



Clark County Planning Commission

Dick Deleissegues, Chair
Steve Morasch, Vice Chair
Jeff Wriston
Milada Allen
George Vartanian
Valerie Uskoski
Ron Barca

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2011**

Public Services Center
BOCC Hearing Room
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

DELEISSEGUES: Good evening. I'll call the Clark County Planning Commission to order for tonight, August 18th. May we have roll call, please.

MORASCH: HERE
BARCA: HERE
DELEISSEGUES: HERE
ALLEN: PRESENT
WRISTON: HERE
USKOSKI: HERE
VARTANIAN: HERE

DELEISSEGUES: On your agenda, it's quite a bit different, the second item has been moved up to September; correct?

ALVAREZ: Correct, September 15th.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of Chair & Vice Chair – continued from May 19, 2011

DELEISSEGUES: And we'll move new business ahead of everything else just in case any of our people here can't be here until the end of the meeting, we've put this election of chair and vice chair off since I think March or it says May 19th, so we'll get on to that first, and it shouldn't take too long, and then we'll move to the annual review and dockets the North Orchards Rezone. So if somebody wants to -- go ahead, Sonja.

WISER: Entertain motions for chair.

BARCA: I'll make a motion that we elect Dick Deleissegues chair.

VARTANIAN: Second.

ALLEN: Second.

WISER: Any further nominations? Okay. Anyone move that nominations be closed?

VARTANIAN: So moved.

MORASCH: Second.

ALLEN: Second.

VARTANIAN: Don't we need a vice chair?

BARCA: This is riveting television, I'll tell you that.

WISER: I don't think we need to vote.

ALLEN: No, there's nobody else.

WISER: There's nobody, okay. Then unanimous vote to have Dick as chair.

VARTANIAN: Here.

WISER: Entertain motions for vice chair.

ALLEN: I nominate Ron Barca.

VARTANIAN: Second.

WISER: Any further nominations?

VARTANIAN: I move the nominations be closed.

USKOSKI: I'll second that.

WISER: Unanimous vote that Ron Barca is vice chair. Congratulations.

BARCA: Boy, this is how politics should get done, huh?

VARTANIAN: Or condolences, whichever is appropriate.

BARCA: There was a deal cut in the backroom.

VARTANIAN: Of course.

WISER: Continue the hearing.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

B. Approval of Minutes for June 16, 2011

DELEISSEGUES: Then we'll move to the minutes for June the 16th. Are there any changes to the minutes for June 16th? If not, motion.

VARTANIAN: I move we accept the minutes as submitted.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: All in favor.

EVERYBODY: AYE

C. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. ANNUAL REVIEWS & DOCKETS:

CPZ2011- 00009 North Orchards Rezone - Consider changing the Comprehensive Plan designation for certain properties in the northern Vancouver Urban Growth Area.

Pursuant to the Clark County Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code (UDC), the Planning Commission will consider rezoning properties in portions of the northern Vancouver Urban Growth Area from Urban Low with R1-20 zoning, to Community Commercial with C-3 zoning.

The subject parcels are:

198120-000; 198116-010; 198116-005; 198116-000; 198125-000; 198120-010;
198120-015; 198120-005; 198071-000; 198115-000; 198115-005; 198115-
010; 198115-015; 198121-000; 198121-005; 198121-010; & 198121-015;

Staff Contact: Jose Alvarez, Planner

Phone: (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4898

Email: Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

DELEISSEGUES: We'll move to CPZ2011-00009, North Orchards Rezone. Can I have a staff report.

ALVAREZ: For the record Jose Alvarez, Community Planning. Why don't we get the maps up here. So the proposal is to make a comprehensive plan amendment and rezone for approximately 20 acres in the North Orchards area, 17 parcels located just east of the intersection of NE 117th Avenue and NE 119th Street. There's an aerial photo of the site and the zoning map. The parcels are zoned R1-20; to the west as community commercial; north, AG-20; across the road is R-30 and C-3.

