks along Highway 99, and the form and density of those parks is inconsistent with the Highway 99 Overlay District standards and redevelopment goals for the area.

B. Existing County Regulations for MHPs

County planning and zoning regulations allow options to permit manufactured home parks and identify their role in providing affordable housing, but provide few mechanisms to protect parks from closures.

Comprehensive Plan: Policies in the draft Comprehensive Plan address some aspects of manufactured home park preservation. First, the Plan establishes that each jurisdiction including the County must identify sufficient land for a “fair share” of lower-income housing including manufactured home parks, and names manufactured home parks as one of the types of development to be permitted to promote greater housing diversity (Policies 2.1.1 and 2.7.1). The Plan also introduces a new goal to: “Prevent discrimination, address displacement, and mitigate past harm in the development and maintenance of housing,” to be implemented by a policy specifically supporting resident ownership of manufactured home parks and generally evaluating the potential for displacement on lands proposed for rezoning or redevelopment which can include manufactured home parks (Policies 2.9.2 and 2.9.3).

Housing Options Study & Action Plan: Recent housing planning efforts identified the important role MHPs play in diversifying housing options that are affordable and incorporate ownership opportunities, as well as the threats to parks’ continued stability. Adopted strategy HO-23 calls for the County to:

Study existing manufactured home parks, identify potential for displacement, and develop strategies to reduce or mitigate displacement. Consider development of a manufactured home park zone where other redevelopment options are limited, there are restrictions on discontinuing manufactured home parks uses, and/or enhanced notification, relocation assistance, and opportunities to convert to tenant ownership in the event of park closures.

Implementation of this strategy has been accelerated to respond to increased concerns about potential park closures and displacement as part of the work plan during the moratorium and Comprehensive Planning efforts; resulting zoning strategies from this effort will help to implement this strategy.

Zoning Code: Current zoning limits where manufactured home parks can be located, and allows parks in zones where a wide range of other residential uses are permitted that may create redevelopment pressures. Manufactured home parks are defined as two or more manufactured homes placed on a site, consistent with state law. (UDC 40.100.070) MHPs are not permitted in any rural or resource zones outside of UGAs. Parks are permitted in all R residential and OR office residential zones where a full range of other residential uses are permitted at greater densities and dimensions than typical MHPs, but prohibited in low density

R1 residential zones and all nonresidential zones. (UDC 40.210, Table 40.220.010-1, Table 40.220.020-1) Development standards for manufactured home parks address densities, setbacks, landscaping and recreational areas, and parking requirements. (UDC 40.260.140) A Type II review is required for new parks through site plan review and review/approval. (UDC 40.510.040.B, 40.520.020.D.4) Parks outside of R residential zones—the majority of existing parks—are regulated as nonconforming uses, which are permitted to continue if legally established. (UDC 40.530.010) However, no expansion such as additional dwellings or modifications beyond maintenance and repairs are permitted, which can limit MHP flexibility and future viability. (URDC 40.530.010.F.5)

County Code: The only other code requirements for manufactured homes are a requirement for a manufactured home placement permit for individual homes on an individual lot or space within a park. (CCC 14.32A)

C. State Requirements

Outside of local zoning regulations, **state regulations aim to cap rent increases to reduce displacement pressures, to lessen impacts on park residents by providing extended notice of park closures, and to allow opportunities for tenants to organize to purchase parks facing closures.**

- Recently enacted **statewide caps on lot rent increases** are intended to protect residents and minimize displacement risks by capping annual rent increases at 5%. (RCW 59.20.370) The rent caps are among the most progressive nationally, though park owners warn that the rent caps may make parks less financially viable and increase closure risks. (<https://www.cascadepbs.org/investigations/2025/06/wa-mobile-homeowners-advocates-react-to-new-rent-stabilization-law/>)
- Park owners are required to provide a **two-year closure notice to park residents** to allow time for them to make plans to move or abandon their manufactured or mobile home, which may be shortened in specific enumerated ways such as paying residents relocation assistance. (RCW 59.20.080)
- The state has also recently adopted **tenant opportunity to purchase (TOPO) provisions**, requiring notice to tenants and an opportunity to form a tenant organization to negotiate for purchase of the park, and conversion to a resident-owned park. (RCW 59.20.305, .325) Some residents have found that the provisions are challenging to utilize, both to form an organization within the 70-day notice period and to assemble a competitive bid relative to private investors. (<https://www.columbian.com/news/2026/mar/20/clark-county-residents-hoping-to-buy-mobile-home-parks-playing-a-losing-game/>)

These regulations apply directly via state statute without the need to incorporate into the County's code, and shape the regulatory landscape for manufactured home parks and residents. Together they appear to reduce potential displacement threats due to rent increases or new management, but have not fully stabilized parks or supported conversions to resident or nonprofit park ownership.

D. Non-Regulatory Approaches to Park Preservation

The most direct way to ensure a park is preserved is to change the ownership structure so that residents are no longer subject to the park owners' rent increases, redevelopment or closure decisions. Alternative ownership models for parks include resident-owned communities (ROCs) that function as cooperatives, which has been done successfully at a handful of Washington parks with assistance from organizations such as ROC Northwest.

(<https://nwcdc.coop/roc-northwest/>) Nonprofit community land trusts are another model, offering long-term, affordable ground leases for individual home owners such a potential project by Evergreen Habitat for Humanity.

(<https://www.opb.org/article/2026/02/23/evergreen-habitat-vancouver-mobile-homes/>)

Successfully organizing to finance and purchase a park is, however, a significant hurdle for most park residents, and there are limited grant or loan funds available from state or local government sources to support these initiatives. Such efforts are also specific to individual parks and contingent upon timing and owners' willingness to sell. No Clark County MHPs have converted to resident or nonprofit ownership to date, despite resident organizing efforts at four parks, but there have been successful efforts across the state to convert parks to nonprofit ownership, ownership by local housing authorities, and resident ownership.

III. CASE STUDIES

Communities across the state are experiencing similar challenges related to preserving manufactured home parks and preventing resident displacement, particularly in regions facing rising housing costs and development pressure. **Cities looking to provide additional regulatory protection for existing MHPs have implemented single-use zoning districts exclusive to manufactured home parks.** Key features of manufactured home park zones in several Washington cities are compared in Table 1; cities have used both base zones and overlay zones, which include varying development and density standards. Case law regarding manufactured home park zones in the cities of Tumwater and Kenmore has established this type of zoning as a legitimate practice for governments in Washington.

All of the examples reviewed would require a property owner to rezone a property before future redevelopment as something other than a park, and a majority of them include specific

review criteria requiring applicants to demonstrate that there is no “reasonable use” of the property as zoned and that the permitted uses are not “economically viable” at that location.

Table 2: Case Studies Summary

City	Zoning Structure	Uses Permitted	Ability to Redevelop	Affordability Provisions	TDR	Other
Vancouver	Base Zone	MHPs, middle housing affordable at 60% AMI, STEP housing (C)	Rezone required, must show current use is not viable	None	None	
Ellensburg	Base zone	MHPs, home occupations	Rezone required, no specific criteria	None	None	
Bothell	Overlay zone	MHPs, STEP housing, day care, ADUs and similar	Zoning and comp plan amendment required, no specific criteria	None	None	Park-specific standards adopted for two existing parks
Bellingham	Overlay Zone	MHPs, utilities, schools and churches	Rezone required, must show current use is not viable	None	None	Local provisions for notice, opportunity to purchase and relocation assistance
Kenmore	Base Zone	MHPs, one single detached dwelling	Rezone required, must show current use is not viable	Bonus density available for affordable units	Yes, bonus density can be transferred	Standards for existing and new parks
Tumwater	Base zone	MHPs, PUDs, residential adjacent uses	Rezone required, must show current use is not viable	None	Yes, minimal allowance	

The most relevant example for Clark County to consider is the new Manufactured Home District in Vancouver, which includes most of the key features of a single-use zone noted above. The district was adopted earlier this year with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning code. (VMC 20.410.120) The new zone permits only manufactured home parks with allowance for single family and middle housing only if permanently affordable at 60% AMI or below, with transitional housing, permanent supportive housing and emergency housing and shelters allowed conditionally, in line with new state legislation. All existing parks and new parks will have this zoning. Parks are not subject to any minimum or maximum densities, with standards for setbacks, spacing between homes, screening and buffering, landscaping, recreational space, lot coverage and parking. A property owner seeking to redevelop a park to another residential use would have to apply for a ‘use exception’ to rezone the property, demonstrating through a discretionary review that the zone does not allow for “reasonable use of property” or that the permitted uses are not “economically viable due to the property’s location, site conditions, or surrounding development.” (VMC 20.450.085.C.10) The rezoning standards are intended to allow for some alternatives if there is a demonstrable rationale for discontinuing park use, to avoid takings claims by property owners.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCEPTS

A new manufactured home park single-use overlay zone for existing MHPs is recommended as the strongest regulatory strategy to preserve parks within urban areas, aligned with enhanced Comprehensive Plan policies supporting park preservation. While a manufactured home park zone does not by itself guarantee park viability, it does reduce redevelopment pressure by permitting only parks unless and until the park owner applies to rezone the property through a discretionary review and demonstrates that the current park and other similar uses are not viable.

Parks should not serve as the only form of affordable housing permitted in the County due to their relatively low density compared to multifamily buildings, but are worthy of targeted protections to ensure diversity of housing options. Residents are highly vulnerable due to the split ownership of the homes and lots, which emphasizes the importance of anti-displacement efforts, and parks also provide a unique ownership and community living opportunity for lower-income households.

Beyond regulations, long-term park viability can be supported through alternative ownership models, such as conversion to a resident-owned cooperatives. The County’s role here is less direct, but could include exploring financial mechanisms, advocating at the state level for greater funds, engaging with partners versed in park conversions, and sharing information and convening park residents and advocates.

The following components of the proposed MHP zoning approach were developed based on consultant's research on state laws and programs, case studies and interviews with City planners detailed in Section III, and in consultation with manufactured home park nonprofit advocates. **County Council direction on the broader MHP zoning strategy and the specific details is desired to inform Comprehensive Plan and zoning updates.**

A. Focus Regulations on Parks Within Urban Growth Areas

MHP zoning should be focused on parks within urban growth areas, including the largest concentration of parks within the Vancouver UGA, because MHPs are an urban-scale use. Parks in urban areas face the greatest redevelopment pressures because of the range of other development permitted. Parks in rural areas face less redevelopment pressure as nonconforming uses that are already developed at higher intensities than are permitted in rural zones; they also would not be eligible to convert to outright permitted uses under the state planning framework for rural areas. Rural parks should retain their existing zoning.

B. Support with Foundation in the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan should establish the policy foundation and zoning framework for manufactured home parks by:

- Expanding the draft manufactured home park preservation policy in the Housing Element to identify exclusive zoning and alternative ownership models as preservation strategies in addition to promoting resident-owned parks. (Policy 2.9.2)
- Listing and describing the proposed overlay zone in the Land Use Element. (Chapter 1)

C. Introduce a New Overlay Zone for Parks

Either a base zone or an overlay zone could be used to designate existing and future manufactured home parks. A base zone replaces the existing zoning and Comprehensive Plan designations to apply uniform design and development standards to all parks, while an overlay supersedes the base zoning without need to change the existing base zoning or designation. Because existing parks are located in a wide variety of zones, rezoning would create 'spot zoning' particularly within commercial and employment districts. Therefore, **the County should implement an overlay zone**, retaining the base zoning and designations for consistency in the event of future park redevelopment. A single MHP overlay should be flexible enough to apply to all parks, but individual parks should be reviewed during implementation to determine if there is a compelling reason for a different zoning strategy such as large parks with significant undeveloped acreage.

D. Require a Use Exception to Rezone Parks

A use exception requirement requires property owners to demonstrate that there is no “reasonable use” of the property as zoned and that the permitted uses are not “economically viable” at that location, effectively adding specific review criteria prior to converting an existing MHP to another use. MHP resident advocates describe this step as slowing redevelopment pressures, though not directly boosting MHP viability. A use exception adds a hurdle to rezoning and redevelopment, but preserves owners’ property rights for potential future opportunities if criteria are met. **Similar use exception language should be incorporated to provide greater durability for the proposed MHP zone.**

E. Limit Permitted Uses to Manufactured Home Parks

The primary purpose of the MHP zone is to permit manufactured home parks, and to limit redevelopment pressures from other residential or commercial uses. Only MHPs and residential-adjacent uses, including some specific uses that are state-mandated in all residential zones, should be permitted within the new zone, including transitional housing and permanent supportive housing, per new state requirements in HB 2266 to permit in any zone that permits residential dwellings.

There has also been discussion about allowing affordable housing on MHP sites alongside an existing park or as redevelopment, such as developed by Habitat or other nonprofits. **Council direction is requested on a preferred approach:**

- ***Allow development of several other housing types, with a requirement for long-term affordability restrictions*** for households making 60% AMI or less, which would provide additional flexibility on park sites and opportunities to provide similarly affordable housing options to supplement manufactured homes. Affordable housing redevelopment may be limited, but permitting it could reduce procedural hurdles for such redevelopment if such projects are proposed. One potential application could be the Habitat for the Hidden Village site.
- ***Retain focus on only MHPs*** to encourage preservation of existing parks and minimize displacement risks for residents, who often cannot move their manufactured dwellings and could lose the value of their homes if the site were redeveloped, even as other forms of affordable housing. There are limited sites developed with MHPs that provide a unique form of naturally occurring affordable housing, whereas there are much broader opportunities to develop affordable housing across R1, R and C zoned properties. The Use Exception (above) could include a specific provision to allow rezoning for residential development with affordability restrictions.

F. Revise and Simplify Development Standards

Dimensional and development standards should largely carry forward existing MHP use standards in UDC 40.260.140 with minor modifications and new base zone standards to address:

- **Density range:** No minimum density is recommended to avoid creating nonconformities for existing parks. Allow maximum density equal to the new R-24 zone, up to 24 units per acre, which is nearly double any existing park's density and allows considerable flexibility.
- **Setbacks:** Maintain existing setbacks for MHPs of 25 feet from public roads and 5 feet from shared property lines, with landscaping buffering.
- **Park size:** Remove minimum or maximum park size, currently 5-50 acres, to better accommodate existing parks sizes ranging from 2-30 acres. Size limits are not significantly related to park viability and are not consistently regulated in other cities.
- **Placement of homes:** Permit placement of manufactured homes of varying ages and recreational vehicles within parks consistent with state laws. (RCW 36.01.225)
- **Parking:** Adjust parking minimums to match proposed ratios in line with new state legislation, including one space per dwelling and zero spaces for units less than 1,200 SF.
- **Recreational areas:** Explore whether to maintain or modify existing standard for percentage of recreational area required that increases with site density.
- **Review required:** Permit MHPs outright in the proposed zone subject to site plan review. Include provisions specifying which modifications to existing parks are exempt, subject to minor site plan, or trigger full site plan review.

G. Do Not Pursue a TDR Program

A minority of programs use a transfer of development rights (TDR) component; Kenmore ties bonus density, to be used onsite or transferred, to provision of affordable housing or other community benefits like parks. TDR can be a useful tool to balance property owners' development rights while preserving existing manufactured home parks, perhaps at lower densities that could be achieved through redevelopment. Such a program would likely be most useful in a context where there is demand for more density than the current zoning districts allow. Clark County has not recently seen significant demand for maximum densities already permitted, and is broadly working towards increasing allowed densities in all residential zones outright as part of planning to meet its housing goals. **A TDR program is not recommended** in the County development context and could work at cross-purposes with other regulatory updates to boost housing capacity.

IV. NEXT STEPS

County Council's review and feedback on the proposed code concept and details at their July 1st work session will inform the draft code updates for a new MHP zone if directed, intended to be incorporated with development code updates implementing the new Comprehensive Plan later in 2026. The draft code will be shared with stakeholders including nonprofit advocates, park operators and park residents, many of whom testified in support of the moratorium and have a strong interest in strategies to support MHPs. Final code will be revised based on stakeholder feedback and Council input as part of the Comprehensive Plan adoption process.

MEMO

DATE: July 15, 2026
TO: Clark County Councilors
CC: Oliver Orjiako, Jose Alvarez and Susan Ellinger, Clark County Community Planning
FROM: Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning
SUBJECT: Residential Code Updates Draft

I. OVERVIEW

The draft code updates are proposed alongside the new Comprehensive Plan to address:

- Implementation of priority code strategies from the Housing Options Study and Action Plan (HOSAP) focused on enhancing multifamily feasibility, expanding opportunities in the mixed-use zone and supporting affordable housing opportunities.
- Consistency with the proposed Comprehensive Plan, notably including creating needed capacity for housing at all income levels by adjusting permitted housing types by zone.
- Compliance with relevant state legislation related to housing, including STEP housing, co-living housing, and new parking minimums.
- Protection for manufactured home parks and residents, as part of the County's work plan under a moratorium on manufactured home park redevelopment.

Draft code updates have been developed over the past two years in collaboration with stakeholders, including five meetings with the Housing Options Study and Action Plan (HOSAP) forum group. Planning Commission and County Council have had initial opportunities to review earlier code drafts at work sessions in summer 2025. Additional consultation has included public open houses alongside the Comprehensive Plan alternatives, presentations at the Development Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB), and interviews with subject matter experts on manufactured housing. The intention for the July 22, 2026, work session with County Council is to provide an overview of the expanded code update package and answer questions that can inform refinements prior to beginning the adoption process for both the new Comprehensive Plan and these implementing code updates.

II. DRAFT CODE SUMMARY

Code updates span multiple chapters and correspond to topics described below.

Code Chapter	Topics Addressed
40.100.070 Definitions	STEP housing, Co-living
40.200.040 Minimum and Maximum Calculations	Prioritizing multifamily (aligning density measurements)
40.220.010 Low-Density Residential Districts	Refinements, STEP housing
40.220.020 Residential and Office Residential Districts	Prioritizing multifamily, STEP housing, Co-living
40.230.010 Commercial Districts	STEP housing, Co-living
40.230.020 Mixed-Use District	Adjusting housing allowances, STEP housing, Co-living
40.250.120 Manufactured Home Park Overlay	Protecting manufactured home parks
40.260.072 Compact Lot Developments	Refinements
40.260.140 Manufactured Home Parks	Protecting manufactured home parks
40.260.150 Multifamily Amenity Areas	Improving quality of multifamily amenity areas
40.340.010 Parking and Loading Standards	Decreasing off-street parking minimums
Appendix F Highway 99 Overlay District Standards	Aligning Highway 99 overlay with middle housing and multifamily updates

A. Refinements in Low-Density Zones

A few housekeeping changes have been identified to clarify provisions for single-family and middle housing adopted with the earlier package of R1 code updates.

- Decrease maximum average lot area standards in all zones specifically for single-family detached dwellings, in order to ensure greater efficiency to create needed housing capacity. The maximum average lot area standard effectively functions as a minimum density standard in the R1 zones, and was not adjusted in the previous round of code updates to better reflect the changing scale in each zone. Commensurate changes to increase minimum densities are also proposed, where they apply to PUDs and other limited scenarios. (CCC Table 40.220.010-2)

- Rather than adjust the minimum densities for townhouse development, remove the minimum densities as such projects are inherently pushing towards the maximum range rather than minimums. (CCC Table 40.220.010-4)
- Clarify that narrow lot standards only apply to compact lot developments if the proposal meets the narrow lot applicability criteria. (CCC 40.260.072)

B. Prioritizing Multifamily in the Medium & High-Density Zones

The draft code significantly simplifies the existing medium and high-density zones: by consolidating the existing zones and focusing permitted uses on multifamily dwellings. Permitting multifamily at proposed higher minimum and maximum densities is designed to create the needed capacity for multifamily development identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

- Consolidating and renaming the zoning districts:

Designation	Current Zone	Proposed Zone
Urban Medium	R-12/OR-15	R-24/OR-24
	R-18/OR-18	R-36/OR-36
	R-22/OR-22	
Urban High	R-30/OR-30	R-50/R-50
	R-43/OR-43	

- Focus permitted uses on multifamily dwellings exclusively, eliminating single-family detached, duplexes and townhouses as permitted uses. Add triplexes and quadplexes as a permitted use in the R-24/OR-24 and R-36/OR-36 zones. (CCC Table 40.220.020-1)
- Increase both minimum and maximum densities permitted in all R and OR zones, and eliminate maximum density for qualifying affordable housing projects. (CCC Table 40.220.020-2) Exempt pre-existing small lots less than 20,000 SF from minimum density standard to allow more flexibility for triplex and quadplex development.
- Reduce required site landscaping from 20% to 15% of the site, to offset separate amenity areas requirement of 5% of the site, and measure the two requirements separately (see Section II.D below). Provide clarity on how required landscaping, setbacks, and amenity area are measured, and where such areas can or cannot overlap. (CCC 40.220.020(C)(6), (9), (10))

C. Adjusting Housing Allowances in the Mixed-Use Zone

Opportunities in the Mixed-Use (MX) zone identified to support increased housing capacity include changing the ratio of residential and nonresidential uses required in a building or site, and focusing permitted housing types on higher-density uses.

- Continue to permit multifamily dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and cottage housing (up to 30% of dwellings), and eliminate single-family detached and townhouse options in order to expand capacity for housing types affordable to lower-income bands. (CCC Table 40.230.020-1)
- Allow residential uses up to 90% of the site/building in both horizontal and vertical configurations, increased from 80%; affordable housing developments are permitted fully 100% residential use with no mixed-use component per a recent code update. (CCC 40.230.020(E)(1)(a))
- Increase minimum and maximum residential densities to match R zones. (CCC 40.230.020(E)(1)(d), (e))
- Revise the housing mix standards to require at least three housing types for developments of 20 acres or more, decreasing the number of housing types required and increasing the applicability threshold given that fewer overall housing types are permitted and the interest to create multifamily capacity. (CCC 40.230.020(E)(1)(d))

D. Revising Multifamily Amenity Area Standards

The goal for revisions to the current multifamily outdoor recreation area standards—proposed to be renamed ‘amenity areas’—is to focus on high-quality spaces that improve livability of multifamily developments without increasing the total amount of space required or creating a potential obstacle to higher density development.

