From:	Cnty 2025 Comp Plan
To:	Dale 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 1:30:09 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

---

Good day, Dale,

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: Dale Bateman <gobuild1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2026 1:23 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.

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 wife 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 designation in its present form.

My perspective on this issue comes not only as a homeowner, but also from many years working in residential construction, project management and estimating. I understand that communities must grow and that additional housing must be accommodated. My concern is whether the infrastructure necessary to support this degree of density is being planned and provided at the same pace as the density itself.

In construction, increasing the intended capacity of a project without first determining whether the underlying systems can support that capacity creates problems later. Roads, utilities, stormwater systems, access, schools and public services are no different.

When we purchased our home in Pleasant Valley in 2020, we deliberately chose this area because of its established, lower-density residential character. Since then, we have watched increasingly compact development continue to move into the surrounding area.

That existing development matters when considering this proposal.

The proposed R32/R36 designation should not be evaluated as an isolated zoning change on an individual tract. The County should consider the cumulative effect of development already completed, development currently underway, and the additional development capacity this zoning change would create.

From a construction and project-planning perspective, one of my primary concerns is sequencing.

Infrastructure should be capable of supporting the planned intensity of development

before that intensity is created — not after residents begin experiencing the consequences.

Increasing residential density can affect far more than the number of homes constructed. It can increase vehicle trips, intersection demand, utility loads, stormwater requirements, emergency-service demand, pedestrian activity and school enrollment. It can also require roadway improvements, sidewalks, crossings and other infrastructure that may not have been necessary under the existing development pattern.

Pleasant Valley Elementary and Middle Schools are located in this immediate area. That makes transportation and pedestrian safety particularly important.

Before approving substantially greater residential capacity, I believe the County should demonstrate that NE 50th Avenue, NE 139th Street and the surrounding road network can safely accommodate the cumulative increase in traffic associated with both existing development and the additional development contemplated by this plan.

The same analysis should apply to utilities and site infrastructure.

Higher-density development creates different demands for water, sewer, stormwater management, fire access and other public infrastructure than lower-density residential development. Those requirements are foreseeable and should be identified, engineered, funded and appropriately sequenced as part of the planning process.

I am also concerned about the abrupt transition between existing single-family neighborhoods and the proposed R32/R36 designation.

From a development standpoint, there is no reason additional housing capacity must automatically result in an immediate transition from established lower-density neighborhoods to substantially higher-density multifamily development.

Good planning can provide transitions.

Graduated density, appropriate setbacks, landscaped or open-space buffers, building-height and massing standards, adequate parking, safe ingress and egress, and thoughtful placement of higher-density buildings can significantly reduce conflicts between different types of development.

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

• The realistic number of additional dwelling units the proposed zoning could

accommodate compared with the existing designation;

• The anticipated additional vehicle trips generated by that development;

• The existing and projected capacity of NE 50th Avenue, NE 139th Street and affected intersections;

• The current capacity of Pleasant Valley Elementary and Middle Schools and the projected student impact associated with additional residential development;

• The water, sewer, stormwater and other utility improvements necessary to support the increased density;

• The pedestrian, roadway and intersection improvements necessary to safely accommodate additional residents;

• The effect on fire and emergency access and service demand; and

• The estimated cost, funding sources and construction schedule for infrastructure improvements required as a result of the additional development capacity.

These are questions that should be answered before the zoning decision is made.

As someone who has spent years estimating and managing construction projects, I know that identifying a desired end result without adequately accounting for the infrastructure, cost and sequencing necessary to achieve it can create expensive problems later.

Planning should work the same way.

The County has an obligation to accommodate growth. But increasing allowable density and providing the infrastructure necessary to support that density are two parts of the same decision.

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 housing capacity is necessary, I ask the Council to consider graduated density adjacent to established single-family neighborhoods and the Pleasant Valley schools, while concentrating the highest densities in locations where transportation, utilities and public infrastructure can reasonably support them.

Once development occurs, correcting inadequate infrastructure or an incompatible

transition becomes substantially more difficult and expensive.

Plan the infrastructure first. Establish that it can support the proposed development. Then determine the appropriate density.

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

Sincerely,

Dale Bateman
Pleasant Valley Homeowner
Vancouver, Washington