This area was brought into the urban growth boundary as part of the 2007 comprehensive plan. In 2007 the western portion nine lots were designated limited commercial, you can see that nine lots, and the eastern portion eight lots were designated light manufacturing. The entire area had an urban holding overlay. The parcels abutting the Lagler property to the north and as part of a Superior Court ruling in 2009 that property was removed from the urban growth boundary.

In 2010 a subarea plan was done to lift the urban holding and change the comprehensive plan designation to urban low with the R1-20 designation for the entire 20 acres. Subsequent to that decision five of the property owners in the area petitioned the Board for a reconsideration to have the zoning relooked at to reapply the commercial as part of the 2011 docket process. The Board asked staff to meet with the property owners to discuss their preferences.

Staff held an open house at the Hockinson Fire Station on May 24th that was attended by two of the original five proponents. A second letter was sent out to the property owners seeking feedback. We received one letter in addition of support and two letters from property owners who wanted to maintain the R1-20. I think in your packet I included a map of the property owners and their preferences and whom we haven't heard from.

Subsequent to the staff report being issued two weeks ago we've received four additional letters from property owners who were supportive of the change to community commercial. Also in your packet was a letter from WSDOT with concerns about transportation and requesting that a more detailed analysis be done on the traffic impacts along 119th Street and 117th Avenue. There was also a revised traffic impact analysis done by Mike Mabrey that concluded that there was a change from the determination that was in the staff report that shows that the existing designation of an M-2cb would be sufficient for the trips generated by the commercial designation.

There's more detail in the analysis on there, but fundamentally it doesn't change our recommendation which is that there isn't any evidence in the record that demonstrates that the existing commercial land is inadequate or that there is a lack of appropriately designated commercial alternative sites. So we're recommending denial but that we should reconsider this area when we're looking to amend the comprehensive plan as part of our update in 2016.

June of 2016 is our new deadline. It does meet a lot of the criteria, but it's just the commercial at this point there isn't commercial demand that substantiate in the record.

DELEISSEGUES: Is that it?

ALVAREZ: That's it.

DELEISSEGUES: Any questions of staff?

ALLEN: So it's been moved out from 2014 to 2016; is that correct?

ALVAREZ: Correct. I believe June 30th, 2016 is the new deadline.

ALLEN: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: And the only change in historical facts from the last time we heard this was some new information about the transportation issues?

ALVAREZ: Yes, that's right.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

ALLEN: But it still remains inadequate?

BARCA: No.

ALVAREZ: Well, actually it's adequate to serve it.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Okay. Is there an applicant here tonight that we could --

ALVAREZ: No. It's a docket request that the County is initiating.

DELEISSEGUES: Why don't we go to the sign-up sheet then. And first on the sign-up sheet I have Lynn Anderson.

ANDERSON: Ken Anderson right here.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you wish to testify?

ANDERSON: Yes, I do just for one moment.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, just sit and give us your name and address if you would.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

ANDERSON: Certainly. My name is Ken Anderson. I'm at 11902 NE 119th Street, Vancouver. I read the report, Mr. Alvarez was nice enough to e-mail that to me so I had a chance to review it earlier, and I can't really argue with too many of the items that he is writing down about and I can only add in our own request from the neighborhood itself, from the people in the neighborhood.

First I'd like to put in the idea that the original review process whereby the land was rezoned from originally from rural residential into a split between light industrial and commercial land was flawed in a lot of ways because a lot of the people in the neighborhood after I went around to everybody's house and had a conversation with everyone, I discovered that most people didn't even know that their land had been rezoned, they were completely unaware of that. And then later on in further processes when the Lagler Dairy land was unfit then for its original designation it was returned back to ag land, the process went to one of kind of confusion in many ways.

See, the land did remain as community commercial and limited industrial and oddly enough it was only at one of these little informal town hall meetings that we had at the Hockinson Fire Department when I asked a question of Mr. Mabrey why did you guys zone this this way and that started this whole thing rolling because he was completely unaware at the time that this land was zoned as it was and that kind of woke him up in a sense at that moment to the inconsistencies which are listed in this report I guess that the community planning commission has found and that's why that kind of instigated the whole thing back to this idea of going to R1-20.