- Shift from a square footage required per unit to an overall 5% of the developable area of a project site. (CCC 40.260.150(C))
 - Example: A previous multifamily project built to 22 du/ac, with 52 total units on 2.4 gross acres/1.9 developable acres required 12,200 SF of amenity area under the current formula (200-300 SF per unit) plus required 48-SF patios for all ground floor units, and now would require 4,175 SF of amenity area at 5% of developable area which is a significant reduction in size.
- Eliminate separate private open space requirement for ground-floor units, and allow private patios or balconies to count towards up to 50% of the required amenity space. (CCC 40.260.150(C)(1), (D))
- Establish standards for common outdoor amenity areas: minimum dimensions, boundaries and accessibility, and improvement requirements. In the interest of enhancing the usability and quality of these spaces, a minimum of 50% of the required amenity area must be improved with active elements. (CCC 40.260.150(E))
- Add option for developers to propose an alternative design, such as alternative configuration, location and amenities, for greater flexibility. (CCC 40.260.150(F))

E. Decreasing Off-Street Parking Minimums

Proposed changes to decrease multifamily off-street parking requirements reflect recently adopted state legislation. HB 5184 caps and eliminates off-street parking minimums for residential and commercial uses in both cities and counties, including:

- Revise minimum off-street parking ratio to 1 space per single-family dwelling and 0.5 spaces per multifamily dwelling, and fully eliminate off-street parking minimums for any dwelling under 1,200 SF, affordable housing and senior housing. In practice, most multifamily dwellings will not be required to provide any off-street parking and developers can elect to provide the amount of off-street parking that best suits the site and intended residents. (CCC Table 40.340.010-4)
- Specify parking minimums for STEP housing, co-living housing and manufactured home parks. (CCC Table 40.340.010-4)
- Revise minimum off-street parking ratios for commercial uses to no more than 1 space per 500 SF, and eliminate parking minimums for commercial uses under 3,000 SF, change in commercial use, ground floor uses in a mixed-use building, and childcare centers. (CCC Table 40.340.010-4)

F. Protecting Manufactured Home Parks

New regulations for manufactured home parks (MHP) are proposed as part of the County's strategy to implement a HOSAP strategy minimizing displacement risks for park residents and to respond to the County's moratorium on MHP redevelopment. Updates include:

- Introducing a new MHP Overlay District to be applied to existing and new MHP parks in all urban zones. Overlay permits MHPs outright and requires a use exception to redevelop including as affordable housing. (CCC 40.250.120)
- Revising development standards for MHPs in all zones, simplifying setback and recreation area standards and explicitly allowing repair, replacement and additional dwellings outright for greater flexibility with ongoing park operations. (CCC 40.260.140)

Additional strategies beyond zoning may include enhanced notification, relocation assistance, and/or financial support for MHP residents and operations.

G. Aligning Highway 99 Overlay Standards

The Highway 99 Overlay encompasses areas with commercial, mixed-use, residential and low-density residential designations, establishing use and form-based development standards for each area. Updates are proposed to align residential areas with both middle housing and multifamily direction proposed in base zones, including:

- Focusing allowed housing types in the Multifamily residential areas to apartments, triplexes and quadplexes, and removing lower-density housing types.
- Expanding middle housing types permitted in Mixed Residential and Single Family residential areas to allow all middle housing types including triplexes and quadplexes.
- Replacing overlay-specific development standards for Townhouses, Duplexes and ADUs with reference to County standards for those housing types, similar to all other residential zones.

H. Allowing STEP Housing

STEP housing includes Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Emergency Housing, and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). State legislation requires the County to permit sufficient capacity for these housing types to meet local need (HB 1220), and more directly, to permit STEP wherever residential and hotel uses are permitted (SB 2266).

- Transitional housing and PSH must be permitted in all residential zones, which maps to the County's R1, R, OR, Commercial, and MX zones, subject to the same standards as other residential uses.
- Emergency shelters and emergency housing must be permitted in all zones where hotels are permitted except industrial zones, which maps to the County's CC (conditionally), GC and MX zones.
- New definitions consistent with state legislation are proposed. (CCC 40.100.070)
- Special use standards will be developed prior to adoption to implement forthcoming Commerce guidance being updated to reflect SB 2266. (future CCC 40.260.076)

I. Introducing Co-living Housing

Co-living housing is a form of multifamily living with individual private 'sleeping units' that may or may not contain private bathrooms and kitchenettes and shared common kitchens and bathrooms, a new spin on boarding houses or single-room occupancies. New state legislation (HB 1998) permits them in all zones where multifamily residential uses are permitted, applying to the R, OR, Commercial and MX zones in Clark County. Proposed code updates permit co-living housing in those zones subject to the same development standards as apply to multifamily residential, and defines the term. Further special use standards will be developed prior to adoption to implement forthcoming guidance from Commerce. (future CCC 40.260.060)

Chapter 1 Land Use Element

Introduction

The Land Use Element of the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan ~~2015-2035~~2025-2045 (20-Year Plan) provides policy guidance for the uses of land throughout Clark County, which range from residential, commercial and industrial structures to farm and forestry activities to parks, open spaces and green spaces, urban and community forests within the urban growth area, and undeveloped environmentally sensitive areas. It contains policies to provide guidance as to how and where these uses should be located and what type of overall land use pattern should evolve as Clark County develops over the next 20 years.

In addition to the written descriptions of existing conditions and the policies, the land use element is closely associated with the 20-Year comprehensive plan map. The map delineates the unincorporated area in various categories, or plan designations, which appear on the map as different colors. Specific policies are applied to specific map designations, providing policy direction for the development of those areas.

This element includes a review of existing conditions and analyses of how Clark County will meet future needs related to land uses. One critical concern that it addresses is whether the map and policies designate adequate amounts of land to meet the residential, commercial, industrial, environmental and other needs of Clark County through the next 20 years. A second equally important concern is the integration of land uses. The various types of uses should be located and developed in an integrated, cohesive manner which minimizes transportation and other public and private service needs and costs and fosters greater accessibility, livability and community in Clark County.

The Growth Management Act of 1990 (GMA) clearly emphasizes the reduction of urban sprawl. The Land Use Element promotes more compact development patterns which allow for more efficient delivery of services and promotes a better balance of jobs and housing to minimize the distance people need to travel between home, workplace and shopping.

The Land Use Element contains provisions for a clear distinction between urban and rural areas through the designation of urban growth boundaries, as required by the GMA. Within urban areas, urban style and density development should occur. Within the rural area, rural style and density development are planned.

Within the urban areas, a range of urban densities and development opportunities are envisioned to accommodate housing and services for households of all income levels. Although single family housing and middle housing will continue to be the most common forms of residential development, certain areas within major activity centers and along transportation corridors are planned for increased multi-family and mixed use development, as well as more intensive commercial uses. Protection of environmentally critical lands and an expansive recreational and open space network development are planned in both the urban and rural areas.

The Land Use Element also contains provisions for advancing environmental justice and climate change and resilience action. GMA requires that Land Use Elements give special consideration to achieving environmental justice in its goals and policies, including efforts to avoid creating or worsening environmental health disparities. The Land Use Element should promote physical activity

and reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled within the jurisdiction, but without increasing greenhouse gas emissions elsewhere in the state. The Land Use Element must reduce and mitigate the risk to lives and property posed by wildfires.

Relation to other elements of the plan

The land use element addresses land development throughout the entire unincorporated area. However, because of its unique conditions and policy issues, analysis and policies for the unincorporated rural area of Clark County are contained in a separate Rural and Natural Resource Lands Element, Chapter 3 and Environmental Element, Chapter 4 of this document.

The Land Use Element is the central element of the comprehensive plan. The other elements must be fully consistent with the land use development patterns and policies presented in the Land Use Element and comprehensive plan map. For example, the Transportation and Capital Facilities Elements must contain adequate provisions to serve the type and extent of the land use patterns envisioned in the Land Use Element. Conversely, the Land Use Element and map must not specify a land use development pattern which cannot be adequately served by transportation and other services specified in the other elements.

Chapter 14 – Climate Element contains most climate change and resilience policies in the Comprehensive Plan related to the GMA climate change and resiliency requirements, but other elements also include climate policies. Climate-related goals and policies within this element are noted in the goals and policies section of this chapter. See Chapter 14 for a comprehensive discussion of climate policies, some of which overlap with land use.

Relation to other county planning policy documents

The Clark County 20-Year Comprehensive Plan, including the land use element, is part of a hierarchy including GMA, the Clark County countywide planning policies, the *Community Framework Plan* and the Clark County zoning ordinance and related implementation measures. The GMA contains general and specific requirements for participating jurisdictions. Clark County's *Community Framework Plan* provides an overall community vision and general policies for future development in accordance with the GMA. Clark County's 20-Year Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Element within, provides detailed policies for managing growth consistent with the mandates of GMA and the direction of the *Community Framework Plan*.

The 20-Year plan and its Land Use Element do not provide all the details, however. Precise standards, such as building setbacks, permitted uses within a particular zoning district or appropriate types of stormwater management systems are included in the implementing ordinances, including the zoning regulations. The 20-Year plan is the controlling document and where the implementing ordinances conflict with the 20-Year plan or fail to implement its policies, the 20-Year plan and its policies shall prevail the implementing ordinances shall be amended to be consistent with the 20-Year plan.

Relation to city comprehensive plans

The land use element and other 20-year plan elements will be the governing documents for all unincorporated lands under the jurisdiction of Clark County. City comprehensive plans and their associated ordinances will be the governing documents applicable within incorporated city limits. Unincorporated lands within adopted urban growth areas will be subject to county plans and ordinances, although cities will be consulted and city policies may be considered. Interjurisdictional provisions are included in the Procedures Element, Chapter 145 of this document.

1 Land Use Conditions

2 General History

3 Clark County was originally settled by Native Americans, who established villages along the Columbia
4 River and in other sites before recorded history. European settlement dates back to the
5 establishment of Fort Vancouver in the early 19th century. Subsequent development of Clark County
6 was primarily agriculturally based, but small residential concentrations within compact grid networks
7 emerged in the Vancouver, Camas and Washougal areas and later in Battle Ground, La Center and
8 Ridgefield.

9 Later expansions in development patterns were brought about largely by transportation
10 improvements. With the arrival of the streetcar, radial development along track lines followed, such
11 as along Fourth Plain Boulevard from downtown Vancouver to Orchards. Increased automobile use
12 beginning in the 1920s extended the reach of development further from the original downtown
13 nodes into areas previously used for agriculture. This process continued with the influx of population
14 during World War II, the post-war construction of Highway 99 and later Interstate 5 and 205.

15 Increasingly dispersed development patterns have occurred over the past 20 years in Clark County.
16 The pace and timing of growth has occurred in cycles, driven largely by regional and national trends.
17 From 2000¹ through 2010², county population grew from 345,238 to 425,363. During this period, Clark County grew by 80,125 residents or by 23.18 percent. On April 1,
18 2015³, the state Office of Financial Management ranked Clark County as the fifth largest county in
19 the state with a population of 448,500.

21 Current general distribution of land uses and population

22 The total land area encompassed by within Clark County's boundary and its associated cities is
23 approximately 420,238 acres, including areas covered by water, unincorporated and incorporated
24 land, and Cowlitz Indian Tribe trust lands. The overall existing distribution of various land uses within
25 Clark County is illustrated in Table 1.1. This Table illustrates how the areas are designated by the
26 comprehensive plan or zoning maps.

27 Table 1.1 | 2015 Generalized Land Uses – Plan Map (Values in Acres)¹

28 [Next draft to include updated table based on preferred land use alternative numbers]

Jurisdiction	Forest	Agriculture	Commercial	Industrial	Business Parks	Mixed Use	Public Facilities	Parks Open Space	Single Family Residents	Multi- Family Residents
Clark County	158,099	34,535	360	573			1,338	8,330	103,759	
Vancouver UGA			5,359	9,426		603	3,601	5,119	31,946	5,758
Camas UGA			889	1603	888		519	832	4,850	648
Washougal UGA			347	815		225	150	433	2,588	256
Battle Ground UGA			797	324	190	1,333		153	2,786	1,238
La Center UGA ²			175	105		129	91	122	1,136	85
Ridgefield UGA			390	1,075	442	48	246	254	2,991	565
Yacolt UGA			39	58			37	42	273	
Woodland UGA							40		111	
Total³	158,099	34,535	8,355	14,279	1,521	2,337	6,022	15,283	150,440	8,550

¹ Source: Clark County GIS

² Cowlitz Indian Tribe trust lands overlap with the La Center UGA [insert number here] acres

³ The total above does not include [insert number here] acres of Cowlitz Indian Tribe trust lands, 18,159 acres of bodies of water; 81 acres of Airport and 260 acres of Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in Vancouver.

Source: Clark County GIS. * The total above does not include 18,159 acres of bodies of water; 81 acres of Airport and 260 acres of Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in Vancouver.

Table 1.2 presents 2015²³ base population and projected increases in Clark County and its cities. It should be noted that city limits listed have not remained static over time and will not do so in the future. Growth within urban growth areas reflects an expansion of city limits as well as births, deaths and net migration.

The projected 2035²⁴ populations for each city reflect an assumption that city limits will grow through annexation to fill the adopted urban growth areas (UGA). Similarly, the apparent decline in the unincorporated rural and urban areas is due to a loss of land area through annexation and not out-migration or other loss of population.

Much of the policy thrust of the Clark County 20-Year plan is in response to the need to plan for the anticipated population growth for the 20-year period ending in 2035²⁴ based on a 1.261.4% growth rate or a projected population of 577,431²⁵ (90% to the urban area and 10% to the rural area). Under the GMA, Clark County and its cities are required to plan for a total population projection as provided by the state Office of Financial Management (OFM). The OFM has estimated a population projection for 2035²⁴ ranging from a low of 459,617²⁶ to a high of 681,135²⁷. The middle series projection, the one considered most likely by OFM, is 698,416. Although the county can exercise discretion over how the projected total is distributed among the urban growth areas and the unincorporated rural area, the comprehensive growth plans of Clark County and its cities must be consistent with the official total allocation.

The 2035²⁴ population projections listed in Table 1.2 are actual goals, not merely future estimates or guidelines, which must be reflected in the respective 20-year plans of the jurisdictions.

Table 1.2 | 2035²⁴ Population Estimates by Jurisdiction⁴⁵

UGA	2015 ²³	2015 – 2035 ²⁴	2035 ²⁴
	Population	Change	Population
Clark County Rural	62,205	12,859	75,064
Battle Ground UGA	20,871	17,572	38,443
Camas UGA	22,843	11,255	34,098
La Center UGA	3,209	4,433	7,642
Ridgefield UGA	6,575	18,919	25,494
Vancouver UGA	315,460	56,601	372,061
Washougal UGA	15,932	6,415	22,347
Woodland	891	229	318
Yacolt UGA	1,661	303	1,964
Total County	448,845	128,586	577,431

Sources: Clark County GIS. Projected 2035 population based on OFM allocation and 1.26% growth rate. 2015 population is based on incorporation of UGA area.

Approximately 90% percent of population growth over the 20-year planning horizon is expected to occur in designated urban growth areas, with 10% percent of the remainder to occur in unincorporated rural and natural resource lands. This type of development pattern is consistent with the goals of the GMA and supports the implementation of the long range vision of the county

⁴ Sources: Clark County GIS

⁵ 2023 population based on OFM April 1, 2023 population estimate. 2025 population is based on incorporation of UGA area.

reflected in the *Community Framework Plan*. To accommodate the population growth over the 20-year planning horizon the following UGA's new total acreage in Table 1.3 is expected to expand to Battle Ground 84,671.61, Camas 244, La Center 72,471.21, and Ridgefield 111,262.39, and Yacolt 12, acres.

Table 1.3 | Total Acreage Added by UGA⁶

UGA Name	Airport	Commercial	Industrial	Mixed Use	Public Facilities	Urban-Low Density Residential	Grand Total
Battle Ground	0	0.113	335	84,671.75	0	0.212	84,671.61
Camas	82	0	0	0	0	162	244
La Center	0	55.040	60	0.61	17.430	0	72,471.21
Ridgefield	0	0	0	0.225	0.14	111.260	111,262.39
Yacolt	0	0	12	0	0	0	12
Grand Total	82	0.113	407	84,672.11	17.4314	111.2650	265,407.77

Source: Clark County GIS

Residential Land Uses

Residential lands provide the base for the provision of housing of Clark County residents. For the purposes of assessing overall land use, perhaps the most significant policy issues related to residential uses are the sufficiency, affordability and location of the overall housing stock. These factors are heavily driven by market and demographic factors which are largely beyond local control, such as interest rates or immigration to the Portland-Vancouver region. However, Clark County is working with all the cities in the county to provide an appropriate land base and policy guidance through the comprehensive planning process to influence these factors in a positive direction.

The 2016-2025 Comprehensive Plan Map for the county and its cities contains an adequate amount of land designated for urban residential use, which is sufficient to accommodate the projected population increase of 115,727,190,754 persons allocated to Clark County urban areas. The methodology used to determine the amount of land needed to accommodate the projected population increases is based on the policy directives of the Board of County Councilors. A more complete analysis of residential development issues is contained in the Housing Element, Chapter 2 of this document.

Commercial and Industrial Land Uses

Urban commercial and industrial designations are designated within the Urban Growth Areas on the Land Use Map. These include Commercial (C), Industrial (I) and Heavy Industrial (IH), as described below. Commercial lands are envisioned to accommodate future employment growth, along with industrial and business lands. The Economic Development Element, Chapter 9 provides further policy direction regarding types of employment uses and attraction of businesses to the county. For designations, goals and policies guiding commercial development in the rural area see the Rural and Natural Resource Element, Chapter 3.

Parks

Clark County has been involved in land acquisition for parks since the 1930s and adopted its first Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Plan in 1965. From 1997 to 2013, the county park system was

⁶ Source: Clark County GIS

jointly planned and managed with the City of Vancouver via an interlocal agreement or memorandum of understanding (MOU). In 2014, the agreement was not renewed. The Clark County Parks Division was created in 2014 under the Department of Public Works and the associated Clark County Parks Advisory Board (PAB) was also established in 2014. In 2015, the most recent Clark County Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan was adopted by the Board of County Councilors. The plan provides direction for the future priorities of the parks system over the next two decades, six years and includes a 10-year needs analysis, qualifies the county for eligibility for state and federal grant resources, fulfills the requirements for a parks element within the comprehensive plan as part of the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) and reflects the guidance from the Greater Clark Parks Advisory Board related to recreational needs and priorities of the community. The Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element, Chapter 7, provides further background and information on these facilities in Clark County.

Land Use Integration

For a community to function in a livable and efficient manner, land uses must not only be provided in sufficient overall quantities, but must also be developed in an integrated, cohesive fashion. The 20-Year Plan encourages improved land use integration on a range of levels, from more efficient overall regional form to better site-specific land use integration and access. Developing in an integrated fashion to include but not limited to working closely with school districts to ensure that new school facilities are within close proximity to neighborhoods they are intended to serve.

Urban Growth Areas

Perhaps the most fundamental policy component of the 20-Year Plan is the establishment of urban growth boundaries, as required by the GMA. Within urban growth boundaries, development of urban uses and densities should occur and urban level-of-services should be available, or capable of being provided in the future. Within the rural area beyond the urban growth boundaries, only rural uses and densities should occur and only rural level-of-services should be provided.

The establishment of urban growth boundaries is intended to reduce service inefficiencies associated with sprawling and dispersed development patterns and to produce a generally more compact overall urban development pattern which can be served more efficiently. Urban growth boundaries also facilitate more efficient timing of growth, as available land supplies within the urban areas are generally utilized before the boundary is extended into the adjacent rural area to allow for more intensive development in that area. In the absence of established boundaries, a leap frog development pattern may occur when urbanization takes place in isolated outlying pockets before it occurs in areas closer to the cities.

Urban growth boundaries also serve the purpose of fostering distinctions between the urban and rural areas which often become blurred or lost in the face of unmanaged growth. Those who choose to live in rural or urban areas often do so because of the relatively unique set of characteristics that each offers. By reinforcing and protecting the distinction between urban and rural areas, growth boundaries can help to conserve for the future many of these characteristics which have been steadily eroded in Clark County in recent years, particularly in the rural communities closer to the urban areas.

Focused Public Investment Areas

Although development will occur throughout the urban areas, the 20-Year Plan encourages more focused capital improvements for a variety of services in specific areas in order to provide “fully served” land where all public facilities meet or exceed standards. Clark County has identified

potential investment areas and developed conceptual plans and cost estimates for making these areas ready to build. Encouraging development in the focused public investment areas will allow mixed use, industrial and professional business activities to locate where they can be served most easily and efficiently by public services, particularly transportation. These centers and nodes have better automobile and transit accessibility than most other urban areas. Encouraging commercial active-tiesactivities in close proximity to higher density housing will provide important opportunities to more closely match jobs, housing and shopping, minimizing traffic impacts by reducing the number and length of automobile trips needed.

Providing a range of development densities in the urban area is intended to foster a variety of options for people or companies wishing to live or do business in the county. Opportunities will be provided in residential areas characterized by larger homes and ample yard space, as well as those who wish to live in a more urbanized setting of smaller homes within walking distance or close proximity of a full range of shops or other activities. More detailed information can be found in the Economic Development Action Plan in Appendix D.

Sub-area Plans

Sub-area planning provides the community with a greater opportunity to be involved in a planning process that is more identifiable and predictable. Neighborhoods, corridors and special districts may be defined and plans will be tailored to address the issues of that area. Upon adoption by the Board of County Councilors they amend and become part of the comprehensive plan.

Many planning efforts have been undertaken within the Vancouver Urban Growth Area in collaboration with area residents, business owners and other stakeholders. Sub-area plans work to create a vision for a community as it grows and develops.

Highway 99

The Highway 99 sub-area is located in an urbanized area of unincorporated Clark County between Vancouver and Ridgefield. The planning area includes approximately 2,400 acres and extends from the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad Bridge near NE 63rd Street (south), Interstate 5 (west), NE 134th Street (north) and the Bonneville Power Administration Transmission Line Right-of-Way (east).

The area has a mix of housing, businesses and undeveloped property, but it is regionally known for US Highway 99. This key corridor, next to Interstate 5, serves as a business district for the Hazel Dell, Salmon Creek and Felida unincorporated areas.

The Highway 99 Sub-area Plan and accompanying form-based code provides a vision for the redevelopment and revitalization of the Highway 99 corridor as shown in Figure 16a.

Mill Creek

The Mill Creek sub-area is bounded by NE 179th Street on the north, NE 50th Avenue on the east, the WSU campus on the south and NE 29th Avenue on the west. The plan includes zoning and traffic circulation for the area and recommendations on public open space, trails, lot size compatibility and design standards for future roads as shown in Figure 16a.

Communitywide Plans

Something as simple as a sidewalk can improve your health and the health of your neighbors by encouraging walking for recreation or travel. Research shows that there are key features of

communities that influence health, such as parks, safe streets, public gathering places and easy access to healthy food.

Other plans have been developed by and with the community to assure we are developing and sustaining healthy and age-friendly communities. Such plans include the Growing Healthier Report, the Aging Readiness Plan, and the Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and the Housing Options Study and Action Plan. The Community Design Element, Chapter 11 includes policies related to the Growing Healthier Report and Aging Readiness Plan, while the Transportation Element, Chapter 5 includes policies related to the Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The Housing Element, Chapter 2 includes policies related to the Housing Options Study and Action Plan.

