| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Cnty 2025 Comp Plan |
| **To:** | Keri Bateman; Cnty 2025 Comp Plan |
| **Subject:** | RE: Public Comment – 2025–2045 Comprehensive Plan Update – Pleasant Valley / NE 50th Avenue and NE 139th Street |
| **Date:** | Thursday, October 1, 2026 1:30:02 PM |
| **Attachments:** | image001.png<br>image002.png<br>image003.png<br>image004.png |

---

Good day, Keri,

Thank you very much for submitting these comments related to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update.

Confirming this has been received and will be added to the Comprehensive Plan Index of Record. This will also be forwarded to be shared with the council prior to tonight's Hearing.

**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:** Keri Bateman <keri@keribateman.com>
**Sent:** Thursday, October 1, 2026 1:18 PM
**To:** Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>
**Subject:** Public Comment – 2025–2045 Comprehensive Plan Update – Pleasant Valley / NE 50th Avenue and NE 139th Street

**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.

Regarding 2025–2045 Comprehensive Plan Update – Pleasant Valley / NE 50th Avenue and NE 139th Street

Dear Clark County Councilors,

Please accept this as my formal written testimony regarding the proposed zoning changes affecting the Pleasant Valley area near NE 50th Avenue and NE 139th Street.

My husband and I are homeowners in the Pleasant Valley neighborhood immediately adjacent to the area affected by these proposed zoning changes. I respectfully oppose the proposed R32/R36 high-density designation in its present form.

I want to be clear that I am not opposed to responsible growth or additional housing. I have worked in residential real estate for decades and understand both the need for housing and the challenges communities face in accommodating population growth.

My concern is the scale and concentration of the proposed density in this particular location, especially when considered together with the significant amount of compact residential development that has already occurred throughout the surrounding area.

When we purchased our home in Pleasant Valley in 2020, location was a deliberate part of our decision. We chose this neighborhood specifically because it offered an established, lower-density residential environment removed from the increasingly compact development patterns occurring elsewhere in Vancouver.

In the six years since, we have watched that distinction steadily disappear.

New developments have continued to surround this area, frequently utilizing smaller lots, tighter building spacing and increasingly intensive residential development. The proposed R32/R36 designation should therefore not be evaluated as though it were occurring on an isolated tract of land. The cumulative effect of the development that has already occurred, the development currently underway, and the additional density contemplated by this plan must be considered together.

At some point, continued increases in density fundamentally change both the character of an established neighborhood and the demands placed upon its infrastructure.

Pleasant Valley Elementary and Middle Schools are located within this immediate area.

Any substantial increase in residential capacity should include a current, transparent analysis of school enrollment and capacity, the number of additional school-age children reasonably anticipated from the increased housing capacity, and the ability of the surrounding transportation network to safely accommodate additional school traffic.

This is not simply a question of classroom capacity. It is also a question of child and pedestrian safety.

Additional households mean additional vehicles, school drop-off and pickup traffic, pedestrians, delivery vehicles and traffic moving through neighborhood streets and intersections. Before substantially increasing residential capacity here, the County should demonstrate that the roads, intersections, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings and other infrastructure serving this area can safely accommodate the cumulative growth being planned.

I am equally concerned about the abrupt transition in land use.

R32/R36 represents a fundamentally different level of residential intensity from the established single-family neighborhoods surrounding this property. There is a significant difference between thoughtfully accommodating additional housing and placing substantially higher-density development immediately adjacent to an established lower-density neighborhood without an appropriate transition.

If additional density is necessary in this area, I urge the County to consider graduated density rather than creating an abrupt boundary between existing single-family neighborhoods and high-density multifamily development. Transitional zoning, meaningful setbacks, landscaping and open-space buffers, appropriate building-height and massing standards, and careful placement of the highest-density development could allow the County to accommodate additional housing while reducing impacts on existing neighborhoods.

As a residential real estate professional, I also know that homeowners do not simply purchase a structure. Buyers make significant financial decisions based upon location, surrounding land uses, neighborhood character, lot spacing, privacy, traffic, schools, noise and the overall residential environment.

Those characteristics were part of what existing Pleasant Valley homeowners purchased and invested in.

This is not an argument against more attainable housing or against people purchasing homes at different price points. A healthy community needs a range of housing choices.

It is an argument for thoughtful placement of density and appropriate transitions between fundamentally different development patterns.

Before approving the proposed R32/R36 designation, I respectfully ask the Council to establish in the public record:

• How many additional dwelling units could reasonably be developed under the proposed zoning compared with the existing designation;

• The projected population associated with that additional housing capacity;

• The anticipated number of additional school-age children and the current capacity of the schools serving this area;

• The anticipated increase in vehicle trips and the capacity of NE 50th Avenue, NE 139th Street and surrounding intersections to accommodate them safely;

• The pedestrian and school-safety improvements that would be required;

• The additional stormwater, utility, fire, emergency-service and other infrastructure necessary to support the increased density; and

• The funding sources and anticipated timing for those infrastructure improvements.

If the infrastructure necessary to support this level of density does not presently exist and there is not a realistic, funded plan to provide it, I do not believe the County should approve the density first and attempt to solve those problems afterward.

There is a reasonable middle ground between preventing growth and accepting maximum density.

Clark County can accommodate future housing while protecting established neighborhoods through graduated density, transitional zoning, appropriate setbacks and buffers, thoughtful building standards, infrastructure investment and careful placement of higher-density development where roads, schools and public facilities are equipped to support it.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council not approve the proposed R32/R36 designation for this Pleasant Valley area in its present form.

If additional residential capacity is required, I ask the Council to consider a lower-density transitional designation adjacent to the existing single-family neighborhoods and Pleasant Valley schools, with substantially higher densities located where

transportation infrastructure, public facilities and surrounding land uses can better support them.

We have already watched this area change considerably since purchasing our home in 2020. Before making another permanent change of this magnitude, I ask the Council to consider not simply how many additional housing units can be accommodated on a map, but what the cumulative effect of these decisions will be on the community being created for both existing and future residents.

Growth is inevitable. Poorly transitioned growth is not.

Thank you for considering my testimony and including it in the public record.

Sincerely,

Keri Bateman
Vancouver, Washington