And finally, and I've been looking at this for a long time and I just I realized that R1-20 is kind of a useless designation to anyone who lives in our neighborhood because you really can't do anything with that, the R1-20 is 20,000-square foot minimum size lot where you can rebuild on that. Well, all these lots are no bigger than 55 or 60,000-square foot with the home centered on them so it really doesn't provide any meaningful change in the neighborhood itself.

When I talked to everybody about it and I thought about it a little more, the community commercial development idea seemed to make the most sense and that was for three reasons. Obviously it positions us better in the future in case development does occur.

As you can see right across the street you have high-density apartments coming in at some point. Down the road further there are many developments which were stalled in this recent economic downturn which I anticipate will resume very soon at some point. And the commercial development across the street is also contiguous with commercial zoning across the street which is right next to our properties. That's that strip of properties that runs right along SR-503. John's Foreign Service used to be there and there's several properties up the road from there.

So designating this land as community commercial would be consistent, our properties abutting this already community commercial land which is at this point useless to anybody

because there's not simply enough land there to develop anything further. And talking to everybody in the neighborhood it seemed the majority of people were in favor of community commercial because then it could be said that later on development could occur as to take into account all the acreage there which would be about 25 acres, not 20.

And there you could easily see that NE 119th Street will become a major arterial east and west. It will serve up to I-5 and it will drain out all the residences to the east of us and this will obviously be a commercial zone of development and I just see that as being a reasonable change to wait for the commercial development to occur.

The last thing I want to say is that it has a benefit for everybody here now in the neighborhood. I think it makes it in as hard an environment to sell a home a little easier to sell your home. It doesn't improve the value of the property but individually it would make it a little easier to sell the homes just as an additional possibility that the properties here could go to commercial and be more valuable in the future.

Also I just I've talked to Mr. Alvarez and there doesn't really seem to be any inconveniences caused to the County in this, there really aren't any changes that I was made aware of through many conversations we had won't cost the County any additional funds. It may be inconsistent in three of the five areas, I won't even begin to argue with that, I'm sure Mr. Alvarez did his homework here, but I just don't see why not, why it can't be done. That's the point here.

And since it is the will clearly the majority of the 17 families here that it's our will that that would suit us better, I think this is a fairly strong argument. And I think that would just conclude what I have to say about that. And I would hope you would consider our vote and the majority vote strongly in this.

MORASCH: Thank you, Mr. Anderson. I have a quick question for you --

ANDERSON: Certainly.

MORASCH: -- before you jump up. As I understand the staff report and the reason the staff isn't supporting this proposal is because they don't feel like there's a need for commercial property in this area --

ANDERSON: Correct, I saw that.

MORASCH: -- or at least not an anticipated need over the next 20-year planning horizon. Is there any evidence in the record or any evidence you can support to of a need for commercial in this area?

ANDERSON: Well, I tried to kind of hint at that by pointing out that all the zoning around us with the exception of the AG-20 which used to be heavy industrial is designed ultimately to handle high densities of people in this area and there are many developments, I don't know if you guys are familiar up with 119th, but there are stalled developments up there. There are

developments to the south of us which are filling in.

There are a lot of people in the area, and though I'm not going to argue with a 20-year plan and in anticipation of additional commercial need, one can clearly see that 119th Street is going to be a major arterial to service places to the east, to the south and to the north and developing area around us.

This road SR-503 and 119th is going to be a major intersection, not totally unlike say 76th and SR-503 where we know there's a Safeway and there's a Fred Meyer and there's a Lowe's and then there's a gas station and a little shopping center on the other corner, that fully developed. And when I moved in less than 20 years ago that was largely farm land and there was a fellow there with tires on his roof who fixed your flats for \$5 on the corner that Lowe's is on.