The 20-Year Plan encourages better land use integration through increased accessibility and interrelation of nearby uses. Development patterns or uses which allow for and encourage pedestrian access are encouraged, while development which is of a strip commercial nature or otherwise exclusively oriented to automobile traffic is not.

Growing Healthier Report

Clark County Public Health examined the ways that our neighborhoods and our built environment impact our health. Working with the community, they identified specific policies and strategies for improving the long-term health of our community through the development of the *Growing Healthier Report*.

Aging Readiness Plan

The Aging Readiness Task Force developed a plan that identifies strategies focusing on healthy communities, housing, transportation and mobility, supportive services and community engagement. The *Aging Readiness Plan* assesses the county's readiness to serve as a home for a growing number of older residents. The plan includes strategies to improve the community's capacity to support its growing older population and ultimately benefit all ages. The Commission on Aging was established in 2012 to lead and manage the implementation of the plan. The Commission on Aging guided an update to the *Aging Readiness Plan* in 2023.

Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Clark County has developed a *Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* to make it safer and more convenient for people to get to major destinations on foot or by bicycle. The plan identifies ways to improve the transportation network by integrating existing sidewalks, bike lanes and trails.

Housing Options Study and Action Plan

The Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan (HOSAP) identifies housing challenges and opportunities to encourage development of housing that is affordable to a variety of household incomes through removal of regulatory barriers and implementation of other strategies. These strategies are needed to help ensure future generations have access to affordable, quality and diverse housing opportunities.

Interpretation of the 20-Year Plan Map

The 20-Year Plan Map identifies a number of different designations which are described below. The plan designations have been chosen are consistent with the location criteria described. Future amendments to the 20-Year Plan map must be made in a manner, which is consistent with these general descriptions (Tables 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6).

Comprehensive Plan Map: Establishes land use designations for all land in Clark County. It shows the long-term vision of how and where the county will change over the next 20 years to accommodate expected population growth.

Zoning Map: Shows how land can be used and what can be built on any given property today. Zones are more specific than comprehensive plan designations and come with a set of rules described in the county's Unified Development Code Title 40.

Table 1.4 | Rural Lands Plan Designation to Zone Consistency Chart

Comprehensive Plan	Zoning
Rural 5 (R-5)	Rural (R-5) Airport (A)
Rural 10 (R-10)	Rural (R-10)
Rural 20 (R-20)	Rural (R-20)
Rural Center (RC)	Rural Center (RC-1), Rural Center (RC-2.5), Rural (R-5)
Rural Commercial (CR)	Rural Commercial (CR-1), Rural Commercial (CR-2)
Rural Industrial (RI)	Heavy Industrial (IH), Airport (A)
Public Facility (PF)	Public Facility (PF), Airport (A)

Table 1.5 | Resource Lands Plan Designation to Zone Consistency Chart

Comprehensive Plan	Zoning
Agriculture (AG)	Agriculture (AG-20)
Agri-Wildlife (AG/WL), Parks/Open Space (P/OS)	Agri-Wildlife (AG/WL)
Forest Tier II	Forest (FR-40)
Forest Tier I	Forest (FR-80)
Airport (A)	Airport (A)

1

Table 1.6 | Urban Plan Designations to Zone Consistency Chart

Comprehensive Plan	Zoning
Urban Low Density Residential (UL)	Single Family Residential (R1-5), Single Family Residential (R1-6), Single Family Residential (R1-6)
Urban Medium Density Residential (UM)	Residential (R-24), Residential (R-36), Office Residential (OR-24), Office Residential (OR-36), Residential (R-12), Residential (R-18), Residential (R-22), Office Residential (OR-15), Office Residential (OR-18), Office Residential (OR-22)
Urban High Density Residential (UH)	Residential (R-50), Office Residential (OR-50), Residential (R-30), Residential (R-43), Office Residential (OR-30), Office Residential (OR-43)
Mixed Use (MU)	Mixed Use (MX)
Commercial (C)	Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Community Commercial (CC), General Commercial (GC)
Industrial (I)	Business Park (BP), Light Industrial (IL), Railroad Industrial (IR), Airport (A)
Heavy Industrial (IH)	Heavy Industrial (IH), Railroad Industrial (IR), Airport (A)
Public Facility (PF)	Public Facility (PF), University (U), Airport (A)
Airport (A)	Airport (A), Heavy Industrial (IH)
Parks/Open Space (P/OS)	Parks/Open Space (P/OS), Parks/Wildlife Refuge (P/WL)
Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)	All zones

2

3 The Plan to Zone matrix is provided to identify those implementing base zoning districts which are
 4 consistent with each plan designation. Those districts which are not included within a given plan
 5 designation are inconsistent with the plan map and are not permitted within that designation. This
 6 information is necessary to determine when, where and under what circumstances these
 7 designations should be applied in the future.

8 20-Year plan designations and location criteria

9 The policies in this chapter and those in the referenced planning studies strive to improve the quality
 10 of life, provide opportunities for innovative approaches to land use and protect our community
 11 character. The policies work in tandem with the Comprehensive Plan map, which illustrates the
 12 location of various land use categories. The Comprehensive Plan map delineates the unincorporated
 13 area in various categories, or plan designations, which appear on the map as different colors.

Residential Lands

There are three separate categories for residential use, ranging from low to high density. Low density residential is predominantly for single-family and middle housing residential development. Medium and high density residential provide land for single-family attached housing, garden apartment and multi-family developments. Public facilities, churches, institutions and other special uses may be allowed in these designations if certain conditions are met. Where offices are determined to be appropriate, office residential zones can be applied in the medium and high density designations.

Urban Low Density Residential (UL)

This designation provides land for single-family and middle housing residential development. Minimum densities will assure that new development will occur in a manner which maximizes the efficiency of public services. New development shall provide for connection to public sewer and water. In addition, public facilities, churches, institutions and other special uses may be allowed in this designation if certain conditions are met. The base zones which implement this 20-Year Plan designation are the R1-20, R1-10, R1-7.5, R1-6 and R1-5 zones. The zones may be applied in a manner that provides for densities slightly higher than existing urban development, but the density increase should continue to protect the character of the existing area.

Urban Medium Density Residential (UM)

This designation provides land for single family attached housing, garden apartment and multi-family developments. Minimum densities assure that areas build out to the density planned, ensuring that the urban areas accommodate anticipated residential needs. Areas planned for urban medium residential use and assisted living facilities shall be located near commercial uses and transportation facilities in order to efficiently provide these services. Public facilities and institutions are allowed under certain conditions. The implementing base zones in this designation are the ~~R-12, R-18 and R-22~~ R-24 and R-36 zones. Where ~~Offices~~ are determined to be appropriate, the Office Residential ~~OR-15, OR-18 and OR-22~~ OR-24 and OR-36 zones can be applied in this designation.

Urban High Density Residential (UH)

~~Outside of the Highway 99 Overlay Area, these~~ areas provide for the highest density housing in the urban area with ~~43-50~~ units per gross acre. Minimum densities assure that these areas build out to the density planned, ensuring that the urban areas accommodate anticipated residential needs including assisted living facilities. Areas with this designation shall be located in transit corridors and near commercial and employment centers to provide demand for commercial and transportation services while providing easy access to employment. Institutions and public facilities are allowed in this zone under certain conditions. ~~Base~~ The implementing zones in this designation ~~are is~~ the ~~R-30 and R-43~~ R-50. Where ~~Offices~~ are determined to be appropriate, the Office Residential ~~OR-30 and OR-43~~ OR-50 zones can be applied in this designation.

Commercial (C)

~~With the 2016 comprehensive plan update, the county has consolidated the three commercial comprehensive plan designations into one Commercial (C) comprehensive plan designation with the three commercial zoning districts remaining. The Commercial (C) designation is intended to provide for a wide range of mixed-residential, retail, service, and institutional uses where appropriate infrastructure and services are available. The following three distinct urban commercial use~~ categories include:

Neighborhood Commercial (NC)

These commercial center areas provide services within walking distance for the frequent needs of the surrounding residents and are implemented by the Neighborhood Commercial base zone. These areas are located in the urban growth boundary and will generally be small areas which are generally designed to serve neighborhoods. Developments in these areas will be designed to be compatible with the surrounding residentially zoned neighborhoods.

New neighborhood commercial areas should generally be less than five acres in size spaced less than five miles from similar uses or zones, serve a population of up to 10,000, locate at neighborhood collector or larger crossroads and serve a primary trade area within a 1.5 mile radius.

Community Commercial (CC)

A commercial center area provides services to several neighborhoods in urban areas of Clark County and is implemented with the Community Commercial zone. New community commercial areas should generally be between five and 20 acres in size, spaced two to four miles from similar uses or zones, serve a population of 10,000 to 20,000, locate at minor or major arterial crossroads and serve a primary trade area between 2 to 4 miles.

General Commercial (GC)

General Commercial areas provide a full range of goods and services necessary to serve large areas of the county and traveling public. This designation is implemented with the General Commercial base zone. These areas are generally located at interchanges, along state highways and interstates and adjacent to major and minor arterial roadways. New general commercial areas should generally be more than 20 acres in size, spaced more than four miles from similar uses or zones, serve a population of more than 20,000 and serve a primary trade area between 3 to 6 miles.

Mixed Use (MU)

The Mixed Use designation intends to allow mixed use developments to provide the community with a mix of mutually supporting retail, service, office and residential uses. Areas within this designation are implemented with the list of uses allowed in the Mixed Use (MX) zone. Areas within this designation are implemented with the list of uses allowed in the Mixed Use (MX) zone and are intended to achieve the following goals and objectives of the *Community Framework Plan* and the comprehensive plan:

- Enhance livability, environmental quality and economic vitality;
- Accommodate and respect surrounding land uses by providing a gradual transition into lower density neighborhoods that may encircle a potential mixed-use site;
- Maximize efficient use of public facilities and services; provide a variety of housing types and densities;
- Reduce the number of automobile trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation; and create a safe, attractive and convenient environment for living, working, recreating and traveling; and,
- Shall be accomplished through design requirements governing such elements as scale, bulk, street orientation, landscaping and parking as contained in the Mixed Use Design Standards;

Industrial (I)

Areas within this designation are implemented with Light Industrial (IL), and Business Park (BP) and Industrial Railroad (IR) base zones and are intended to provide the community with employment opportunities such as compatible office and attractive new non-polluting industries. Areas designated Industrial also provides for more intensive job related land uses that pay family wages, such as professional offices, research and technology related industries.

- Light Industrial (IL) base zones are intended to provide for light manufacturing, warehousing, transportation and other land intensive uses. Services and uses which support industrial uses are allowed in these areas but limited in size and location to serve workers within the industrial area.
- The Business Park (BP) base zone provides for uses permitted in the business park and is intended to provide for campus like development with higher job densities and family wage jobs than in traditional industrial areas.
- The Industrial Railroad (IR) base zone provides land uses that require and take advantage of rail access. This designation is appropriate for industrial and manufacturing uses including manufacturing, assembly, fabrication, processing and bulk handling and storage (warehousing).
- Airport (A) base zone provides land uses for airports that allow public use.

Heavy Industrial (IH)

This designation is implemented with a heavy industrial (IH) and Industrial Railroad (IR) base zones and provides land for heavy manufacturing, warehousing and industrial uses that may be incompatible with other categories of land uses. This designation is appropriate for areas which have extensive rail and shipping facilities.

- The Heavy Industrial (IH) base zone provides land for heavy manufacturing, warehousing and industrial uses that may be incompatible with other categories of land uses. This designation is appropriate for areas which have extensive rail and shipping facilities.
- The Industrial Railroad (IR) base zone provides land uses that require and take advantage of rail access. This designation is appropriate for industrial and manufacturing uses including manufacturing, assembly, fabrication, processing and bulk handling and storage (warehousing).

Public Facility (PF)

This designation is applied to land uses that have already constructed facilities or are for public use. Public schools, Government buildings, water towers, sewer treatment plants and other publicly owned uses are included in this designation. The implementing base zone is Public Facility (PF), University (U) and Airport (A).

Airport (A)

This designation is applied to airports that allow public use. It is implemented with the an Airport (A) and Heavy Industrial (IH) base zones.

Parks/Open Space (P/OS)

These areas provide visual and psychological relief from man-made development in the urban area. Open space also provides opportunities for recreational activity and environmental preservation, maintenance and enhancement. Open space may include, but is not limited to developed parks, trails

and greenways, special areas, public and private recreational facilities, critical lands and public gathering spaces. It is implemented with a Public/Open Space (P/OS) and Parks/Wildlife Refuge (P/WL) base zones.

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

These areas are owned by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) where they operate their transmission facilities.

Rural Lands

The Rural (R-5, R-10, R-20) designations are intended to provide lands for residential living in the rural area. Natural resource activities such as farming and forestry are allowed and encouraged to occur as small scale activities in conjunction with the residential uses in the area. These areas are subject to normal and accepted forestry and farming practices. The Rural 5, 10 and 20 comprehensive plan designations are implemented with corresponding Rural 5, 10 and 20 base zones. A Rural 10 designation is applied within the rural area to prevent premature subdivision of future urban areas where the lands are adjacent to designated Urban Reserves, where the predominant size is equal or greater than 10 acres, to act as a buffer to Natural Resource lands or to protect environmentally critical areas consistent with applicable county ordinance and related regulations. This allows for efficient urban development when land is added to the urban growth areas. A Rural 20 designation applies to rural areas where the lands act as a buffer to Natural Resource designated lands, are used for small scale forest or farm production or contain significant environmentally constrained areas as defined by applicable county code and related regulations.

Rural Center (RC)

The rural center residential zones are to provide lands for residential living in the Rural Centers at densities consistent with the comprehensive plan. These districts are only permitted in the designated Rural Centers and are implemented with the RC-1 and RC-2.5 base zones.

Rural Commercial (CR)

This commercial district is located in rural areas outside of urban growth boundaries in existing commercial areas and within designated Rural Centers. These areas are generally located at convenient locations at minor or major arterial crossroads and sized to accommodate the rural population. Rural commercial areas are not intended to serve the general traveling public in rural areas located between urban population centers. Rural commercial areas within designated Rural Centers are implemented with the CR-2 base zone. Existing commercial areas outside of these Rural Centers are implemented with the CR-1 base zone. All new rural commercial applications shall address the criteria for new commercial areas through a market and land use analysis.

Rural Industrial (RI)

This industrial designation is to provide for industrial uses in the rural area that are primarily dependent on the natural resources derived from the rural area. The Heavy Industrial base zone implements this designation.

"Major industrial development" means a master planned location suitable for manufacturing or industrial businesses that: (i) Requires a parcel of land so large that no suitable parcels are available within an urban growth area; (ii) is a natural resource-based industry requiring a location near agricultural land, forest land, or mineral resource land upon which it is dependent; or (iii) requires a location with characteristics such as proximity to transportation facilities or related industries such

that there is no suitable location in an urban growth area. The major industrial development may not be for the purpose of retail commercial development or multitenant office parks.

Resource Lands

Agriculture Lands (AG)

These lands have the growing capacity, productivity, soil composition and surrounding land use to have long-term commercial significance for agriculture and associated resource production. This designation is implemented by the Agriculture (AG-20) base zone.

Agriculture/Wildlife (AG/WL)

This designation is applied to areas in the Columbia River lowlands which have the characteristics to support long-term commercially-significant agriculture and are valuable seasonal wildlife habitat. The primary uses in this area are commercial agriculture, wildlife habitat management and recreation. This designation is implemented by the Agriculture/Wildlife (AG/WL) base zone.

Forest Tier I

This designation is applied to those lands which have the physical characteristics that are capable of management for the long-term production of commercially significant forest products and other natural resources such as minerals. This tier is primarily applied to larger parcels and major industrial forestry landowners. The Forest-80 (FR-80) base zone implements this designation.

Forest Tier II

This designation is applied to those lands which have the physical characteristics that are capable of management for the long-term production of commercially significant forest products and other natural resources, such as minerals. The Forest-40 (FR-40) base zone implements this designation.

Previously Developed Agriculture and Forest Zoned Property

Land divisions of remainder or parent parcels created under previous Agriculture or Forest Zoning District “Cluster” provisions, which are now within a resource zone or rural residential zone, cannot further divide until brought into the urban growth area.

Overlays

An overlay zone lies on top of an existing base zone and provides an additional layer of development standards or special provisions in addition to those in the underlying zone. Overlays are used to accomplish a variety of land use and development goals such as:

- Providing design guidelines for a particular area;
- Maintaining current codes while addressing a special need of a particular area within a zone(s);
- Protecting valuable resources, such as historic and natural resources;
- Helping meet goals and objectives of the community;
- Protecting the quality of surface water.

For example, overlays may be applied to protect the historical nature of an area (e.g. materials, façade design, or color). Overlays can manage development in or near environmentally sensitive areas, such as groundwater recharge areas (e.g. to ensure water quality and quantity), special habitat (e.g. species or feature protection) or floodplains (e.g. prevent flood damage). Common

requirements may include building setbacks, density standards, lot sizes, impervious surface reduction and vegetation requirements.

Highway 99 Overlay

This overlay district implements the Highway 99 Sub-Area Plan. Underlying zoning districts remain unchanged, however there are additional or alternative permitted uses and design standards. The overlay district provides for the use of a hybrid form-based code which establishes minimum setback standards, minimum and maximum height standards and different parking requirements and modifies other regulations for the underlying zoning districts within the sub-area.

Mill Creek Overlay

This overlay implements the Mill Creek Sub-Area plan. The overlay provides for special provisions and modifies other regulations for the underlying zoning districts within the sub-area.

Urban Holding Overlay

The Urban Holding Overlay protects areas from premature land division and development that would preclude efficient transition to urban development or large-scale industrial development. The Urban Holding Overlay is implemented by Urban Holding-10 (UH-10) and Urban Holding-20 (UH-20) zoning overlay districts. Removal of the Urban Holding Overlay shall be consistent with the special implementation procedures provided for in Chapter 14.15, Procedure Guidelines. Designation and removal of the overlay is through a Type IV process.

Urban Reserve Overlay

The Urban Reserve Overlay lies on the fringe of the Urban Growth Boundaries and protects areas from premature land division and development that would preclude efficient transition to urban development. These lands are identified as being future additions to Urban Growth Areas and may be added to the urban area as necessary through amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. The Urban Reserve Overlay is implemented by Urban Reserve-10 (UR-10) zoning overlay for future urban residential development and Urban Reserve-20 (UR-20) zoning overlay for all other types of future urban development.

Surface Mining Overlay

This designation is implemented with an overlay zone and recognizes existing mining areas and is to allow for the future mining of minerals in an economically feasible way. Other land use controls which flow from 20-Year Plan policies or state or federal law apply to development proposals that are identified on zoning or other adopted maps but are not specifically identified on the 20-Year Plan Map.

Existing Historic Resort Overlay

This designation is implemented with an overlay zone and recognizes the following existing historic resort: Alderbrook. Criteria for approving additional existing historic resorts through the Annual Review or period plan updates are set forth in RCW 36.70A.362.

Railroad Industrial Overlay

This district is implemented with an overlay zone and recognizes the importance of the County railroad as an economic development asset. The development standards in the overlay closely match those of the County's industrial zoning districts.

Equestrian Overlay

This overlay promotes equestrian activities by allowing the development of communities with a focus on equestrian facilities, access to trails and on sustaining the area's rich equestrian tradition. An equestrian overlay may only be established on parcels located outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.

Freight Rail Dependent Uses Overlay

This designation is implemented with an overlay that identifies parcels where freight rail dependent uses adjacent to the short line railroad may be permitted.

Airport Environs Overlay

This overlay is intended to identify and protect existing and/or future/new general aviation public use airports that have been or may be significantly impacted by adjacent development.

Rural Center Mixed Use Overlay

The rural center mixed use overlay is intended to provide the opportunity for a limited number of residential lots within rural centers to develop with a mix of retail, service, office and residential uses. Maintaining the rural character of rural centers is the paramount goal when considering mixed use development.

Wildland Urban Interface

The county's wildland urban interface/intermix ordinance recognizes that residential and commercial development is occurring in what was once wilderness in Clark County. Urban encroachment has created a high fire hazard in areas where urban development is intermixed and interfaces with the wilderness. These wildland urban interface/intermix geographic areas and associated requirements are defined in the wildland urban interface/intermix ordinance, codified in Clark County Code Title 15 Fire Prevention.

Manufactured Home Park Overlay

The Manufactured Home Park Overlay protects existing and new manufactured home parks within urban growth areas to ensure ongoing viability of this unique form of naturally occurring affordable housing and to minimize displacement risks for residents. The Manufactured Home Park Overlay is implemented by the Manufactured Home Park (MHP) zoning overlay district.

Concurrency

A critical aspect of land development is the availability and delivery of public services needed to serve that development. The GMA reinforces and formalizes this concept, known as concurrency, to require that necessary public services be available as part of the concurrency management program with new development. GMA requires that at minimum, specific levels of service standards for transportation be adopted by local jurisdictions and those development proposals which cannot demonstrate compliance with these adopted service standards be denied. If they so choose, jurisdictions may also adopt levels of service for sewer, water, storm drainage, schools, parks, fire and police.

Further information and policies regarding service concurrency are contained in the applicable element chapters. The establishment of level-of-service standards has a significant impact on future land use development patterns as well as service delivery. Table 6.1 in the Capital Facilities and Utilities Element summarizes generalized service provision anticipated in the urban and rural areas of Clark County. The descriptions are not precise standards to be used for regulatory purposes.

Overburdened Communities

Historical and current land use plans and associated development regulations can have a wide range of impacts in a community, positive and negative. Those impacts may be felt more or less by different populations and/or places. Impacts may also be cumulative, in which multiple impacts are felt by the same population or place.

The WA State Department of Health developed an environmental health disparities map that shows the relative burden of each census tract in the state related to 25 environmental and socioeconomic factors. An overburdened community is a geographic area where vulnerable populations face combined, multiple environmental harms and health impacts, and includes, but is not limited to, highly impacted communities as defined in RCW 19.405.020. A vulnerable population is population groups that are more likely to be at higher risk for poor health outcomes in response to environmental harms, due to adverse socioeconomic factors, such as unemployment, high housing and transportation costs relative to income, limited access to nutritious food and adequate health care, linguistic isolation, and other factors that negatively affect health outcomes and increase vulnerability to the effects of environmental harms; and sensitivity factors, such as low birth weight and higher rates of hospitalization as defined in RCW 36.70A.030. A copy of the WA Environmental Health Disparities (EHD) map (version 3.0) for Clark County is provided in Figure 37. Based on this map, the most burdened census tracts in the unincorporated county are located in the Hazel Dell, Minnehaha, and Five Corners/Orchards areas.^{7, 8}

The Environmental Health Disparities map is consistent with local Clark County Public Health research, plans, and policies. For instance, Clark County Public Health Prioritizing Places, 2024, Clark County Community Health Assessment, and 2024-2029 Clark County Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) all use a health lens to, respectively, identify priority places in the community with poor health outcomes, identify priority community health needs, and identify ways to improve health outcomes. The findings from these projects align with the information illustrated in the environmental health disparities map. In 2020, the Clark County Board of Health adopted Resolution No. 2020-12-05 relating to eliminate systemic racism and health inequities in Clark County. These examples of county work and decisions point to a need for the county to help address the root of persistent community needs and poor health outcomes.

With land use planning, the types of uses allowed in each zone and the compatibility or proximity of different land uses near each other are examples of decisions that can impact community health. Development regulations and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) are additional examples of land use tools that can help avoid or minimize negative environmental health impacts associated

⁷ The WA State Department of Health cautions using the EHD map alone and recommends incorporating community engagement and local data when shaping policies, priorities, and projects.

⁸ Census tracts in Fruit Valley and Washougal also rank high in the unincorporated area, however, most of the population of those census tracts is located within incorporated areas.

1 with land uses. A few examples of land use planning considerations that relate to environmental
2 health impacts include:

- 3 • The county's heavy industrial land use designation and associated zones allow uses that may
4 be incompatible to be located near other types of uses due to negative environmental health
5 impacts related to air quality, extreme heat, noise, or water quality. Planning additional
6 growth to locate near heavy industrial land, or, planning additional heavy industrial land near
7 areas with growth, could potentially worsen health in those communities.
- 8 • Neighborhoods adjacent to busy roadways experience pollution from vehicle exhaust and
9 wear of brakes and tires. These roadways can also contribute to urban heat. Placing
10 additional growth near heavy traffic roadways could expose future residents and workers to
11 diminished air quality, heightened noise, and hotter temperatures, affecting health.
- 12 • The health-related impacts of various land use patterns on spaces used by vulnerable
13 populations, such as schools, childcare centers, senior facilities, and medical centers are
14 important to understand and minimize.

15 Land use designations, associated infrastructure, and development regulations can impact the health
16 outcomes of a community. Ensuring access to green spaces and tree canopy, promoting physical
17 activity through the built environment, and reducing exposure to pollution, especially for
18 overburdened communities, are important protective factors of health. Implementing policies that
19 improve these protective factors for vulnerable populations can help advance environmental justice
20 in the county.

21 **Green Spaces, Urban and Community Forests**

22 GMA specifies that a land use element designates the proposed general distribution and general
23 location and extent of the uses of land, where appropriate, for open spaces and green spaces, urban
24 and community forests within the urban growth area.

25 In addition to parks/open space and public facility land use designations and associated base zones,
26 green spaces and urban and community forests are encouraged through various land use planning
27 tools within the unincorporated urban growth areas, including but not limited to: critical areas
28 ordinances and overlays, the Clark County Comprehensive Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan,
29 green infrastructure such as stormwater management facilities, and urban tree canopy policies.
30 Further information and policies are contained in other, applicable element chapters.

31 The GMA definition for green space focuses on urban parcels less than one acre in size that are
32 vegetated and create public value. Clark County currently has approximately 240 acres of green
33 space in the unincorporated urban growth area that are less than one acre in size, vegetated, and
34 publicly owned. Larger vegetated parcels and privately owned properties in the urban
35 unincorporated growth area are not captured by this metric. See Chapter 7 – Parks, Recreation and
36 Open Space Element for more information on the existing tree canopy in the unincorporated urban
37 growth areas.

Table 1.7 | Acres of Green Space⁹ by Unincorporated UGA

Unincorporated UGA	Acres of Green Space ¹⁰
Battle Ground	3.45
Camas	0.44
La Center	0.79
Ridgefield	0.23
Vancouver	235.00
Total	239.91

Goals and Policies

The 20-Year Plan policies listed in this element directly follow the mandates of the GMA and the Clark County *Community Framework Plan*, adopted by Clark County in May 1993 pursuant to GMA.

Washington State Goals and Mandates

As noted earlier, the GMA lists 14¹⁵ broad goals regarding land use in general, as well as specific mandates regarding the designation of urban growth boundaries and provisions for development within the boundaries. Above all else, the GMA requires more compact growth patterns to allow for more efficient service delivery. GMA requires that a clear distinction be made between urban and rural lands. Participating counties must adopt urban growth boundaries in which urban growth will be encouraged and outside of which only nonurban growth may occur.

Similarly, urban level public services must be in place, or be capable of being provided within the boundaries, but only rural level services should be provided outside the boundaries. The boundaries must be large enough to accommodate urban growth levels projected by the state to occur over a 20-year period and may include areas outside of existing city limits but only if those areas are characterized by existing urban growth or are adjacent to areas of existing urban growth.

In both the urban and rural areas, cities or counties must adopt level-of-service standards for basic services such as transportation, sewer, water and stormwater provisions and must ensure that new development proposals are capable of meeting those levels of service standards. The goals and mandates of the GMA are presented in more detail in the Introduction of the 20-Year Plan.

GMA requires the Land Use Element goals and policies give special consideration to achieving environmental justice including efforts to avoid creating or worsening environmental health disparities. Land Use Elements must reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled, and reduce and mitigate the risk to lives and property posed by wildfires.

Community Framework Plan

Pursuant to the GMA, Clark County adopted the *Community Framework Plan* to establish an overall vision for the long-term growth of Clark County consistent with the GMA and to articulate basic policies related to land use to implement that overall vision. The *Community Framework Plan* also contains policies, which **are very general in nature, and** were adopted to establish a procedure for bridging the gap between the *Community Framework Plan*, **which is very general in nature** and the actual 20-Year Plan policies, which are more specific.

⁹ Green space definition in Table 1.7 is based on RCW 36.70A.030 and does not reflect all vegetated spaces in the unincorporated urban areas in the county

¹⁰ Source: Clark County GIS

Buildable Lands Review and Evaluation Program

The Buildable Lands Review and Evaluation Program, often referred to as the Buildable Lands Program and established in RCW 36.70A.215 and WAC 365-196-315. Amendments to the GMA in 1997 requires Clark County and its cities to collect data on buildable lands and analyze how planning goals are being achieved. The amendments, often referred to as the Buildable Lands Program, require local governments are required to monitor the amount and density of residential, commercial and industrial development that has occurred since adoption of a jurisdiction's Growth Management comprehensive plan. If the results of the seven-year buildable land evaluation reveal deficiencies in buildable land supply within UGA's, Clark County and the cities are required first to adopt and implement reasonable measures that will remedy the buildable land supply shortfall before adjusting UGA boundaries. More information about the Buildable Lands program can be found on the county's website at: [www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/monitoringhttps://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/buildable-lands-report](https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/monitoring/buildable-lands-report).

The Buildable Lands Program, at minimum, should answer the following questions:

- What is the actual density and type of housing that has been constructed in UGA's since the last comprehensive plan was adopted or the last seven-year evaluation completed? Are urban densities being achieved within UGA's? If not, what measures could be taken, other than adjusting UGA's, to comply with the GMA?
- How much land was actually developed for residential use and at what density since the comprehensive plan was adopted or the last seven-year evaluation completed? Based on this and other relevant information, how much land would be needed for residential development during the remainder of the 20-year comprehensive planning period?
- How much land was actually developed for residential use and at what density since the comprehensive plan was adopted or the last seven-year evaluation completed? Based on this and other relevant information, how much land would be needed for residential development during the remainder of the 20-year comprehensive planning period?
- To what extent have capital facilities, critical areas and rural development affected the supply of land suitable for development over the comprehensive plan's 20-year timeframe?
- Is there enough suitable land in Clark County and each city to accommodate countywide population growth for the 20-year planning period?
- Does the evaluation demonstrate any inconsistencies between the actual level of residential, commercial and industrial development that occurred during the seven-year review period compared to the vision contained in Clark countywide planning policies and comprehensive plans and the goals and requirements of the GMA?
- What measures can be taken that are reasonably likely to increase consistency during the subsequent seven-year period, if the comparison above shows inconsistency?

Land Use Element policies

The Land Use Element for 20-year comprehensive plans determines the general distribution and location and extent of the uses of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces and green spaces, urban and community forests within the urban growth area, public utilities, public facilities and other uses. The Land Use Element includes population densities, building intensities and estimates of future population growth. The land use element is to provide for protection of groundwater resources and where applicable, address drainage, flooding and run-off problems and provide for coordinated solutions. The land use element is to advance environmental justice, reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled,

and reduce and mitigate wildfire risk. The following policies are to coordinate the efforts of Clark County and cities in designating land uses, densities and intensities to achieve the pattern described above in their respective Comprehensive Growth Management Plans.

Climate-related goals and policies within this element are noted as helping achieve greenhouse gas reduction [GHG], resilience [RES], or both [GHG, RES]. VMT-reduction policies are tracked in Appendix I.

1.1 Countywide Planning Policies

1.1.1 Clark County, municipalities and special districts will work together to establish urban growth areas within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth may occur only if it is not urban in nature. Each municipality within Clark County shall be included within an urban growth area. An urban growth area may include territory located outside of a city if such territory is characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to areas characterized by urban growth.

1.1.2 The County and relevant jurisdictions will consult with the Cowlitz Indian Tribe where urban growth areas are adjacent to the boundary of the Cowlitz Indian Reservation in order to assure that policies developed in compliance with Chapter 36.70A accommodate the Tribe's and relevant jurisdictions' future growth needs. "Relevant jurisdictions" are defined as those adjacent to and/or affected by the Cowlitz Indian Tribe Reservation.

1.1.3 Urban growth areas shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in Clark County for the succeeding 20-year period.

1.1.4 Urban growth shall be located primarily in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing public facility and service capacities to adequately serve such development and second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served by a combination of both existing public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources. Urban governmental services shall be provided in urban areas. These services may also be provided in rural areas, but only at levels appropriate to serve rural development. Urban governmental services include those services historically and typically delivered by cities or special districts and include storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection, public transit services and other public utilities not normally associated with non-urban areas.

1.1.5 An urban growth area may include more than a single city.

1.1.6 Urban growth is defined as growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of buildings, structures and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of such land for the production of food, other agricultural products, fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources.

1.1.7 Clark County and cities shall review their designated urban growth area or areas in compliance with Chapter 36.70A.215. The purpose of the review and evaluation program shall be to determine whether Clark County and its cities are achieving urban densities within Urban Growth Areas. This shall be accomplished by comparing

the growth and development assumptions, targets and objectives (Appendix K) contained in these policies (and in county and city comprehensive plans) with actual growth and development that has occurred.

1.1.8 Each municipality within Clark County shall annually provide to Clark County parcel specific information on land developed or permitted for building and development in three categories: residential, commercial and industrial. Clark County and municipalities shall follow the guidelines specified in the Plan Monitoring Procedures Report for the collection, monitoring and analysis of development activity and potential residential/employment capacity.

1.1.9 Clark County, in cooperation with the municipalities, shall prepare a Buildable Lands Capacity Report consistent with Chapter 36.70A. The report will detail growth, development, capacity, needs and consistency between comprehensive plan goals and actual densities for Clark County and the municipalities within it.

1.1.10 Clark County and municipalities shall use the results of the Buildable Lands Capacity Report to determine the most appropriate means to address inconsistencies between land capacity and needs. In addressing these inconsistencies, Clark County and municipalities shall identify reasonable measures, other than adjusting urban growth areas that will be taken to comply with the requirements of Chapter 36.70A.

1.1.11 Population projections used for designating urban growth areas will be based upon information provided by the Office of Financial Management, and appropriate bi-state/regional sources.

1.1.12 Interagency Cooperation. Clark County and each municipality will work together to:

- Establish a Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) to develop an ongoing coordination program within the urban growth area; Each jurisdiction, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe and the Southwest Regional Transportation Council may designate one staff representative and an alternate to the TCC.
- Include the Cowlitz Indian Tribe as a member of the Technical Coordinating Committee in order to facilitate interagency planning efforts and intergovernmental coordination;
- Provide opportunities for each jurisdiction to participate, review and comment on the proposed plans and implementing regulations of the other;
- Coordinate activities as they relate to the urban growth area;
- Coordinate activities with all special districts;
- Seek opportunities for joint efforts, or the combining of operations, to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness in service provision; and,
- Conduct joint hearings within the urban growth areas to consider adoption of Comprehensive Plans.

1.1.13 Any local jurisdiction, including the county, may initiate an amendment to or request an interpretation of any Countywide Planning Policy, as follows:

- The local jurisdiction shall submit the proposed amendment or proposed interpretation to the County Manager or their designee (County Manager), and shall include the following in the proposal:

- In the case of an interpretation request, identification of the policy and the exact language of the proposed interpretation; or
- In the case of a proposed amendment,
 - The exact language of the proposed amendment (shown in "strike out" for deletions and "underline" for additions); and
 - An explanation of the need for the proposed amendment, including the factors, data, or analyses that have changed since the adoption of the Countywide Planning Policies and/or the experiences with the existing Countywide Planning Policies that have prompted the proposed amendment; and
 - An analysis of how the proposal meets the criteria in 40.560.010.F through K, or city code, as applicable.
- The county shall initially refer a proposed amendment to or interpretation request regarding the Countywide Planning Policies to the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), (see also in Policy 1.1.12), which shall review the proposal and develop a consensus-based recommendation, as follows:
 - TCC Members shall endeavor to reach agreement on a mutually acceptable course of action regarding a proposed amendment or interpretation request, with decisions made by agreement rather than by majority vote where TCC members agree to support, accept, live with, or agree not to oppose the decision. The TCC can only make recommendations when a majority of members are present. The TCC can only revisit a previous decision if a majority of the TCC agrees.
 - If consensus regarding a proposed amendment or proposed interpretation is not reached, the group will explore whether modifications to that proposal can help achieve consensus. If the TCC still cannot reach consensus, the proposed amendment or interpretation will be forwarded through the remainder of the process along with a summary of the meeting discussion in place of a recommendation.
 - Once the TCC makes a recommendation, or cannot reach consensus, on a proposed amendment, the process continues as follows:
 - The county shall review the proposed amendment utilizing the Type IV docket code amendment procedures as outlined in CCC 40.510.040, 40.560.010 and 40.560.030 for review of the proposal.
 - If approved by the County Council, staff from each jurisdiction shall bring the proposal through their respective jurisdiction's adoption or approval process.
 - Each jurisdiction shall notify the County Manager of the results of its adoption process.
 - If the amendment is considered outside of the periodic review process, each jurisdiction shall consider the amendment in its next annual comprehensive plan update.
 - If the amendment is considered as part of a periodic review process, the timing of the request must reasonably coincide with the overall schedule of the periodic review, or the request will be considered as part of the next amendments docket as outlined in 40.560.030.

1.1.14 Coordination of land use planning and development:

- Clark County and each municipality shall cooperatively prepare land use and transportation plans and consistent development guidelines for the urban area.
- Comprehensive Plans must be coordinated. The comprehensive plan of each county or city shall be coordinated with and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted by other counties or cities with which Clark County or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues. The cities and Clark County shall play partnership roles in the production of plans which provide the opportunity for public and mutual participation, review and comment.
- Conversion of industrial or employment lands to non-industrial or non-employment center districts may occur within the following parameter:
 - Protect and preserve lands zoned heavy industrial for heavy industrial uses.
 - Protect employment center lands from conversion to residential.
 - Consider rezoning of employment center lands to non-retail commercial or business park if the proponent can show that (a) the zone change would accommodate unforeseen and rapidly changing commercial development needs and (b) the proposed designation is more suitable than the current designation given the land's site-specific characteristics and (c) the proposed zone change will generate greater economic benefit jobs at a higher density than the current comprehensive plan zone allocation.
- Urban development shall be limited to areas designated by the urban growth boundary. Clark County and each local jurisdiction urban areas would have a higher average density than currently exists, approximately 4, 6 to 8, units per net residential acre depending on the specific urban area. No more than 75 percent of the new housing stock would be of a single product type (e.g., single-family detached residential or attached multi-family). This would not apply to the Yacolt urban growth area due to wastewater management issues. will plan for and provide housing based on the allocation and at the income levels in the Housing for All Planning Tool (HAPT) in Appendix J.
- The zoning density targets, proposed by each jurisdiction, will be used for estimating capacity in the Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) in Appendix K.

1.1.15 Urban Growth Area Centers (UGA) have a full range of urban levels of services and can be divided into three main categories in the following density tiers:

- **Vancouver Urban Growth Area** is now or will be a major urban area activity centers with a full range of residential, commercial and industrial uses, high-capacity transit corridors, schools, major cultural and public facilities. Major urban areas centers, have or will have, urban densities of development of at least 8 or more units per net residential acre as overall averages. Areas along high capacity transit corridors and priority public transit corridors may have higher than average densities while other areas would have lower densities (e.g. established neighborhoods and neighborhoods on the fringes of the urban area). Regional institutions and services (government, museums, etc.) should be located in the urban core.
- **Urban Growth Areas of Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield and Washougal**, will have a full range of residential, commercial and industrial uses, schools, neighborhood, community and regional parks and are within walking distance to HCT corridors or public transit. These areas will have employment opportunities

and lower densities than a major urban area centers, averaging at least 6 units per net residential acre (4.5 gross units per acre). Higher densities occur along transit corridors and in the community center, with lower densities in established neighborhoods and on the outskirts of the community. These urban growth areas centers should have a center focus that combines commercial, civic, cultural and recreational uses.

- **Urban Growth Areas of La Center and Woodland** will have predominantly residential uses with at least 4 housing units per net residential acre (3 gross units per acre) and includes pedestrian-oriented commercial uses, schools and small parks.
- There are no standards for the **Yacolt Urban Growth Area** due to lack of public sewer. A mix of residential uses and densities are or will be permitted. Neighborhoods are to have a focus around parks, schools, or common areas.

1.1.16 Rural Centers are outside of urban growth areas centers and urban reserve areas and provide public facilities (e.g., fire stations, post offices, schools) and commercial facilities to support rural lifestyles. Rural centers have residential densities consistent with the surrounding rural minimum lot sizes and do not have a full range of urban levels of services.

1.1.17 Establish consistent regional criteria to determine the size of urban growth areas for the 20-year comprehensive plans that:

- Assume the need for residential market factor lands added to the amount called for in the population forecast to build in flexibility.
- include a household size of 2.66 people per household consistent with the Department of Commerce's Housing for All Planning Tool (HAPT);
- conserve designated agriculture, forest or mineral resource lands;
- utilize innovative programs, including the transfer of development rights;
- ensure an adequate supply of buildable land;
- have the anticipated financial capability to provide infrastructure/services needed for the 20-year growth management population projections; and,
- balance industrial, commercial and residential lands.

1.1.18 Establish consistent regional criteria for urban growth area boundaries for the 20-year comprehensive plans that consider the following:

- geographic, topographic, man-made and natural features (such as drainages, steep slopes, riparian corridors, wetland areas, etc.);
- public facility and service availability, limits and extensions;
- jurisdictional and special district boundaries;
- location of designated natural resource lands and critical areas; and,
- minimize split designations of parcels.

La Center UGA

1.1.19 There shall be no net material increase in cardroom capacity within the La Center Urban Growth Area.

1.1.19 Clark County and each municipality shall give special consideration to achieving environmental justice in comprehensive plan goals and policies, including targeted efforts to avoid creating or worsening environmental health disparities and improve health outcomes in all communities. The jurisdictions shall collaborate on environment and health issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries, such as air and water quality.

1.1.20 Clark County and each municipality shall plan for residential neighborhoods that protect and promote the health and well-being of residents by supporting equitable access to parks and open space, safe pedestrian and bicycle routes, clean air, soil and water, fresh and healthy foods, high-quality education from early learning through K-12, affordable and high-quality transit options and living wage jobs and by avoiding or mitigating exposure to environmental hazards and pollutants.

1.1.21 Clark County and each municipality shall evaluate comprehensive plans for potential physical, economic, and cultural displacement of marginalized residents and businesses. Each jurisdiction shall use a range of strategies to mitigate displacement impacts.

1.1.22 Engage and partner with communities disproportionately impacted by planning decisions and practices to inform strategies, actions, regulations and resource allocation decisions that reduce and repair harm to these communities.

1.1.23 Clark County, each municipality, and Clark County Public Health shall collaborate to develop an agreed upon methodology for metrics and tracking outcomes related to improving environmental justice, reducing health disparities, and minimizing displacement. The methodology should acknowledge the complexity of measuring these challenges and the cumulative impacts on populations and places from compounding and intersecting impacts.

1.1.24 Clark County and participating cities shall work cooperatively to adopt a countywide transfer of development rights (TDR) program to support mutually agreed upon conservation goals (i.e., the preservation of agricultural lands) and require that any expansion of any urban growth boundary shall require participation in the program. When Clark County expands an urban growth boundary contingent upon the use of the TDR program, the county and the participating city shall enter into an interlocal agreement that, at a minimum, includes the following provisions:

- Establishing requirements for completing expansions to the urban growth boundaries contingent upon the transfer of development rights from eligible sending areas designated by the county to the receiving areas created by the expansion.
- Setting timelines for full implementation of the transfer of development rights program and any requirements or limitations placed on the expansion area until such a time as a TDR program is implemented.
- Identifying guidelines for monitoring, reporting, and reassessing market conditions.

La Center UGA

1.1.25 There shall be no net material increase in cardroom capacity within the La Center Urban Growth Area.

Cowlitz Indian Tribe

To adequately plan for growth and implement the policies of the Growth Management Act, the county, municipalities, and special districts will consult with the Tribe to create continuous and on-going mechanisms that coordinate regional and local planning as follows:

1.1.26 Meaningful and substantial opportunities for early and continuous tribal government participation in planning.

1.1.27 Local jurisdictions will work with the tribe to develop agreements that provide for discussion on comprehensive planning issues among governments. The parties will jointly determine the appropriate contents of agreements and a schedule for completing them.

1.1.28 The tribe, county, municipalities and special districts are encouraged to coordinate plans among and between governments and agencies to address substantive areas of mutual interest and promote complementary and cooperative efforts.

1.1.29 The county, municipalities, special districts, and tribe are encouraged to keep one another informed about matters of local and regional interest by mutually agreeable means and schedule.

County 20-Year Planning Policies

Goal: Adopt Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries to efficiently accommodate residential and employment increases projected within the boundaries over the next 20 years.

1.2 Policies

1.2.1 The UGAs shall be consistent with the following general goals:

- reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development;
- provide for the efficient provision of public services;
- protect natural resource, environmentally sensitive and rural areas;
- encourage a clear distinction between urban and rural areas;
- maintain densities which support a multi-modal transportation system;
- support variety, choice and balance in living and working environments;
- promote a variety of residential densities; and,
- include sufficient vacant and buildable land.