So that developed rather quickly when it was appropriate, when there was a commercial need. I'm just being optimistic possibly. And I understand that currently the economic situation in the country doesn't seem to bode very well, but I've been around a long time and I know and I've seen a lot of these downturns, I'm older than I look, and I know that when things turn around, they turn around very quickly and I anticipate that would happen in the 20-year plan which has changed overnight.

Now I understand what Mr. Alvarez is suggesting here with the 2016, you know, of looking at this again and the possibility of this being redesignated as community commercial if the need arose, that's fine too. Again I just don't see how it inconveniences anybody right now and it does have a benefit right now for the people in the neighborhood. I am looking out just for myself and everybody else there. We came to this conclusion obviously the vote of being 10 to 17, 17 that we would have a benefit now out of this making it a little easier to sell our homes.

Now the area cannot really be developed individually. The homes can't be because it's a single lane private road that runs in and we're all on a septic system so it would be kind of unlikely that code could be met on this. I talked to a few people about this and it just didn't seem logical that it would happen.

So possibly my reasoning is a bit on the selfish you might say, but what else can I say then. You're seeking our opinions and I am trying to look out for the best financial future of my family and everyone else's as well.

MORASCH: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions of Ken?

BARCA: Mr. Anderson, as I understood it when you purchased the property it was rural residential?

ANDERSON: Yes.

BARCA: And if it was to go back to some form of residential R1-20 which is an urban designation that would pretty much put you on par before we had the County make the error as we might say in the designation of choice there? That would basically put you on par with before then; right? You were residential and you're going back to residential?

ANDERSON: Well, actually from my understanding what we were was R-5.

BARCA: R-5, right. In a rural setting.

ANDERSON: Right.

BARCA: But now you're inside an urban growth boundary.

ANDERSON: Well, yeah, the R1-20 I don't see any difference between the two if that's what you're saying, yeah.

BARCA: Okay.

ANDERSON: Not really. I mean there would be no change to anything.

BARCA: And I want to clarify something else. You talked about a majority of people in the neighborhood wanting the change, we have on record 10 out of 17, is that the number you're working with as well?

ANDERSON: Yes, I am.

BARCA: I just wanted to make sure there hadn't been any changes in that regard.

ANDERSON: No. Several of the people simply didn't want to get involved with it and one of the families living there they don't actually own the house and the owner does not want to be involved, that's all.

BARCA: Okay.

DELEISSEGUES: Any other questions? Okay, thank you, Ken.

ANDERSON: Thank you, guys.

DELEISSEGUES: Next on the sign-up sheet is Nancy Scheibner.

SCHEIBNER: That would be me. My husband and I, we were the first person to buy property in Kristin Meadows and we bought it to be a residential home for our family. We've lived there for 24 years.

DELEISSEGUES: Let me just say before you start, when you hand these out and sit down and give your name and address and then we'll start over again so we're all on the same.

SCHEIBNER: This is just copies for all of you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

VARTANIAN: Thank you.

SCHEIBNER: My name is Nancy Scheibner. My address is 12105 NE 122nd Avenue, Brush Prairie. My husband and I, we were actually the first people to buy a lot in Kristin's Meadows and we're Lot C on that plot map. I just handed you a copy of the covenants that we were given when we bought our property and had our house built and we want to have it remain primarily residential.

I agree with your conclusion that we don't need more commercial properties there. Bowyer's Market where WinCo is has not got tenants for the areas there that are already waiting for businesses to build. Mr. Anderson did come to our house when we were home to talk about his ideas about advocating the change in the zoning and I listened to him, he was very nice, but we just don't agree with what he's saying.

Mainly he was telling us that our property would increase in value if we changed to this zoning and that it would make it easier to sell. I'm not really sure what he's basing that on because all the houses would have to be bought up and rebuilt into something because they are all single-family homes situated on lots.

He talked to everyone and I'm not sure how many people were understanding what this is all about and I'm wondering how many of the people that are for it are actually here today too. We're just strongly in support of your recommendation and we think you should hold to that. That's really all I have to say.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of Nancy before she leaves?