1.2.2 The UGAs shall be consistent with the following more specific criteria:

- Each UGA shall provide sufficient urban land to accommodate future population/employment projections through the designated planning period.
- Cities shall be located within UGAs. Urban services shall be provided within those areas. Urban services should generally not be provided outside UGAs. (See Chapter 6, Capital Facilities and Utilities for urban and rural services.)

- Lands included within UGAs shall either be already characterized by urban growth or adjacent to such lands.
- Existing urban land uses and densities should be included within UGAs.
- Land within the UGA shall not contain areas designated for long-term agriculture or forestry resource use.
- UGAs shall provide a balance of industrial, commercial and residential lands.
- The UGAs should utilize natural features (such as drainage ways, steep slopes, open space and riparian corridors) to define the boundaries.
- No UGA expansion into the 100-year floodplain of a river segment that is located west of the Cascade crest and when the river has a mean annual flow of 1,000 or more cubic feet per second per RCW36.70A.110(8).
- Each UGA shall have the anticipated financial capability to provide infrastructure/services needed in the area over the planning period under adopted concurrency standards.

Vancouver Urban Growth Area

- 1.2.3 Ensure coordination of environmental protection, preservation and enhancement programs and regulations.
- 1.2.4 Coordinate and cooperate with other governmental agencies, districts and private and commercial interests throughout the Vancouver/Portland Metropolitan area in open space, park and recreation planning and development.
- 1.2.5 Restrict amendments to the urban growth boundary to encourage infill development.
- 1.2.6 Concentrate development in areas already served by public facilities and services. Use the provision or planned provision of public services and facilities as a means of directing development into desirable areas.
- 1.2.7 Water service should be extended throughout the Vancouver urban area in accordance with the timing and phasing established in the Vancouver six-year capital facilities plan. Extension of public water service should not be permitted outside the Vancouver urban area.
- 1.2.8 Encourage retrofitting areas with sewer and prohibit new development on septic tanks in the urban growth area.

Washougal Urban Growth Area

- 1.2.9 Recognizing the authority of the National Scenic Area legislation, as a matter of policy Clark County favors the exclusion of the Washougal UGA from the National Scenic Area.

Yacolt Urban Growth Area

- 1.2.10 The Yacolt Urban Growth Boundary will be reevaluated by Clark County at such time as the Town of Yacolt develops a plan assuring that public sewer will be available.

Woodland Urban Growth Area

1.2.11 Recognizing that the Woodland UGA spans both Cowlitz and Clark Counties, the Clark County Comprehensive Plan and the goals and policies within it only apply to the Clark County portion of the Woodland UGA. The City of Woodland will manage each portion of its UGA according to the respective county's comprehensive plan.

Goal: Encourage more compact and efficiently served urban forms and reduce the inappropriate conversion of land to sprawling, low-density development.

1.3 Policies

1.3.1 Urban densities and uses may occur throughout the urban growth area if it is provided with adequate services. Development and redevelopment in the UGA should be strongly encouraged to occur in greater intensity in major centers, transit routes and other areas characterized by both existing higher density urban development and existing urban services. Development and redevelopment should be encouraged to occur with less intensity in areas where urban development is of lower density or has not yet occurred, or in areas where urban services do not yet exist.

1.3.2 Devise specific policies and standards to promote higher density urban, commercial and mixed-use development and to support pedestrian and transit travel within high-density residential and commercial areas. [GHG, RES]

1.3.3 Encourage and provide incentives for infill development throughout urban areas. [GHG, RES]

1.3.4 Zoning ordinances and other implementing measures shall specify maximum and minimum residential densities with in the residential zoning districts.

1.3.65 Property rights of landowners should be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.

Goal: Integrate land uses to reduce sprawl, promote physical activity through active transportation and foster neighborhood and community identity.

1.4 Policies

1.4.1 Plan for connected and accessible communities in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area where a significant majority of daily needs can be met within a convenient and safe walk, ride, roll, or transit ride by planning for amenity-rich activity centers and corridors, areas of dense, mixed-use urban development, neighborhood-scale commercial opportunities, and safe connections between destinations. [GHG, RES]

1.4.2 Encourage mixed land use in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth area to locate many activities near each other and locate mixed land use near public transit stops. [GHG, RES]

1.4.43 Interrelated uses should generally be encouraged to locate in close proximity of each other:

- Frequently used commercial activities and the residential areas they serve should be allowed and encouraged to locate near to one another.
 - Schools or other frequently used public facilities and the residential areas they serve should be allowed and encouraged to locate near to one another.
 - Commercial, industrial or other employers and the residential areas they serve should be allowed and encouraged to locate near to one another, as long as negative impacts from non-residential uses on the residential areas are mitigated.
- [GHG, RES]

1.4.24 Encourage mixed-use developments, which provide opportunities to combine residential, commercial or other uses within individual structures, or within adjacent structures or developments. [GHG, RES]

1.4.35 Promote the development of identifiable residential neighborhoods and shopping districts through the encouragement of more compact development patterns and the use of shared design and landscaping characteristics and the development of landmarks. [GHG, RES]

1.4.46 Encourage compact commercial development with an appropriate mix of uses. [GHG, RES]

1.4.57 Commercial developments should utilize shared facilities and infrastructure, including but not limited to common wall structures, shared parking lots, access points, sidewalks, signs or innovative design features. [GHG, RES]

1.4.68 Commercial development should be designed and located as follows:

- Features to both allow for and encourage pedestrian access to and between commercial developments and roadways shall be provided.
- Storefront design with zero or minimal front setbacks should be used. Frontal parking should be minimized. Side or rear lot parking should be encouraged.

[GHG, RES]

1.4.79 Higher intensity uses should be located on or near streets served by transit. [GHG, RES]

1.4.810 Streets, pedestrian paths and bike paths should contribute to a system of fully connected routes to all destinations. [GHG, RES]

1.4.911 Access to the transit system should be provided.

- Transit stations should be located at major activity centers and along transit streets and nodes.
- Neighborhoods and commercial nodes should have access to the public transportation system.
- Transit stops should be located within convenient walking distance of residential and employment populations.
- Transit shelters should be provided where appropriate.
- Bicycle parking should be included in commercial, industrial and public facility sites. [GHG, RES]

Goal: Encourage resilient development within the unincorporated urban growth area and away from areas that are prone to climate-related hazards such as flooding and wildfire. (See additional policies related to this goal in Chapter 14 – Climate Element). [RES]

1.5 Policies

1.5.1 Seek to reduce natural hazard exposure through land use planning and ensure that land use planning processes are informed by the most current hazard information including the Clark Regional Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan by: identifying and mapping hazards, assessing vulnerability, and implementing measures to reduce risk, such as avoiding development in floodplains, wildfire-prone areas, and landslide zones to the maximum extent possible, incentivizing climate-smart building practices and fire-wise practices. [RES]

1.5.2 Periodically review the county’s Wildland Urban Interface/Intermix ordinance for consistency with best practices and revise if necessary. [RES]

Goal: Advance environmental justice through the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan and associated plans, policies, development regulations, and strategies. [GHG, RES]

1.6 Policies

1.6.1 Review, evaluate, and update as needed practices, processes, procedures and structures to advance environmental justice through all Comprehensive Growth Management Plan amendments, associated plans, policies, development regulations and strategies per RCW 36.70A.070. [GHG, RES]

1.6.2 Improve sustainability and environmental justice by engaging with overburdened communities on new county-led planning projects. [GHG, RES]

1.6.3 Review county development regulations for polluting and hazardous uses and recommend ways to eliminate or minimize potential harm. [GHG, RES]

1.6.4 Avoid creating or worsening environmental health disparities and work towards eliminating environmental health disparities. [GHG, RES]

1.6.5 Design and implement an unincorporated county anti-displacement strategy to discourage displacement of vulnerable population groups due to gentrification while fostering housing affordability and availability. [GHG, RES]

Strategies

- Review proposals for UGA expansions for consistency with the above policies and the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215.
- Consider the above policies in the evaluation of zone change proposals.
- Encourage urban Planned Unit Developments which allow for better integration of related land uses, such as commercial and residential uses.
- Review zoning and site plan review standards to allow and encourage individual developments containing a mix of uses.

- Develop and adopt plan and Industrial Railroad zoning district with use provisions consistent with land use objectives.
- Review zoning and site plan review standards to encourage the provision of more compact and pedestrian and transit friendly commercial development.

Vancouver Urban Growth Area

- Develop parking standards that reflects the community's desire which should include redevelopment potential of under-utilized parking lot parcels, establishing maximum parking requirements and shared parking.
- Establish city- and county-sponsored neighborhood associations supported by staff liaisons throughout the Vancouver urban area.
- Develop standards for affordable housing which consider parking requirements, vehicle trip generation, levels-of-service, neighborhood character and overall livability.

Chapter 2 Housing Element

Introduction

The purpose of the Housing Element is to identify the need for and mechanisms that will lead to the construction and preservation of decent housing for all economic segments of the Clark County population. Regionallywide in orientation, the Housing Element addresses needs throughout all of Clark County. It sets policy direction for lands under county government jurisdiction, is coordinated to the greatest extent possible with housing policies developed by cities and towns within greater Clark County, and provides practical implementation guidance. The need for mechanisms to ensure a variety of housing prices and neighborhood designs is discussed as well as the types of housing that should be available in the future.

Relationship to other elements and plans

The Housing Element of the 20-Year Plan builds upon principles and policies established in earlier county comprehensive plans. Earlier plans discussed housing primarily in light of its land use implications. This plan addresses housing in broader terms, reaching beyond land use patterns and densities to discuss issues such as affordability, special needs and community character.

The Housing Element also builds upon principles and policy direction provided by the Countywide Planning Policies and the *Community Framework Plan*. These policies, developed through an extensive public participation process, are intended to provide long-term, overall guidance for Clark County and its cities in developing the Housing Element for the 20-Year Plan.

RCW 36.70A.070 outlines GMA climate change and resiliency requirements. Chapter 14 – Climate Element contains most climate change and resilience policies in the Comprehensive Plan, but other elements also include climate policies. Climate-related goals and policies within this element are noted in the goals and policies section of this chapter. See Chapter 14 for a comprehensive discussion of climate policies, some of which overlap with housing.

Clark County Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan

The Housing Element of the 20-Year Plan has a relationship to the Clark County Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (HCD). Each jurisdiction that receives assistance from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is required to prepare a plan that addresses the needs for low-income people. Clark County recently completed a five-year HCD Consolidated plan for 2015-2019 20250-20294 which is designed to:

- provide an assessment of housing, homeless, and community development needs in Clark County;
- Provide an analysis of the housing market;
- identify resources and key players;
- develop strategies and goals to ensure affordable housing and decent living environments for person who earn 80 percent or less of the area's median income (\$58,800 for a family of four— HUD 2015 data), including homeowners, renters, the elderly, families, people with special housing needs and people who are homeless;

- develop strategies and **prioritize** goals to ensure support for programs and facilities that promote viable communities and address community development, infrastructure and human service needs of urban and rural areas; and
- **Develop an annual action plan and descriptive method for distribution of CDBG and HOME funds and to carry out activities in support of this strategic plan for the first year of the Five-Year planning period.**
- report the annual use of HUD entitlement funds.

The Housing Element uses many of the statistics and needs assessments prepared in the **HCD Consolidated Plan**. Implementation of the policies in the Housing Element through ordinances and programs will assist in meeting needs identified in the **HCD Consolidated Plan**.

Special needs populations, such as people who are homeless, people at risk for homelessness, **the frail/elderly older adults**, single parents, physically disabled, victims of domestic abuse, veterans, chronically mentally ill, developmentally disabled, migrant farm workers and persons living with HIV/AIDS or chemical addictions are addressed in both the Housing Element and the **HCD Consolidated Plan**.

Housing affordability is a key component within the Growth Management legislation. Housing affordability will be affected by policies adopted in the other elements including transportation, public facilities, utilities, open space and recreation, land use and (for the county only) rural lands. Likewise, the pattern and density of housing development will affect the cost to the county; to local utilities to extend services such as water lines, sewer lines, transit service, fire protection, etc.; and, ultimately, to the businesses and residents of Clark County in user fees and taxes.

Updates of the county zoning ordinance, land division ordinance, Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), **and Parks Impact Fee (PIF), Schools Impact Fee (SIF), and Fire Impact Fee (FIF)** ordinances and new ordinances and programs created as a result of this planning process, will implement the goals and policies established in the Housing Element. These land use and development ordinances are prepared by the respective municipal jurisdictions and should be reviewed for compatibility with the plan.

Housing Element requirements

The Growth Management Act of 1990 (GMA), as amended, **per RCW 36.70A.070(2) and WAC 365-196-410**, requires that 20-Year Comprehensive Plans have a housing element **ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods** that:

- **Recognizes the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods;**
- **Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth and includes units for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income households; and emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing;**
- **Includes a statement of goals, policies and objectives for the preservation, improvement and development of housing, including single-family residences, and within an urban growth area boundary, moderate density housing options including, but not limited to duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes;**
- **Identifies sufficient capacity of land for housing, including, but not limited to, government assisted housing, housing for moderate, low, very low and extremely low-low income**

families, households, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes, emergency housing, emergency shelters, permanent supportive housing and foster care facilities; and

Makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

The Procedural Criteria for Adopting Comprehensive Plans and Development Regulations for the Act further specify that the Housing Element of the 20-Year Plan (WAC 365-195-310) shall, at a minimum, contain:

- An inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs;
- A statement of the goals, policies and objectives for the improvement, preservation and development of housing;
- Identification of sufficient land for housing, including but not limited to, government assisted housing, housing for low income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing and group homes and foster care facilities; and
- Adequate provision for existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community.

The Act and its Procedural Criteria provide the legislative framework for preparation of the Housing Element.

Organization of the element

The Housing Element consists of three sections: the Background and Existing Conditions section including statistics supporting the county's Housing Element. It summarizes existing conditions and information in Clark County and focuses on inventory data, which support the policy orientation on growth management; 2) the Goals and Policies section, on an issue by issue basis, presents a comprehensive set of goals and policies to guide the implementation of the plan; and 3) the Strategy section consists of a set of planning strategies related to housing in Clark County. See [the Consolidated Plan HCD](#) for additional information on county housing issues.

Background and existing conditions

The housing needs of Clark County are determined by the characteristics of its existing and projected population (age, household size, income, special needs, etc.), when compared to the characteristics of the existing and expected housing supply (size, cost, condition, etc.). Clark County is expected to add approximately 128,586-190,754 people or 48,340-103,698 households over the next twenty years. The issue facing local governments is where to direct this growth given environmental constraints and the cost of providing public services and how to ensure that a range of housing types and prices are available.

Much of the data contained in this section comes from the [HCD Consolidated Plan](#) prepared by Clark County Department of Community Services, and the [Housing Inventory and Analysis: Clark County Unincorporated Vancouver Urban Growth Area](#) which was issued in March 2021 in conjunction with the [Housing Options Study and Action Plan](#).

The [HCD Consolidated Plan](#) is required under the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990. All jurisdictions eligible for funding under this act and wishing to participate in the program

are required to prepare a plan identifying the different types of housing needed in the community and setting priorities for addressing them.

This report also contains data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census for 1990, 2000 and 2010 the years 2016 – 2020, as provided. Between the 2000 and 2010 census, data was being collected through the American Community Survey (ACS). Some of the data previously collected in the decennial census was no longer being asked in the long form decennial census and was only available through the ACS. This makes comparison to previous decennial census information a challenge. The ACS data provided in this report is primarily of the 5-year survey which is more reliable than the 1-year or 3-year survey. In addition to the Consolidated Plan and the ACS, data from the Housing Inventory and Analysis (HIA) report as contained within the larger Housing Options Study and Action Plan is also referenced herein. The HIA's purpose is to summarize quantitative analysis and qualitative information collected through stakeholder interviews to paint a picture of current housing issues in the unincorporated portion of the Study Area. The findings in this report provide a coherent analysis of housing supply, demand, needs, and preferences throughout the Study Area to provide context for evaluating potential actions.

Population

Table 2.1 shows the population trends of the cities and unincorporated areas of Clark County from 1990-2010 to 2025. There has been a significant increase in the overall population of the county in the last two and a half decades 15 years. Clark County population has increased approximately 90 percent in population since 1990 with a 30.18 percent increase since 2010, based on the decennial census.

Table 2.1 | Population Trends in Clark County, 1990-2025

Area	1990	2000	2010	2015	2020	2025
Clark County	238,053	345,238	425,363	451,820	503,311	542,400
Unincorporated	173,844	166,305	203,339	214,585	233,048	245,750
Incorporated	64,209	178,933	220,024	237,235	270,263	296,650
Battle Ground	3,758	9,322	17,571	19,250	20,743	22,790
Camas	6,798	12,534	19,355	21,210	26,065	27,970
La Center	483	1,654	2,800	3,100	3,424	4,270
Ridgefield	1,332	2,147	4,763	6,400	10,325	16,290
Vancouver	46,380	143,560	161,791	170,400	190,915	205,100
Washougal	4,764	8,595	14,095	15,170	17,039	18,360
Woodland*	94	92	83	85	84	85
Yacolt	600	1,055	1,566	1,620	1,668	1,785

Sources: OFM Forecasting, State of Washington web site. The 2010, 2015 and 2025 population numbers are based on April 1, 2020 estimates. Note: * The portion of the City of Woodland population that resides in Clark County.

This growth has occurred in both unincorporated areas and in cities. The unincorporated areas had a 23 percent increase in population since 1990 and 15% of the overall increase occurring between 2010 and 2020 a 4.4 percent decrease between 1990 and 2000. This decrease is in large part due to a large annexation of previously developed unincorporated Clark County into Vancouver in 1997. Incorporated areas of the county grew substantially in the past twenty five fifteen years, increasing by 269 percent since 1990, and 33.23 percent since 2010. By 2025, the county anticipates a population increase of 128,586 190,754 or a 36.42 percent increase over the 2015 census count of 425,363 451,820 with estimating a total population of 577,431 718,154.

Age

Table 2.2 shows the changes in the distribution of the age of the county's population since 1990. The data shows the largest population group for 2020 are children persons aged 0-19 (129,915). Persons aged 40-59 were the next largest group (130,003). Clark County's population continues to be family households with children. Housing policy should make efforts to address the needs of this significant population.

Table 2.2 | Age Distribution of Clark County Residents, 1990-2010-2020

Age	1990	2000	2010	2020	% Change 1990- 2020	% Change 2000- 2020
0-19	74,164	108,037	123,429	129,915	46%75%	445%
20-39	75,080	97,649	108,959	130,267	30%44%	4220%
40-59	54,623	95,130	120,008	130,003	74%138%	268%
60-85+	34,186	44,422	72,967	113,126	30%231%	5055%
Total	238,053	345,238	425,363	503,311	45%111%	2318%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census; Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management,
Corrected 1990 Population by County by 5-Year Age Groups, State of Washington, April, 2000.

Comparing percentage change data provides insight into future growth trends. The largest percentage increase occurred in the 60-85+ group, reflecting the aging of the baby boomer generation. This trend will continue and require more attention be paid to the housing needs of an aging population. Young adults may find themselves increasingly pushed out of Clark County's market, compared to persons aged 40-59 who may have more financial ability to pay for housing.

Race and Ethnicity

According to the 2020 U.S. Census, the total minority population represents 15.27 percent (44,747) of the county's population, up from 15.7 percent in 2010. The HCD Consolidated Plan (2025-2029) contains information on special populations and their housing needs in 2000. It reviewed the percentage of minority persons in each census tract and found no concentrations of minority persons in any one area of the county. In recent years, there has been an influx of immigrants from Eastern Europe and Russia into Clark County. These new residents, while not racial minorities, are a distinct ethnic community. Their housing needs are being met by the private market, although they may require assistance adjusting to their new communities. Table 2.3 shows the distribution of population by race in Clark County in 1990-2000 and 2020. From 2000 to 2010, the Hispanic population in Clark County also substantially increased from 4.7 percent (16,248) to 7.6 percent (32,166).

Table 2.3 | Clark County Population by Race and Ethnicity

Race and Ethnicity	Total Persons 2000	% of County Population 2000	Total Persons 2010	% of County Population 2010
White	366,648	89.0%	363,397	85.4%
Black	5,813	1.7%	8,426	2.0%
Native American	2,910	0.8%	3,624	0.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander*	12,369	3.6%	20,212	4.7%
Two or More Races	10,641	3.1%	17,219	4.0%
Hispanic	16,248	4.7%	32,166	7.6%
Other Race	6,857	2.0%	12,485	2.9%
Total**	345,238	100%	425,363	100%

Race and Ethnicity	Total Persons 2000	% of County Population 2000	Total Persons 2010	% of County Population 2010	Total Persons 2020	% of County Population 2020
White	306,648	89.0%	363,397	85.4%	366,727	72.86%
Black	5,813	1.7%	8,426	2.0%	10,850	2.16%
Native American	2,910	0.8%	3,624	0.9%	3,051	0.61%
Asian/Pacific Islander *	2,369	3.6%	20,212	4.7%	29,037	5.77%
Two or More Races	10,641	3.1%	17,219	4.0%	32,320	6.42%
Hispanic	6,248	4.7%	32,166	7.6%	58,790	11.68%
Other Race	6,857	2.0%	12,485	2.9%	2,536	0.50%
Total**	345,238	100%	425,363	100%	503,311	100%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, **2020 Decennial Census**. * Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander were separated from Asian in 2010 and accounts for .6% of total (2,708) persons **Hispanic is considered ethnicity, not a separate race category and is not included in total percentage.

Households

A household **is includes** all **of** the people living in one housing unit, whether or not they are related. A single person renting an apartment is a household, **just** as is a family living in a single-family house. The number and type of households in a community can indicate the housing needs of that community. Table 2.4 gives historic information on the numbers of households in Clark County and each of its cities. As is the case with population, most of the household growth has occurred in incorporated communities **over the past 20 since 2010 years**.

Table 2.4 | Number of Households in Clark County, **1980-20101990-2020**

Jurisdiction/Area	1990	2000	2010	2020	% Change 1990-2020	% Change 2010 - 2020
Total Clark County	88,571	127,208	167,413	195,036	120.20%	16.50%
Total Incorporated Clark County	26,630	69,129	91,915	110,468	314.83%	20.18%
Total Unincorporated Clark County	61,941	58,079	75,498	84,568	36.53%	12.01%
Battle Ground	1,341	3,071	5,952	7,449	455.48%	25.15%
Camas	2,438	4,480	7,072	9,234	278.75%	30.57%
La Center	129	552	981	1,248	867.44%	27.22%
Ridgefield	441	739	1,695	3,688	736.28%	117.58%
Vancouver	20,135	56,638	70,005	81,809	306.30%	16.86%
Washougal	1,898	3,294	5,673	6,444	239.52%	13.59%
Woodland (part)	49	46	53	55	12.24%	3.77%
Yacolt	199	319	484	541	171.86%	11.78%

Jurisdiction/Area	1990	2000	2010	Change 1990-2000	Change 2000-2010
Total Clark County	88,571	127,208	167,413	+38,637	+40,205
Total Incorporated Clark County	26,630	69,129	91,915	+42,499	+22,786
Total Unincorporated Clark County	61,941	58,079	75,498	-3,862	+17,419
Battle Ground	1,341	3,071	5,952	+1,730	+2,881
Camas	2,438	4,480	7,072	+2,042	+2,592
La Center	129	552	981	+423	+429

Ridgefield	441	739	1,695	+298	+956
Vancouver	20,135	56,638	70,005	+36,493	+3,367
Washougal	1,898	3,294	5,673	+1,396	+2,379
Woodland (part)	49	46	53	3	+7
Yacolt	199	319	484	+120	+165

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Intercensal Estimates of Housing Units, Washington State Office of Financial Management.

The county's growth patterns will change as a result of adopting this plan to implement the GMA. Household growth, like population growth, will be directed to cities or urban growth areas which will eventually be annexed to cities. If growth patterns in the future are similar to those of the past, households in rural areas will be larger on average than those in urban areas, by approximately 10 percent. Table 2.5 shows the county's household growth patterns since 1980.

Table 2.5 Household Characteristics in Clark County, 1980-2020

Year	Total Households	Persons Per Household	Senior Households	Non-Senior Households
1980	68,750	2.76	11,086	57,664
1990	88,571	2.66	15,243	73,328
2000	127,208	2.69	23,131	104,077
2010	158,099	2.67	35,395	122,704
2020	178,478	2.68	52,580	125,898

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Washington Office of Financial Management.

Income

The relationship of household income to housing prices is the main factor affecting the ability of Clark County's residents to secure adequate housing. Table 2.6 compares median household incomes for Clark County and each of the cities. Median income is defined as the mid-point of all of the reported incomes; that is, half the households had higher incomes and half the households had lower incomes than the mid-point, with the county median household income very similar to the statewide average.

Table 2.6 | Median Household Incomes in Clark County, 1990-2020

Jurisdiction/Area	2000	2010	2020	% Change 2000-2020	% Change 2010-2020
Total Clark County	\$48,376	\$58,262	\$77,184	60%	32%
Battle Ground	\$45,070	\$57,134	\$89,626	99%	57%
Camas	\$60,187	\$77,334	\$99,917	66%	29%
La Center	\$55,333	\$71,522	\$96,151	74%	34%
Ridgefield	\$46,012	\$76,295	\$102,508	123%	34%
Vancouver	\$41,618	\$48,875	\$70,385	60%	44%
Washougal	\$38,719	\$61,121	\$89,608	131%	47%
Yacolt	\$39,444	\$53,452	\$76,429	94%	43%
Washington State	\$45,776	\$57,244	\$77,006	68%	35%

Jurisdiction/Area	2000	2010	2020	% Change 2000-2010	% Change 2010-2020
Total Clark County	\$48,376	\$58,262	\$77,184	20%	32%
Battle Ground	\$45,070	\$57,134	\$89,626	27%	57%
Camas	\$60,187	\$77,334	\$99,917	28%	29%
La Center	\$55,333	\$71,522	\$96,151	29%	34%
Ridgefield	\$46,012	\$76,295	\$102,508	65%	34%
Vancouver	\$41,618	\$48,875	\$70,385	17%	44%
Washougal	\$38,719	\$61,121	\$89,608	58%	47%
Yacolt	\$39,444	\$53,452	\$76,429	35%	43%

Washington State	\$45,776	\$77,244	25%
------------------	----------	----------	-----

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

The definitions of extremely low, very low and moderate-income households are established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). These terms are based on a percentage of the area's median household income for a family of four. They are used to evaluate income levels in Clark County. Table 2.7 shows the numbers of households in each income category for 2000 and 2012.

Table 2.7 | Households by Income Group in Clark County, 2000–2012

INCOME GROUP	2000			
	OWNER- OCCUPIED	PERCENT OF TOTAL	# HOUSEHOLDS (COMBINED)	PERCENT OF TOTAL
EXTREMELY LOW INCOME (<= 30% HAMFI) (LESS THAN 50% OF MEDIAN)	7,970	23%	33,715	24%
VERY LOW INCOME (>30 TO <= 50% HAMFI) (50% TO 80% OF MEDIAN)	9,595	16%	19,780	18%
LOW INCOME (>50% TO <= 80% HAMFI) (81% TO 95% OF MEDIAN)	20,075	16%	36,200	20%
MODERATE INCOME* (>80% TO <= 100% HAMFI) (MIDDLE AND UPPER INCOME* (MORE THAN 95% OF MEDIAN))	14,245	53%	21,210	50%
MIDDLE AND UPPER INCOME* (>100% HAMFI)	70,665	16%	87,270	47%
MEDIAN INCOME**	\$48,376		\$70,786	

Source: 2000-2012 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS). * 2008-2012 CHAS data for moderate income parameter changed to >80% to <=100 HUD Adjusted Median Family Income (HAMFI); Middle and Upper Income is >100% HAMFI ** 2008-2012 CHAS data uses estimates of median family income for the Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

Extremely low-income households include households whose incomes are 30 percent of median and below. Very low-income households are those whose incomes are less than 50 percent of the area's median family income. In 2000, a family of four making between \$14,513 and \$24,188 fell into this category for a total of 26,902 households or 23 percent. For 2012, a family of four making less than \$35,393 fell into this category. This represents a two percent decrease in the number of families with very low incomes between 2000 and 2012 but this constitutes more than one-fifth of the county's households. Low-income households are those whose incomes are between 50 percent and 80 percent of the area's median family income. A family of four making between \$24,188 and \$38,704 fell into this category. There were 21,970 households (16 percent of the total) that were defined as low income in 2000. In 2012, a family of four making between \$35,393 and \$56,629 fell into this category for a total of 28,970 households, or 18 percent. This represents a two percent increase in the number of families with low incomes between 2000 and 2012. Together, in 2012 low income and very low income households constituted 39 percent of the county's households.

Moderate-income households are those whose incomes are between 80 percent and 100 percent of the area's median family income. In 2000, a family of four making between \$31,800 and \$50,313 fell into this category. There were 10,966 households (approximately 12 percent of the total) that were defined as moderate income in 2000. In 2012, a family of four making between \$57,337 and \$70,786 fell into this category. This represents a 3 percent increase in

the number of moderate income families between 2000 and 2012. Together, in 2012 moderate, low and very low-income households constituted over 50 percent of Clark County's households.

Percent of Income Spent on Housing

HUD defines housing cost burden as the extent to which gross housing costs, including utility costs, exceed 30 percent of gross income, based on data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. This is the threshold at which the cost of housing typically becomes a burden. At this point the money available for other necessary expenses such as food and medical care is reduced.

Generally, upper income households can afford a higher percentage of income for housing than can lower income households. The percentage of income spent on housing increases as income decreases. The lowest income households are, therefore, most likely to be overpaying for housing relative to their income and in need of assistance.

The HCD Consolidated Plan notes that between 2000 and 2020, the median home value increased from \$153,100 to \$254,200, a 66% increase. During the same time period, the median contract rents increased from \$606 to \$1,375 per month; a 28% increase.¹ The median sale prices are still increasing faster than wages in the county. This means that more and more people are being priced out of the market. Based on the projected increases in housing costs, new housing could be unaffordable to extremely low, very low, low income and moderate-income households of Clark County.

Special Housing Needs

Some people in Clark County need modified housing units or special services in order to live independently. Other people require living in a group home or institutional environment. While some of these people will have the resources to take care of their needs, many will not. The HCD Consolidated Plan identified these special housing needs populations in Clark County and made recommendations for serving those needs.

Physically Challenged Persons

- **Physically Challenged:** The US Census Bureau, 2010-2014 ACS 5-year estimate identifies approximately 34,603 people under the age of 64 have a disability, mobility and/or self-care limitations.
- **Frail Elderly:** The 2015 – 2020 ACS indicates that in 2012, 37 percent of Clark County seniors report having a disability (ACS 2010-2012).
- **Developmentally Disabled:** As of 2015, the Clark County Department of Community Services estimates that there are approximately 7,926 persons (1.7 percent of the 2020 county population) with developmental disabilities in the county. As of 2015, there are 2,373 individuals known to the state Developmental Disabilities Administration who are eligible to receive state funded services. (see Developmental Disabilities Comprehensive Plan 2010-2014/2021-2025)

The majority of the housing need for physically challenged persons is among the elderly older adults. These people may need special housing with ramps instead of stairs, elevators for units with two or more stories and modified facilities. The federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990

¹ Per the Washington Center for Real Estate Research website ([County Dashboard – Real Estate Research](#))

requires changes to building and zoning codes that to improve access for disabled persons. These codes will apply to new construction and to major rehabilitation or remodeling of existing units.

Experience in states which have had similar legislation for the past decade indicates that adaptations to ensure accessibility and mobility for the disabled add less than \$1,000 on average to the cost of new multi-family housing. It, notably, is more expensive and not always possible to modify an existing unit for handicapped accessibility. Older units, particularly older multi-family structures, are very expensive to retrofit for disabled occupants because space is rarely available for modifications such as elevator shafts, ramps and widened doorways. Much of the existing multi-family housing (traditionally the more affordable housing) cannot economically be modified to meet the needs of disabled residents.

Senior Citizens

Senior citizens are defined as people over age 65, according to the US Census, and. The elderly are generally considered a special needs group because of the high correlation between age and disability. Also, many older adults seniors live on a fixed income, and. They cannot afford higher rents, and if they own their own home, they may not be able to afford the cost of increasing taxes or maintenance. A fixed income also may not permit them to rent a new apartment in a new facility that would provide them with a full range of care services.

In 2020, there were 48,710 senior citizens living in Clark County. Of which, 88.70 percent (33,002) of senior citizens live in family households headed by people over age 65 -Table 2.8. Another 26.24 percent (12,604) live alone and 4 percent (2,960) live with non-relatives. At least 2 percent (1,172) of the senior citizens live in group quarters (e.g. nursing or retirement homes) and 4 percent (1,932) live with family or friends.

Table 2.8 | Senior Citizens Housing Arrangements in Clark County, 2020

Household Type	Total Numbers of Persons	Percent of Total
Family Household	33,002	68.70
Non-Family Households	14,536	30.28
Living Alone	12,604	24
Group Quarters	1,172	2
Total	48,710	100

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2016-2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

The population of elderly residents is increasing and will continue to increase through the end of the decade. In addition, people are living longer and the number of people over 75 is increasing. Currently, The 2020 census reports that there are 55,192 persons over the age of 75 living in Clark County, an increase of 20,628 persons, a 167% increase from as recorded in the 2010 census over the age of 75 living in Clark County. The majority of the elderly populations prefer to live independently in family units or alone. This population would be well served by a variety of housing types that lend themselves to smaller, affordable and accessible rental and housing units. Elderly persons who live with family or friends might benefit from zoning provisions that allow for another, smaller unit to be built on single-family lots.

Homeless Persons

HUD defines "homeless" as those persons or families which "(1) lack a fixed, regular and adequate nighttime residence; or (2) Individual or family who will imminently lose their primary nighttime

residence; (3) Unaccompanied youth under 25 years of age, or families with children and youth, who do not otherwise qualify as homeless under this definition; and, (4) any individual or family who is fleeing, or is attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions and has no other residence, and lacks the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.² whose nighttime residence is a public or private emergency shelter, an institution that provides temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized, or a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings." This definition does not include persons forced to live with friends or relatives, in unsafe or inappropriate housing. This definition also excludes recently homeless persons who are in transitional housing programs but have not yet attained housing self-sufficiency.

The Council for the Homeless notes in the 2023 Homeless Crisis Response System Report that the fastest growing groups of homeless persons in Clark County are categorized as Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC), representing 42% of the people who were homeless. two parent families with children, single women with children, single persons and older adults. The Emergency Shelter Clearinghouse Council for the Homeless operates a referral hotline from 9:00 am until 8:00 pm seven days a week to refer homeless persons to available shelter.

Families with Children: This is one of Clark County's largest un-housed populations. Both single and two parent families are sheltered in all except one shelter facility on a space available basis. Most shelters allow a 30-day stay.

Youths: Of the 8,752 people who experienced homelessness in Clark County in 2023, 737 were Youth ages 12-17, and 735 were Young Adults ages 18-24. Combined that means 16% of people experiencing homelessness in 2023 were aged 12–24. Southwest Washington had no community-based services to help homeless and runaway at risk youth and their families, which led to the opening of the area's first ever emergency shelter in 1996. The Oak Bridge and Oak Grove Youth shelters assist more than 385 youth in crisis every year. **Domestic Violence:** There is currently one emergency shelter (28 spaces) in Clark County for victims of domestic violence. In 2014, Safe Choice, the domestic violence shelter, provided 5,115 bed nights of emergency shelter. As reported in their 2025 audited financial statement, the SafeChoice Domestic Violence Program served 1,165 unduplicated survivors of domestic violence and responded to 10,590 calls to our 24-hour crisis line during the 2025 fiscal year. The emergency shelter provided up to 9,486 bed nights for 51 adults and 72 children.

Aging Adults: In 2023, adults aged 55+ experiencing homelessness decreased by 4% from 2022. To support this positive shift and continue the downward trend, the addition of more focused senior programs, should be considered.

Based on this information, homeless persons have a significant need for housing in Clark County. Housing policies should address the needs of this population, as well as the needs of persons at 30 percent of area median income and below. Since some homeless families and individuals have disabilities or require a period of extra support, a strategy should include permanent supportive housing.

² See Federal Title 24 CFR 578.3

Projected Household Growth

The population growth forecast of OFM is translated into approximately 48,340 additional households who will be seeking housing in Clark County by the year 2045. Table 2.9 highlights the percent change of 10 years and the average annual change within the county. Based on growth projections from the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM), the county will grow at a rate of 1.426 percent per year. The characteristics of these households are likely to change over the period covered by the 20-Year Plan as the population of the county, the state and the United States as a whole age. In 1990, households with elderly heads made up 6.417.5 percent of the total households. In 2020, the number of households with elderly heads increased to 25.41 percent. Projections indicate that elderly households will increase to 17.5 percent of the total in 2040, almost a threefold increase.

Table 2.9 | Population Trends, 1950-2045 in Clark County

Year	Total Population	10-year Increase	10-year % Change	Average Annual % Change
1950	85,307	NA	NA	NA
1960	93,809	8,502	10.0	1.0
1970	128,454	34,645	36.9	3.7
1980	192,227	63,773	49.6	2.0
1990	238,053	45,826	23.8	2.4
2000	345,238	107,185	45	4.7
2010	425,363	80,125	23.2	2.1
2020	527,400	102,037	19.3	1.9
2035-2045	577,437	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	54			

Sources: Washington State Office of Financial Management, April 1 Intercensal and Postcensal Estimates of the Total Resident Population by Year 1968-2002; Washington State Growth Management Population Projections for Counties: 2010 to 2040

Housing Resources

Table 2.10 shows the number and type of housing units in Clark County for the period 1980-2010-2020. The total number of housing units in Clark County in 2010 was 169,520. Single family homes make up 73 percent (122,935) of this stock. Multi-family homes constitute 22 percent (38,096) of this stock. Manufactured homes make up 4.7 percent (8,031) of the housing stock of Clark County.

Table 2.10 | Number of Housing Types in Clark County, 1990-2010-2020

Housing Types	1990	2010	2020
Single Family Units*	63,684	94,664	122,935
Multi-Family Units	21,033	30,217	38,096
Manufactured/Mobile Home Units**	7,520	8,833	8,031
Unknown	645	346	458
Total Units	92,849	134,030	169,520
	34,030	69,520	78,478

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census * Includes attached and detached units and 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year Estimates **The ACS uses the term mobile home instead of manufactured

Using 1990-2010-2020 figures, the total number of housing units in the county has risen by 267.29 percent since 2010 and 833 percent since 1990. The number of single family units has

risen 308.15 percent since 2000 and 9340.45 percent since 1990. Multi-family units have increased in number by 26 percent since 2000 and 8126.86 percent since 1990. Manufactured (and other) housing has shown the smallest increasea decrease of 17-21.48 percent over 1990-2000 figures but moreand an additional decrease of significantly a 15.37 percent declinesince 2000.

County funding for affordable housing

Clark County utilizes Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Funds (HOME) for funding of capital projects related to affordable housing, and state Consolidated Homelessness Grant (CHG) and local Document Recording Fees (DRF) for operating funds for shelters, transitional, and permanent housing.

Oversight for CDBG and HOME funds is provided by the Urban County Policy Board (UCPB), which is composed of elected public official from each local government outside City Vancouver, or a designated alternate. The UCPB adopts procedures and criteria for the allocation of HOME and CDBG funds; reviews and recommends proposals for funding; reviews Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. Proposals for funding are received through a competitive public solicitation that takes place on an annual cycle. The public solicitation make available the annual allocation of CDBG and HOME funds of approximately \$1,500,000 of CSBG and \$600,000 of HOME funds. A program history of CDBG funded projects can be found on the Community Services CDBG web page at <https://clark.wa.gov/community-services/community-development-block-grant> and a program history of HOME funded projects can be found on the Community Services HOME webpage at <https://clark.wa.gov/community-services/home-investment-partnerships-program>.

Oversight of the CHG and DRF funds allocated as operating funds for shelters, transitional, and permanent housing is provided by the Clark County Council, under the advice of the Community Action Advisory Board (CAAB). The CAAB is composed of elected public official from each local government outside City Vancouver, or a designated alternate. The role of the CAAB is to advocate on behalf of people who are low-income to ensure services are available and equitable and reviews and recommends proposals related to homeless housing and services for funding. Proposals for funding are received through a competitive public solicitation for proposals that takes place on a three-year cycle. The amount of funding available in the solicitation varies, depending on the CHG amount the County receives from the State as well as the local collection of DRF which is contingent on real estate transactions. Over the past couple of years, Clark County has received an average of \$14,000,000 per year in CHG funds from the State and collected almost \$6,000,000 per year in local DRF. Detailed revenue and expenditure reporting per year, as well as reporting on outcomes can be found in the CAAB Meeting Documents section of the Community Services CAAB webpage at <https://clark.wa.gov/community-services/caab-community-action-advisory-board>.

In 2026, the Clark County Council approved a 0.1 percent sales tax that will generate about \$6.5 million a year for affordable housing and behavioral health services. The tax revenues can be used for the construction, acquisition and maintenance of affordable housing for those who make 60 percent of the area median income or less.

In the spring of 2003, Clark County memorialized the recommendations to dedicate document recording fees to affordable housing as presented by community stakeholders. This funding source was developed as a result of House Bill 2060, which was passed by the Washington State Legislature during the 2002 session. SB 2060 established a dedicated source of revenue for affordable housing, a \$10 recording fee. The fees are collected by County Auditor who may retain up to 5 percent for

administration. The remaining funds are split into two categories. Sixty percent (60%) of the funds are to go to local jurisdictions for the sole use of housing for people between 0–50% of the area median income. The remaining 40 percent goes to the Department of Commerce for allocation of operational support to state funded projects that service households from 0–30% of the area median income.

The CDBG and HOME Program staff hosted two community meetings to solicit recommendations for the use of the local funding. The total is estimated to be \$750,000 annually. The community group developed the following recommendations regarding the distribution of funds:

Capital funds for transitional and permanent housing: Thirty percent (30%) of the funds would be used for development of transitional and permanent housing, including acquisition and rehab or new construction costs. New construction is only an eligible use if vacancy rates are under 10%. The document recording fee revenues can leverage other capital resources such as HOME and CDBG.

Operating funds for shelters, transitional and permanent housing: Forty percent (40%) of the funds would be used to maintain the current level of shelter services, provide operating subsidies to transitional or permanent housing providers, or rental assistance vouchers to private for profit and non-profit housing providers.

Creation of a Local Housing Bond: Approximately 1/3 (a flat \$250,000) per year of the available revenue would be used to purchase a 10-year low income housing bond. Bond proceeds, estimated at approximately \$2,000,000, will be deposited in an interest bearing account for the purpose of land or housing acquisition. The land banking approach, made possible with the bond, would allow Clark County to secure property while costs and interest rates are as low as they are likely to be in the foreseeable future. This bonding mechanism would also assist Clark County and the cities within the county to meet their housing goals as outlined in the Growth Management Act, including goals for affordable housing.

The Clark County Housing Review Board (CHRB), a local group of citizens appointed by the county, was given responsibility for oversight of the Clark County funds associated with SB 2060. The county approved the plan and goals designed by the CHRB. In response to the approved plan, staff worked with stakeholders to implement the plan goals.

Manufactured housing is a major source of affordable housing in Clark County. Manufactured housing units are distinguished from "mobile homes" because they are more durable and less mobile in nature. Once manufactured housing units are sited they are rarely moved. Additionally, manufactured housing meets HUD standards, which makes it possible to get a loan to purchase a new manufactured home with little or no down payment. The buyer can also purchase the land to site the manufactured home on contract with little down payment. This is a very attractive option for those with little savings.

Housing Tenure

Table 2.11 shows housing units by type of occupancy over time. In 2020, five percent (9,314) of the total units were vacant. This is typically, six percent is considered a normal or healthy vacancy rate. The remaining 95 percent units (158,099) were occupied. Of these, 66 percent (104,003) of the units in Clark County were owner-occupied. The remaining 34 percent (54,096) were occupied by renters.

Table 2.11 | Number of Housing Units by Occupancy Type in Clark County, ~~1980-2000~~ 2000-2020

Housing Occupancy Type	2000	2010	2020
Total Housing Units	134,030	167,413	186,317
Vacant Units	6,822	9,314	7,839
Occupied Units	127,208	158,099	178,478
Owner-Occupied Units	85,550	104,003	119,725
Renter Occupied Units	41,658	54,096	58,753

Housing Occupancy Type	1990	2000	2010
Total Housing Units	92,849	134,030	167,413
Vacant Units	4,409	6,822	9,314
Occupied Units	88,440	127,208	158,099
Owner-Occupied Units	56,872	85,550	104,003
Renter Occupied Units	31,568	41,658	54,096

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Housing Costs

The ~~HCD Consolidated Plan report~~ notes that affordable housing is generally associated with an adequate supply of older housing. The ~~2000~~ 2020 Census indicated that Clark County has ~~over 7,481~~ approximately 6,693 housing units that were built in 1939 or earlier. This is ~~2.94~~ 3 percent of the current housing stock. ~~There are 5,063 owner-occupied units and 2,418 rental units that were built in 1939 or earlier.~~ Future affordability will be greatly affected by market conditions. However, it can be assumed that existing older housing stock will continue to provide many of the more affordable units in the future, unless there is some form of public intervention in helping to reduce the costs of new units.

Rental Costs

Table 2.12 shows the average rental costs for the Vancouver area for the period of ~~2011-2016~~ for the years 2015, 2020, and 2025. The data reflects ~~modest~~ an average rental increase for each size of unit ~~from between 2011-2015~~ 2015-2020 of 59 percent. Between 2020 and 2025, the region saw another ~~and then~~ a large increase of approximately ~~2732~~ 91 percent in the ~~2016 rental data~~ rental data for one, two, and three-bedroom units. This 91 percent rent increase in this 10-year time ~~ere is a much larger increase across the board in 2016 that seems to more~~ accurately reflects the housing affordability crisis.

Table 2.12 | Fair Market Rents in ~~the~~ Clark County, ~~2010-2015~~ 2015, 2020, and 2025

Year	One Bedroom	Two Bedroom	Three Bedroom
2014 2015	\$783 \$793	\$905 \$944	\$1,318 \$1,391
2012 2020	774 1,289	891 1,495	2,157 2,297
2013 2025	756 1,750	912 1,997	1,344 2,739
2014	774	922	1,359
2015	793	944	1,391
2016	\$1,024	\$1,208	\$1,757

Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development

FY2011-2016 Fair Market Rent, ~~for the Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA MSA~~

Renters in Clark County are diverse. For some moderate and upper income households, renting is a choice despite the fact that they have the financial means to buy a home. For some young

households, renting is a stepping stone to future homeownership. For many low and moderate-income households, however, renting is the only financially feasible choice due to the high cost of ownership, including initial investment costs. The rising cost of renting has the greatest effect on the most vulnerable of Clark County's population. Once rents get too high, low-income households are forced to double up with family members, live in an apartment that is far away from their job, school, or social networks or sometimes are even forced into homelessness.

Subsidized Housing

According to HCD the Consolidated Plan, rent assistance programs are available to assist only a portion of the 4,325,575 low-income renter households in need of rent assistance Clark County. Single person non-elderly (or non-disabled) households are not eligible for assisted housing under the programs now offered in the county.

The Vancouver Housing Authority (VHA) administers rental assistance vouchers for about 3,500 Clark County households. That includes both tenant-based vouchers as well as project-based vouchers. VHA and partner nonprofits also own and or manage about 400 subsidized apartments through the HUD 202, HUD 811, and New Construction Section 8 programs.

The Vancouver Housing Authority (VHA) serves a total of 3,153 Clark County households with rental assistance and subsidized housing. The VHA owns 1,054 units of federally subsidized Low Rent Public Housing and Section 8 New Construction. This program includes 150 units at Skyline Crest (a development that is also home to the RISE & STARS Community Center); two downtown Vancouver high rises for elderly, frail elderly and disabled people; 30 units at Fruit Valley; 14 in Camas; 12 in Ridgefield; and 269 units scattered throughout Clark County.

In 2003, the VHA contracted with U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer 2,300 Housing Choice and Mod Rehab rental vouchers. Both the low rent public housing and the voucher program are designed to allow low-income families, elderly and disabled residents to pay 30 percent of their income for rent.

The VHA also contracts with several nonprofit corporations to manage two properties for disabled people, two group homes, three properties that provide transitional housing and five properties for low-income seniors. In addition, the VHA owns 100 units of Medicaid assisted living for low-income frail elderly people and 2,136 non-subsidized affordable workforce housing units. Workforce housing is defined as housing that is closer to market rate and is used as an investment to provide local funding for deeply subsidized housing.

Market and institutional influences on housing production

Typical of most communities in the United States, the primary influences on housing price in the county include, but are not limited to:

- land use controls which limit both the areas where housing may be built and the density of development, with a resulting impact on land cost and development costs;
- building code requirements (such as those related to the Americans with Disabilities Act; energy efficiency, etc.) which may increase construction costs and ultimately increase housing price;
- off-site improvement requirements;
- finance costs such as interest rates, other loan costs;

- tax limitations measures that limit the public sector's ability to subsidize housing development;
- materials and construction costs; and,
- in-migration and mismatches in housing supply and demand.

Most notably, the construction costs and home purchase prices rise with interest rates. Since the large number of savings and loan failures in the late 1980s, federal regulators have reduced the percentage of an institution's portfolio, which can be in real estate development. This has resulted in making financing of residential development more difficult. Similarly, increases in land costs or construction costs will increase the cost of the housing which is developed unless more units can be built on the same site. Rising energy costs increase the costs of construction and maintenance of housing units; however, conservation measures can reduce lifecycle costs for energy.

The housing needs continuum in Clark County

Housing affordability issues impact all households in all income groups. Every household has an income at one level or another and must find housing that meets but does not exceed the requirements of ~~the~~that income level. Sometimes this relationship is called "attainability." Households at higher incomes have fewer housing affordability problems, largely because their incomes allow greater flexibility to access housing at, or less than, their incomes. In addition, there are generally more housing units available within their income ranges. Persons with lower incomes have more housing affordability problems partially because their ability to access housing in their target price range is limited by persons from higher ranges "buying down," and by limited numbers of units. In addition, the lower the income range, the less potential the household has for "buying down".

What is affordable housing? Housing affordability is defined by financial lenders, government officials and ordinary citizens in different ways. Lenders generally claim that affordable housing is housing expenditure at or below 30 percent of household income. A household earning \$58,262 (the county median in 2025) should spend no more than \$17,479 per year or \$1,457 per month on housing. This may be in rent or in-house mortgage payments.

It is apparent that the definition of affordable housing has altered over time and continues to be in dispute depending on the perspective of the groups involved. Lenders and bureaucrats respond in a manner assessing the total debt limit that appears to be a reasonable lending risk at any point in time. Families respond in terms of their personal preferences and their other debts. Low and moderate-income advocates respond in terms of the impracticality of accumulating four-figure down payments and in terms of the potentially disastrous impact on people with fragile incomes when every available penny is committed to housing. There are six components when addressing the affordability issue as follows:

- availability of properly zoned and buildable land;
- cost of borrowing money;
- regulatory restrictions influence affordability;
- consumer expectations;
- wage/housing balance, which is the relationship between the wages earned by people in the community and the housing price; and
- jobs/housing balance, which is the relationship between the location of jobs and the location of housing.

All these components need to be addressed in determining the affordability issue for a community. This Chapter defines housing affordability as a range of expenditure, which should be between 30 percent of income and/or house purchases at 2.5 times household income. These are conservative measures, which serve to decrease the amount of expenditure suitable for housing from those levels illustrated by many lenders in their standard publications. It is believed that these measures, however, are more reflective of the real level of expenses that moderate- and low-income households can bear, noting that most households have standing financial commitments that decrease their loan to value ratios.

Racially Disparate Impacts and Displacement

Racially disparate impacts occur when neutral policies or practices result in disproportionate effects on a defined group or groups of people. The county evaluated Clark County's process considered social justice and equity, and accessibility as part of its Housing Options and Study Action Plan (HOSAP) in 2022. The study evaluated housing policies and how regulatory barriers affect access to moderate, low-income, and very low-income residents. The study evaluated the impacts of disparity and displacement. And although displacement does not appear to be a significant challenge for the county, manufactured home parks, as one of the largest sources of housing that is affordable to lower income households, is most vulnerable to redevelopment and in need of protection through zoning and code amendment.

Table 2.13 | Clark County Income by Race and Ethnicity, 2020

Race and Ethnicity	Total Households	% of County Population	Median Income	% of County Median Income
	2020	2020	2020	
White	155,670	83.3%	\$77,184	102%
Black or African American	3,263	1.8%	\$61,475	80%
American Indian and Alaska Native	974	.5%	\$63,939	83%
Asian	7,441	4.2%	\$89,583	116%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,186	.70%	\$66,505	86%
Some other race	6,675	1.8%	\$49,611	64%
Two or more races	11,756	3.7%	\$69,662	90%
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)	3,269	6.6%	\$57,521	75%

****The American Community Survey reports 178,478 households with a median income of \$77,184 and a margin of error +/-747 in overall households and +/- \$1,513 in median income.**

Clark County family household incomes are generally lower across Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) groups when compared to countywide and white alone income levels. As a result, rising housing costs disproportionately burden households of color, who spend more of their income on housing and have lower homeownership rates. These factors create a higher risk of exclusion and displacement for BIPOC community members within the county.

Most households in Clark County are not cost burdened by housing, paying less than 30% of their income toward housing costs. According to the Consolidated Plan (2020-2024), approximately 18.3% of households in the jurisdiction are cost burdened by housing, paying between 30 and 50% of their income toward housing related costs. An additional 11,825, or 12.12% of households are severely cost burdened, paying more than 50% of their income toward housing. White, Black/African American,

Asian, American Indian, and Alaska Native households are roughly comparable with the jurisdiction numbers, ranging from 62.8% to 69.9% of these households paying less than 30% of their income toward housing costs. Although limited in number, Pacific Islander households indicate that 85.4% of households pay less than 30% of their income for housing. However, the data also show that Hispanic households are disproportionately burdened by housing costs, with only 54.2% of households paying less than 30% for housing; 27.7% of Hispanic households are cost burdened and 16.9% of Hispanic households are severely cost burdened, paying more than 50% of their income toward housing costs. Displacement occurs when people must move from their homes for reasons other than changes in their personal circumstances. This could include moves due to rising rents, evictions or foreclosures, cultural or social exclusion, or other factors. Displacement risk is calculated by looking at areas with increasing rents, areas experiencing demographic shifts, or areas that are vulnerable to change based on factors such as income, race, or rental status.

The Displacement Risk Map (Figure 35) identifies areas around Clark County that are at high and moderate risk of displacement due to accelerating market trends, disinvestment, and gentrification.

Summary and Conclusions

The inventory and analysis presented in this Chapter lead to the identification of a variety of factors that will affect the ability of households in Clark County to find suitable affordable housing. The following section highlights the issues ~~effecting~~ affecting housing affordability for all segments of the population in the future.

The cost for land and construction of new housing has been increasing rapidly ~~over the past seven years~~. If the trend continues, then there will be even less affordable new housing built in the county. The needs of middle as well as lower income households will be more difficult to meet with new housing.

Restrictions on local government funding resources have resulted in increasing use of development impact fees to pay for the cost of extending services to new housing developments. However, these impact fees increase the cost of the new housing. The goal of making new development "pay its own way" may run counter to the goal of producing an adequate supply of affordable housing.

Changes in federal regulation of the banking and savings and loan industries have affected the availability of financing for residential development and the types of projects being financed. It is much harder to finance projects now and financial institutions are requiring greater equity participation by the developer in each project. It is also more difficult to find financing for unusual or creative housing designs, which might reduce the cost of each home to the purchaser or renter. Federal, state and local governments should consider public subsidies in order to ensure that such housing is available.

Increasing federal, state and local environmental protection regulations have reduced the amount of land available for development and increased the time and cost involved in producing housing. The goal of protecting sensitive environmental resources may run counter to the goal of producing an adequate supply.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) requires that financial institutions demonstrate that they invest a portion of their funds in the community where they are located and where their customers live. The Act is particularly concerned with investment loans for home purchase and rehabilitation

loans in older neighborhoods. The intent is to discourage "redlining" or the practice of refusing to make loans for properties located in older or predominantly minority neighborhoods. The CRA provides an opportunity for local developers and non-profit agencies to work with the banks and savings and loans to develop affordable housing and to maintain or improve existing housing in older neighborhoods.

Until the early 1980s, the federal government provided most of the support for the creation and maintenance of affordable housing, including tax incentives and direct funding of construction and operating costs. The withdrawal of this support, coupled with a changing economic environment, has severely reduced the availability of affordable housing. The absence of the federal government and lack of history or experience of the state and local government and the private sector in funding affordable housing has resulted in a confusion of roles and responsibilities. In order to provide the housing needed by the low and middle income population, it will be necessary for the county, cities, state and the private sector to create new working relationships if the needs for financing, construction or acquisition and maintenance of housing are to be met.

Fair Housing

The goal of fair housing is to encourage freedom of choice in the sale or rental of dwellings. Fair housing rights are established both through federal law (Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968) and Washington State legislation (WAC 49.60.222 through 224). The private sector and public sector housing agencies are very familiar with these principles as they apply to buyer/seller or landlord/tenant relationships. Discrimination based on race, color, age, sex, religion and national origin is prohibited.

In 1988, the Federal Fair Housing Act was amended in a manner that makes it evident that it is not legal to deny persons with disabilities the opportunity to live in a community. The amendment also makes it clear that persons may not be discriminated against on the basis of family status. The Washington Housing Policy Act, adopted in 1993, reinforces these principles by prohibiting local ordinances that treat households with disabilities differently from other households. For the purpose of this 20-Year plan, written in 1993 and updated in 2002, low-income persons are not considered a group protected under fair housing laws. If applied, income tests must be applied to all groups (e.g., disabled, racial, national origin) equally.

Several of the groups specifically noted in fair housing laws are commonly referred to as "special populations." Special populations include the physically disabled, mentally disabled, mentally ill, homeless and other persons who may experience barriers to housing because of a disability or condition. Special needs populations are among the most noticeable persons needing fair housing protection. Fair housing, however, is a broader concept that attempts to protect all citizens from unfair or discriminatory treatment.

In the development of land use regulations, communities must examine whether the effect of a regulation, action or policy is exclusionary. Local land use policies, regulations and actions must not have the effect of excluding individuals from Clark County or cities within Clark County. Persons should be able to find a variety of housing opportunities.

The 20-Year Plan proposes that an essential element in the continued achievement of fair housing is a land use regulatory approach that allows anyone seeking housing to take "managed risks". That is, regulations should protect public health and safety, but not to the point that the regulations have

the effect of excluding populations from finding housing that they can afford. Fair housing should not become a paternalistic approach to protection that eventually excludes the disabled, elderly, or other individuals. The 20-Year Plan also works toward fair housing by using the household, rather than the family, as the basic definition for an assemblage of persons in a dwelling unit.

Household is a broader term that allows for non-nuclear families, unrelated individuals, domestic partnerships, caregivers and other arrangements. A household orientation reflects the increasing diversity of living arrangements in the county.

Incentives for fair housing and a greater awareness of how the principle serves to protect all persons will be increasingly necessary in the future as Clark County's population grows and diversifies. Fair housing requires the attention of many segments of the community. Appropriate land use practices are a necessary step. These practices must be reinforced by fair lending practices, underwriting standards, appraisals, bonding and by other implementation policies and procedures that effectuate, on a daily basis, principles of fairness. Central to fairness is a clear understanding of both the income characteristics of the community and the characteristics of housing. Over time, the county's racial structure, household living arrangements, number of special needs persons, etc. will change. There is a continuing need to educate government officials and citizens to their individual rights and to the rights of others.

Special Needs Housing

It is the intent of this plan to encourage self-determination and independence among individuals with special needs. County and the cities policies, ordinances and codes should treat people with special needs equivalent to the general population. Land use regulations should not discriminate against these households. Land use regulations should be limited to the impact of the use upon the landscape, without consideration of the circumstance of the persons in the household.

People with special needs, just like other segments of the population, want to locate across the county, depending upon personal preferences and upon the locations of family and friends, health care, support services and transit. Housing provided by both the public and private sectors will allow the greatest range of locational choices. Special needs populations live throughout the county at this time, even though they may be under served or be limited in their access to housing. In the next 20 years, neighborhoods across the county should become accessible to special needs individuals. There is a dual responsibility; neighborhoods must become more accepting of people with special needs and people with special needs must become good neighbors in their community.

Just as people with special needs want to live in different neighborhoods, their specific housing needs vary also. Not all disabled persons require housing adapted with rehabilitated kitchens, bathrooms, etc. Not all persons require assistance from a caregiver. It is important that planners have knowledge of the needs of different client groups and avoid generalizations. Providing for people with special needs does not necessarily mean increased levels of social services or infrastructure. It may mean cultivation of a greater awareness of the impact of regulations upon these groups and encouragement of incentives to provide affordable, accessible housing.

The managed risk approach is applicable to all special populations and in particular to individuals traditionally considered "undesirable" because of previous lodging in institutions or correctional facilities. As these individuals rejoin the general public, the public must be protected, but in a reasonable fashion that does not preclude the transition of people to an independent lifestyle.

The Clark County Consolidated **Housing and Community Development Plan (HCD)** examine the needs of special populations in detail from a short-term perspective. The Housing Element of the 20-Year Plan attempts to address needs from a long-term perspective and to propose public and private sector responses to the needs.

Neighborhood Character and Vitality

Clark County's residential neighborhoods vary in size, density, housing type and amenities. The character of a neighborhood, both its livability and identity, is closely associated with its design, the characteristics of the residents and the services provided. Regardless of the character of the neighborhood, residents generally want a feeling of comfort and security, privacy and a sense of belonging. Neighborhood character is an important element of the *Community Framework Plan* and is a central component of an approach that encourages a hierarchy of well-defined places. Over the next 20 years, preservation of existing neighborhoods will require a conscious acknowledgment of the existing nature of the people, visual character and services. New development in previously undeveloped areas should occur with an identifiable visual and service character. Infill development should occur with a visual and service character compatible with existing development.

A population diverse in its age, ethnicity, income, household structure and size and mental and physical abilities has the potential to create strong and vital neighborhoods. The contribution of individuals, through their participation in public processes or through their daily lives in a neighborhood, influences the character of a neighborhood. Acceptance and appreciation of diverse individuals is a desirable value now and in the future.

This 20-Year plan intends to promote service delivery systems that are highly visible to users, accessible and centrally located on a neighborhood district basis. A major objective of the 20-Year Plan is to ensure that housing remains affordable for all income groups. One of the advantages of the 20-Year Plan is the variety of housing options, which will be available for residents.

Infill

In order to achieve the goals of the 20-Year Plan, Clark County and other jurisdictions must encourage the use of infill parcels for homes and also must ensure that development is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Infill is a term used to describe development of parcels that was "passed over" in a first phase of development. Some lots in the urban area were not developed because they continued in rural uses such as horse lots, orchards, etc. In some cases, there was insufficient demand for the land or people chose not to develop right away. The physical development constraints of some parcels, such as drainage ways, steep slopes, etc. may also lead to them being "passed over." The parcels are now surrounded by development, which may be residential, commercial or industrial in nature. In some areas, infill will mean mixing housing with commercial development and may require special consideration of physical constraints, existing infrastructure and adjacent land use.

Infill development is central to achieving target densities and to reducing sprawl. Targeted infill development sites can also serve to focus public investment in areas, which have existing urban development but need additional infrastructure to support increased densities. This type of infill development could include co-locating employment centers with housing, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled, lessening congestion and reducing the overall costs for infrastructure.

Accessory Units

Accessory units are another method for increasing density in a manner that may be affordable. Accessory housing units are complete living quarters constructed within an existing single family lot. They occur through conversion of an attic, a basement, a garage or other space. They are always secondary in size to the existing dwelling, usually less than 1,000 square feet. Common names for these units include granny flats, mother-in-law apartments and bachelor units. Some communities allow accessory units to be free standing. Freestanding units are generally called echo units or accessory cottages. Accessory units combine the advantages of small size, maximizing use of existing dwellings and income for homeowners as advantages. Clark County has had an Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance in effect since 1992.

Variety in Neighborhoods

In order to implement the 20-Year Plan in a manner that preserves and enhances neighborhoods while also maintaining identity and livability, Clark County and local jurisdictions will need to identify the features that make an attractive residential development and ensure that future development include these features. Over time, greater breadth and variety in neighborhood design should be allowed. The flexibility should also be accompanied by consistency and predictability in the development process. A major objective of the 20-Year Plan is to ensure that housing remains affordable for all income groups. One of the advantages of the 20-Year Plan is the variety of housing options, which will be available for residents. These will include single-family homes on a variety of lot sizes, as well as multi-family homes (apartments, condominiums, town houses) and mobile homes. This variety is expected to make it easier for the home building community to develop housing in a range of prices affordable and attractive to all county residents.

Fair Share

The state GMA directs all communities to formulate policies that allow accommodation of their "fair share" of housing types and income groups. The growth management act does not explicitly require a numerical approach to fair share. In general, the fair share process should provide low and moderate income housing targets for cities, urban growth areas and county rural areas that are achievable in a progressive manner over the 20-year planning period. The allocation process should identify programs and finance mechanisms that will result in the construction and rehabilitation of housing so that the targets are meaningful. Noting the complexity of the task, Clark County determined that preparation of a fair share allocation is a complex process in and of itself and requires a participatory process supported by thorough technical analysis. Formulation of a fair share approach is supported by this plan and is an implementation technique requiring immediate funding and analysis.

The fair share principle has a close relationship to the question of neighborhood character. In accordance with the fair share concept, a community may need to provide for income groups and housing types that are not part of its traditional character. In addition, existing neighborhoods may experience a change in character in order to provide housing for persons of higher or lower income than currently exist. These changes are expected to occur throughout Clark County in a progressive manner. Achievement of a fair share concept will require adequate financing, community design, public involvement and attention to the impact of change upon residents of an area.

Rehabilitation and Preservation

The Framework Plan concept, with its emphasis on a hierarchy of identifiable places, supports the preservation and rehabilitation of existing structures. Because existing structures provide much of the character of places, their preservation into the future will provide a basis for definition of community character. Existing structures also provide an opportunity for increased residential density with minimal community disruption when accessory units are allowed within structures and on existing lots. In addition, accessory units and existing houses are often among the most affordable units in the real estate market. Rehabilitation of existing structures also reflects an environmentally conscious approach to neighborhoods with an orientation toward stewardship and reuse of existing resources.

The *Community Framework Plan*, with its emphasis on increased density in urban areas also acknowledges that over time existing structures may be replaced with higher density structures, mixed uses or other innovations in land use. In concept, the removal of a housing unit in residential areas either through demolition or conversion to another use should be accompanied by the replacement of a residential use in the same neighborhood district. The intent of this plan is to place a priority upon rehabilitation and preservation of structures, while acknowledging that over time not all structures can or should be retained. In every case, all costs of rehabilitation, including life cycle costs and potential tax credits, must be considered.

Housing rehabilitation must be integrated with a concern for the persons in a structure and must respond to their social and service needs. Rehabilitated strategies must be tailored to the character of the area served. Rehabilitated buildings should be safe and habitable, but should not be required to meet the same codes as new construction.

Rehabilitation strategies specifically tailored to the condition of the neighborhood, integrating physical, demographic and economic needs provide an opportunity to re-use existing housing stock. Not only is this wise conservation of natural, human and physical/cultural resources, it also preserves the units most likely to be affordable to low and moderate income persons. As a technique to provide affordability, rehabilitation cannot be overlooked or underappreciated.

It is the intent of this Chapter to advocate for safe and habitable housing for all Clark County residents. In order to accomplish this aim and also to preserve affordability, it is essential that building codes allow a tiered approach to acceptable building condition. The cost of rehabilitating structures to the same standards as new construction often is prohibitive, dissuades owners from making improvements and increases the cost of dwellings. Provision also should be made for certified historic preservation and restoration projects, allowing rehabilitation to safe and habitable levels without meeting the same codes as non-historic rehabilitation or new construction. Achievement of this objective may require a statewide approach to revision of codes and a concerted effort on the part of both the public sector (including planners and building officials) and the private sector. Currently there is a low-income home owner rehabilitation program funded with CDBG in Clark County.

Affordability

The concern for housing affordability is a nationwide issue. Much of Clark County's growth in the last 20 years can be attributed to its affordability compared to the surrounding region. Clark County and

city officials see maintenance of affordability into the future as an important objective. The 20-Year Plan, as a government document, provides an opportunity to focus on the leadership role that local government can take to work cooperatively with all segments of the community in order to increase affordability within the context of protecting public health, safety and welfare. Provision of affordable housing for the individual should not come about at the cost of the community as a whole. The interests of the community as a whole, however, include the need to provide housing which is affordable for individuals.

Consumer expectations also play an important role in affordability. Consumers in all income ranges exhibit a trend toward increasing expectations for size and amenities. These add to the cost of housing. For most consumers, a house is their single most significant financial investment. Houses are more than a place to live, they impose a significant financial responsibility upon owners and offer an important windfall profit opportunity. In the 1980s and 1990s, homeowners have become increasingly protective of the value, both real and perceived, of their homes. This is often exhibited as NIMBYism (**Not In My Back Yard**) where property owners strenuously object to the introduction of new housing that differs from existing housing in type or value. Many of these objections are based in the fear of people of differing incomes, race, age, or ethnicity and their perceived impacts on the value of property. NIMBYism influences housing affordability and it results in excessive delays in permit review processes or effectively excludes legitimate housing types or income groups from neighborhoods. In the planning process, this intolerance must not be underestimated but must be recognized and planned for in education programs, public hearing processes and in programs that attempt to create a sense of community that extends beyond the financial commitment of a house purchase.

Just as supply and demand interact to influence cost, housing price and local wages interact to influence affordability. A dual effort to increase local wages while also retaining moderately priced housing, will keep housing affordable to more of the population. Housing affordability is a relationship between an individual's income and the price of housing.

From the perspective of community planning, it is desirable to provide both jobs and housing within a community for the benefit of individuals and the community tax base. The relationship of jobs and housing is described in two ways:

- the wage/housing balance is the relationship between the wages earned by people in the community and the housing price. Ideally, there is a sufficient number of housing units affordable to all levels of wage earners and
- the jobs/housing balance is the relationship between the location of jobs and the location of housing. Ideally, jobs are created in locations that are convenient to housing.

In both relationships, the planning objective is to create opportunities so people who want to live close to work may do so. There is no requirement (or assurance) that the people working a particular job will live in the proximal housing, or vice versa. The two principles may be applied separately or together when looking at a community's affordability strategy. The intent of the Housing Element is to assure that communities investigate both relationships and attempt to achieve both a jobs/housing and wage/housing balance within their urban area.

Traditionally, planners have looked at a jobs/housing balance and have tried to promote housing opportunities in locations close to the workplace. This helps community diversity and reduces

commute trips. Now with the interest in affordability, communities are also looking at wage/housing balances, trying to promote availability of housing that workers can afford close to their jobs.

Chapter 9 Economic Development Element of the 20-Year Plan includes general policies and strategies and also includes strategies to improve wages. Many of the Housing Element's programs and regulations provide tools to address the housing affordability issue. The local plans will address the location issue and the wage/housing issue through their statements on the need for affordable housing.

Inclusionary Zoning

An innovative tool to provide affordable housing is a voluntary inclusionary zoning program. A voluntary inclusionary program would be based on incentives for developers to build a percentage (usually 10 - 15%) of housing in their subdivision as affordable. The units would be smaller, simpler homes in a compatible design with the rest of the subdivision. In exchange for the affordable units, developers would be given incentives that would make it profitable for them, such as density incentives, expedited review, or impact fee waivers.

Inclusionary zoning does several things. It can integrate low and moderate income housing units into market rate subdivisions and avoid concentrations of low-income housing into one neighborhood. Increased density in some neighborhoods can encourage the viability of transit. Employers located in suburban communities benefit as well by having an accessible low and moderate-income workforce.

Neighborhood character is important to preserve and inclusionary zoning allows this to happen by giving the design control to the developer. Unlike infill, the affordable units are part of the subdivision plan and can be designed to be similar to their surrounding homes. This allows a community to retain its character while accommodating affordable housing. Inclusionary zoning can be an important tool to provide affordable housing to the growing number of households in Clark County that are priced out of the market. Homeownership prices have been escalating in the county, which has priced many working families out of homeownership.

Inclusionary zoning can provide homeownership opportunities for those families by making it profitable for developers to build homes that those families can afford. Inclusionary zoning, through partnerships with non-profits and public agencies, can also provide affordable rental opportunities in new subdivisions.

Several other tools are available to the public sector to help influence the availability of affordable housing, such as publicly subsidized rental housing and community land trusts to foster a permanent inventory of affordable housing. Clark County has invested in the Southwest Washington Community Land Trust.

Financing Affordable Housing

Finance of housing and in particular affordable housing is a specialized market niche that requires the cooperation of land developers, builders, government and lenders. Finance plays a vital role in the final cost of housing and its associated infrastructure. The intent of this plan is to both identify and advocate for finance mechanisms for housing and associated infrastructure that are stable. Both housing and infrastructure improvements are long-term investments. Mechanisms that are predictable over time may stabilize risk and increase the potential for project funding. This does not

imply that new finance mechanisms and institutional structures will not or should not arise over time, or that interim finance mechanisms are not appropriate. Rather a long-term view of finance mechanisms is necessary. In the last twenty years, the nation's financial institutions, lending systems and local taxing mechanisms have undergone radical change. More change should be expected in the next twenty years.

Another important component of this plan is the recognition that the public, not-for-profit and private finance sectors all play an important role in housing finance. A healthy and complete housing finance system will involve the participation of all three sectors in a manner that most appropriately reflects public purpose, capital requirements, costs, interest rates and other influences on the financial markets. Public sector financing of housing is traditionally identified with housing for the lowest income groups and involves the deepest direct subsidies. The public sector is also involved in middle and high-income subsidies to housing through tax policies. The public sector's role is changing as the need for partnership approaches to finance emerges.

The not-for-profit sector is an emerging finance sector. Working with private sector partners, the nonprofit sector can access public funds in order to meet a public purpose while the private sector partner can offer the deep financial backing required to develop housing. The Vancouver Housing Authority has partnered in this way to develop eleven properties that use bond financing to develop affordable housing for households at or below 80% of area median income. Two of the developments include tax credit equity, allowing the rents to be affordable to households at or below 60% of area median income. These properties will remain a community asset to be used for future affordable housing needs.

Private sector finance is the mainstay of housing development. Increasingly, in order to meet the needs of low and moderate income persons, the private finance institutions need the assistance of the public and not-for-profit sector. The private sector also has responsibilities to invest in communities through the Community Reinvestment Act. CRA goals often give impetus both to partnerships with the other sectors and to innovative financing techniques.

Housing Types, Housing Tenure, Sufficient Land and All Income Groups

The Growth Management Act is clear in its direction that comprehensive plans are to provide sufficient land and opportunities for a variety of housing types, ranging from site built to offsite manufactured. It is clear in its direction that special needs housing must be accommodated within the community. It is also clear that the housing and land use elements of local plans must be structured in a manner that makes it possible for persons of all income groups to have a degree of choice in their geographic search for housing. Sufficient land must be available for housing so that all income groups can exercise a choice to live in a community.

The Land Use Element, Chapter 1 of the 20-Year Plan provides, in both policy and mapped form, is a vision of the location of land uses in the future. The Land Use Element contains areas planned for residential, commercial, industrial, forest, agricultural, recreation and other land uses. The residential plan identifies areas for single and multiple family uses at a variety of densities. It includes mixed-use areas where combinations of commercial, institutional and residential uses are allowed. It also includes agricultural and forest areas where residential uses are allowed at a low density. The Land Use Element specifies target densities for the uses.

Goals and Policies

Clark County has developed general goals and policies it will use to direct housing development. Climate-related goals and policies within this element are noted as helping achieve greenhouse gas reduction [GHG], resilience [RES], or both [GHG, RES].

The Clark County Housing policies are as follows:

2.1 Countywide Planning Policies

- 2.1.0 The county and each municipality shall prepare an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing. [RES]
- 2.1.1 The Comprehensive Plan of the county and each municipality shall identify sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income families households, manufactured housing, multifamily housing and group homes, and foster care facilities, emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing. All jurisdictions will cooperate to plan for a "fair share" of the region's affordable housing needs and housing for special needs population, consistent with their HAPT allocation [RES]
- 2.1.2 Link economic development and housing strategies to achieve parity between job development and housing affordability. [RES]
- 2.1.3 Link transportation and housing strategies to assure reasonable access to multi-modal transportation systems and to encourage housing opportunities in locations that will support the development of public transportation. [GHG, RES]
- 2.1.4 Link housing strategies with the locations of work sites and jobs. [GHG, RES]
- 2.1.5 Link housing strategies with the availability of public facilities and public services. [GHG, RES]
- 2.1.6 Encourage infill housing within cities and towns and urban growth areas. [GHG, RES]
- 2.1.7 Encourage flexible and cost efficient land use regulations that allow for the creation of alternative housing types which will meet the needs of an economically diverse population. plan for and accommodate housing for all economic segments of the population. [RES]
- 2.1.8 Clark County and each municipality shall adopt incentives, strategies, actions, regulations, and consider funding tools that increase the supply of housing for households with extremely low-, very low- and low-incomes and with special needs by private or public developers. [RES]
- 2.1.9 Clark County and each municipality shall implement strategies that address cost barriers to housing affordability, including, but not limited to:
 - updating development standards and regulations;
 - shortening permit timelines;
 - implementing online permitting;

- optimizing residential densities;
- reducing parking requirements;
- developing programs, policies, partnerships, and incentives to decrease costs to build and preserve affordable housing [RES]

2.1.10 Identify and begin to undo local policies and regulations that result in racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing including zoning that may have a discriminatory effect and areas of disinvestment and infrastructure availability. [RES]

2.1.11 Promote homeownership opportunities for low-income and moderate-income families and individuals while recognizing historic inequities in access to homeownership opportunities for communities of color. [RES]

2.1.12 Plan for and provide housing based on the allocation and at the income levels in the Housing for All Planning Tool (HAPT) in Appendix J. [RES]

County 20-Year Planning Policies

Goal: Provide for diversity in the type, density, location and affordability of housing throughout the county and its cities. Encourage and support equal access to housing for rental and homeowners and protect public health and safety. [RES]

2.2 Policies:

- 2.2.1 Ensure that implementation measures recognize variety of family-household structures. [RES]
- 2.2.2 Encourage a variety of housing types and densities, including mixed-use centers, services and amenities. [RES]
- 2.2.3 Clark County shall create a voluntary inclusionary zoning program in residential and mixed-use zones with bonus incentives strategies. A demonstration project should be created to illustrate profitability to finance institutions and developers and to illustrate the effectiveness of the policy to the public. [RES]
- 2.2.4 Develop a fair share housing allocation that provides low- and moderate-income housing targets for cities and urban growth areas. The program should include a housing inventory, incentives and financing mechanisms. [RES]

- 2.2.5 Preserve the character of ~~stable existing~~ residential neighborhoods through selective and innovative zoning techniques ~~that discourage disinvestment, displacement, and exclusionary housing.~~ [RES]
- 2.2.6 Encourage a variety of housing types and densities in residential neighborhoods. [RES]
- 2.2.7 Encourage infill as a development and redevelopment concept. Appropriate development regulations that accomplish infill should consider:
- impact on older/existing neighborhoods;
 - development that is appropriate to surrounding residential density, housing type, affordability or use characteristics;
 - encouragement of affordable units;
 - maintenance of neighborhood integrity and compatibility;
 - address and prevent future displacements; and,
 - provision of development standards and processes for infill regardless of the sector (public, not-for-profit, or private sectors) creating it. [GHG, RES]
- 2.2.8 Assure that policies, codes and ordinances promote neighborhood designs that are pedestrian and transit friendly and discourage reliance upon the automobile. [GHG, RES]
- 2.2.9 The county should take appropriate action to encourage the preservation and expansion of the current stock of federally subsidized affordable housing. [RES] ~~Washougal Urban Growth Area~~
- ~~2.2.10 The Development Code will provide for mobile and manufactured housing in a manner that ensures that such developments contribute to the design quality, landscape standards and safety of the community.~~
- ~~2.2.11 The Development Code will encourage innovative housing design for efficient, low cost, high density housing.~~
- ~~2.2.12 The Development Code will provide for group homes and other institutional housing for special needs persons.~~
- ~~2.2.13 The City will encourage individual and neighborhood beautification programs using garden clubs, schools and other local groups.~~

Goal: Plan for increasing housing needs of low-income and special needs households. [RES]

2.3 Policies

- 2.3.1 Assure that codes and ordinances allow for a continuum of care and housing opportunities for special needs populations, such as emergency housing, ~~permanent supportive housing~~, transitional housing, extensive support, minimal support, independent living, family based living, or institutions. [RES]
- 2.3.2 Clark County or local jurisdictions shall plan for low-income and special needs housing that is well served by public transit. [GHG, RES]

- 2.3.3 Ordinances shall allow for housing for special needs populations as permitted/conditional uses, by basing siting decisions on the impact of the use upon the landscape, not on the circumstances of the occupants. [RES]
- 2.3.4 Building and site plan codes shall encourage the development, rehabilitation and adaptation of housing that responds to the physical needs of special populations. [RES]
- 2.3.5 Encourage both the public and private sector (including financial institutions) to invest in the creation of special needs housing. [RES]
- 2.3.6 Continue to coordinate the development of special needs housing with social service providers and with public agencies that provide services and capital. [RES]
- 2.3.7 Encourage provision of very low and low income housing through the use of document recording fees dedicated to affordable housing. [RES]
- 2.3.8 Ensure housing policies, codes and regulations encourage the development of units for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income households. [RES]
- 2.3.9 Assure that codes and ordinances promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourages preservation of existing housing stock. [RES]
- 2.3.10 Establish anti-displacement policies, with consideration given to the preservation of historical and cultural communities as well as investments in low, very low, extremely low, and moderate-income housing. [RES]

Goal: Provide assistance for maintenance and rehabilitation of housing for Clark County residents. [GHG, RES]

2.4 Policies

- 2.4.1 Encourage programs in deteriorating older neighborhoods that address structural, demographic and economic issues. [RES]
- 2.4.2 Work with building officials to encourage rehabilitation that provide for safe and sanitary housing. [GHG, RES]
- 2.4.3 Encourage voluntary housing rehabilitation programs. [GHG, RES]
- 2.4.4 In areas where housing is rated as fair or below by the local assessor, focus public investment on infrastructure surrounding the dwelling as well as rehabilitation efforts. [GHG, RES]
- 2.4.5 Maintain the housing stock by ~~rehabilitation~~ ~~rehabilitating~~ homes rated as fair or below by the local assessor. [GHG, RES]
- 2.4.6 Enhance the safety of housing by reducing the lead-based paint hazard. [RES]
- 2.4.7 Encourage the creation of housing that is energy efficient, resource efficient and has high indoor air quality. [GHG, RES]

Goal: Promote an active role in affordable housing using a combination of regulatory, partnership and finance techniques. [RES]

2.5 Policies

- 2.5.1 Ensure that policies, codes and regulations, including public development covenants, provide the opportunity to site affordable housing types, in particular off-site manufactured homes and accessory units. [RES]
- 2.5.2 Enhance provision of affordable housing for persons with incomes less than 30 percent of the median family income by using available federal and state programs and by promoting private/public partnerships which focus on this affordability range. [RES]
- 2.5.3 Enhance provision of affordable housing through the development of at least one and preferably more than one, private/not for profit/government partnership with the purpose of creating housing priced for persons with incomes between 30 and 90 percent of the median family income. [RES]

Goal: Establish a secure funding mechanism to support development of affordable housing. Coordinate and concentrate public expenditures to make positive and visible impacts on targeted neighborhoods. [RES]

2.6 Policies

- 2.6.1 Assess the impacts of fee waivers, exemptions and other deductions or exclusions on the housing needs continuum. [RES]
- 2.6.2 Target the work of housing partnerships (private, not for profit or profit) to various income levels, to encourage rental and home ownership opportunities. [RES]
- 2.6.3 Encourage and stimulate financing for affordable housing including innovative, single room occupancy. [RES]

Goal: Support diversity in the mix of housing types in the community, while improving home ownership tenure. [RES]

2.7 Policies

- 2.7.1 Provide opportunities for new development types to occur. There shall be no more than 75 percent of any single product type of housing in any jurisdiction (e.g., single-family detached residential).
Strategies to achieve these opportunities include but are not limited to:
 - Minimum density for single family and multi-family. These should average: eight or more dwelling units per acre within the Vancouver urban growth area, six or more units per acre with the Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield and Washougal urban growth area and four or more units per acre within the La Center and Woodland urban growth area.
 - Provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units.
 - Provision for duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and cottages in single family.
 - Provisions for townhouses/row houses.

- Allowance of manufactured home parks.
 - Provision for diversified single-family and middle housing types throughout low-density zones.
 - Recognition of the flexibility allowed in housing types as part of a Mixed Use Development (e.g. living units above commercial areas).
 - Recognition of Assisted Living Units as a housing type.
 - Provision for diversified housing types allowed as part of a mixed use development.
 - Recognition of Senior Housing Units as a housing type. [RES]
- 2.7.2 Consider the dislocation impacts of programs that promote conversion of units from rentals to owner occupied. [RES]
- 2.7.3 Encourage housing that is created using the principles of Universal Design. [RES]

Goal: Plan for and support diverse, affordable, climate-resilient housing options throughout the county. Encourage and support equal access to housing for renters, homeowners, and people without stable shelter to protect public health and safety. [RES]

2.8 Policies

- 2.8.1 Ensure that policies, codes, regulations, and practices increase and protect access to safe, affordable housing, especially in overburdened communities. Access to safe, stable housing provides protection during extreme weather events, while affordable housing leaves residents more resources to spend on resilience-building essentials such as air conditioning, air purification, food, and health care. [RES]
- 2.8.2 All Housing Element policies are also considered Climate Element resilience policies. [RES]

Goal: Prevent discrimination, address displacement, and mitigate past harm in the development and maintenance of housing. [RES]

2.9 Policies

- 2.9.1 Collaborate with community leaders, organizations, non-profits, and businesses to help vulnerable groups obtain and maintain housing. [RES]
- 2.9.2 Support resident ownership and nonprofit ownership of manufactured home parks. Develop and apply an overlay zone for existing and new manufactured home parks that supports continued manufactured home park use and limits redevelopment to other uses. Evaluate options for enhanced notification and relocation assistance in the event of park closures. [RES]
- 2.9.3 Evaluate the potential for displacement on lands proposed for rezone or redevelopment. [RES]

Strategies

The following strategies are proposed as a means to achieve the goals and policies of the Housing Element. These are a range of strategies that the county is considering and some of these strategies may be implemented over time.

- Develop a program to assist municipalities in accommodating diverse households.
- Maintain a tenant/landlord handbook to focus on tenant/landlord rights and responsibilities as well as fair housing legislation.
- Provide targeted information regarding fair housing such as booths at public events, web site and a more active role in support of fair housing regulations.
- Work with financial institutions, not for profits and the public sector to create mechanisms such as reverse mortgage programs, loan pools, housing trust funds, local funding and other tools to finance rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing.
- The county supports the extension of contracts for federally subsidized affordable housing that are up for renewal.
- The county supports the purchase of expired federally subsidized affordable housing by non-profits or the Vancouver Housing Authority in order to preserve the affordability of the housing.
- Maintain an outreach/education program to explain all aspects of home ownership and tenancy including maintenance, repair, landscaping, credit, prevention of discrimination and predatory lending.
- Continue to enhance partnerships between public and private sector interests to work with Home Investment Partnership, state agencies, financial institutions, builders, etc., to develop housing appropriate for all groups along the housing continuum.
- Promote affordable housing demonstration projects at a variety of densities and incorporating a variety of housing types such as elderly housing, smaller cottage one-story housing in order to illustrate what can be accomplished using local builders, financing, etc.
- Promote employer sponsored homeowner programs.
- Provide information to the lending community regarding the planning process and its impact on the development process.
- Encourage the use of low income tax credits and bond financing for equity in construction financing.
- Encourage the development of custom lending targeted for difficult to finance projects.
- Develop finance mechanisms to preserve and rehabilitate small apartment complexes (8-20 units).
- Enhance the local (nonfederal) renewable housing fund, such as 2060, for people with low incomes and special needs. Resources for the fund might be the result of bond issues, mileage, existing revenue or reallocation of the real estate excise tax (REET).
- Promote the facilitation of low-income housing projects through the use of the Development Coordinator. Provide guidance for these projects on process, available options and compliance with state and local codes.
- Develop a voluntary inclusionary zoning program.
- Develop affordable housing program to address the impacts of mobile home park conversion on residents.
- Encourage the preservation and expansion of rental housing for seniors with incomes below 60 percent (establisher federal guidelines) of the area's median income.

- Encourage weatherization of homes to reduce energy costs. Provide information, education and assistance to moderate income households who do not qualify for the federal weatherization assistance program but cannot afford the initial weatherization investment.
- Develop a Clark County Universal Design Information Guide to assist homeowners in increasing the ease and flexibility of their home.
- Consider incorporating universal design principles in Clark County’s building code review process.
- Encourage the development of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) – by exempting them from site plan review. Consider exempting ADUs from TIFs and PIFs.
- Consider more flexibility in the creation of duplexes by allowing them in all single family zones.
- Encourage new developments of senior housing to be within a half-mile of transit, services and retail amenities.
- Consider cohousing to be developed in single family residential zones.
- Consider assisted living facilities in single-family residential zones as a conditional use.
- Consider developing a shared housing program.
- Partner with the Building Industry Association to provide a universal-designed home and information at the Clark County Parade of Homes.
- Consider zone changes to allow more areas to support diverse housing types, including small-lot single-family, multifamily, duplexes and accessory dwelling units.