VARTANIAN: I've got a question. Is there a homeowner's association that incorporates all these --

SCHEIBNER: We don't really have a formal home association. The last time we did anything was go around and collect money, we have a private road that we had to have resurfaced, so we don't really.

VARTANIAN: Well, then I take it these, are they really CC&Rs or are they --

SCHEIBNER: Well, that was given to us by the original developer of the property Randy Hanson so they're supposed to be in effect.

VARTANIAN: Don't CC&Rs override pretty much what --

WRISTON: It says right in the --

VARTANIAN: -- the jurisdiction can say then?

WRISTON: It says right in the first paragraph it can be modified with 80 percent of the vote of the --

VARTANIAN: Oh, okay. That's assuming there's --

ALLEN: But they have not been modified and/or recorded modifications have not been recorded?

SCHEIBNER: No.

WRISTON: Before they could be developed or something like that, I would assume they're still valid depending upon if they were recorded properly and all of that.

VARTANIAN: Does counsel have any information? I mean does the homeowner's association have to be active or does there have to be something going on?

COOK: No.

BARCA: The homeowner's association is a separate issue from CC&Rs.

VARTANIAN: Oh, okay. Thank you very much.

ALLEN: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Nancy. Next is Stan Scheibner. Do you want to add to that?

SCHEIBNER: Yeah, just a little bit.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay.

SCHEIBNER: Stan Scheibner, 12105 NE 122nd Avenue, Brush Prairie. And I just think that a change in designation to a commercial would harm my property value. We're not located on 119th Street, we're one of the majority of the houses that's back in aways, and unless the whole thing would be developed at once, I think it would be a detriment to my property values if there's any change made to it.

And like my wife said the Bowyer's Marketplace it's got ones by the WinCo, they built one strip mall where they have a Subway, a tanning shop and a haircut place and they have a whole other vacant set of buildings where no tenants have come in yet and then they have acres of room for more development that apparently nobody has an interest in. So there's lots of room right in our area for business development that there's no interest in right now. And so I guess that's all I have to say.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions of Stan? No questions. Thank you for your testimony.

SCHEIBNER: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: Next is Janesa Reich.

REICH: My husband is next on the list and he'll talk.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, we'll go to Cody.

REICH: My name is Cody Reich. I live at 12003 NE 121st Street. I want to thank you for your time this evening. I have property zoned commercial on Fourth Plain and I happen to fall under the Fourth Plain overlay and so I've spent a lot of time over the last few years kind of being part of trying to improve a pretty poor area that's got some high crime rates and low rental rates.

And so I spent a lot of time just studying and learning how commercial works and the pulse points and how basically retail centers and retailers are kind of like sheep in the sense they all want to be together. And so when you have a small area of commercial like you do across the street with the WinCo, tenants want to be next to tenants. You find that commercial space next to commercial space would build nicer areas.

So just to touch on the point of why there's some vacant space over there right now is probably because there's just not a lot of commercial around in the area, but it does take time to fill up. And looking ahead further down the road it makes more sense to actually probably rezone that area commercial in my opinion because you end up with a corner that's similar to 72nd down off of 119th where you have commercial on all four corners.

It's going to be really odd with the small lots there because I mean some of the houses can build another house with the 20,000 zoning, there are positions to put more houses and it just seems unfortunate on such a prime corner with the opportunity to go commercial in the future would be wasted if we start building more houses now.

So I'm in support of making the zoning change, but either way I enjoy where I live. And I'm not building commercial, I'm just thinking long-term as a pulse point along 503 as a possible kind of another hub area where commercial would be well served with access along 119th and 117th.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you very much.

REICH: Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: We don't have anyone else on the sign-up sheet. Does anyone in the audience wish to testify on this? Seeing none, we'll return it to the Commission. Comments?

Return to Planning Commission

WRISTON: Well, it seems to me that the area is appropriate for commercial; however, I think that as staff has pointed out waiting until the 2016 plan may make more sense.

I guess the only concern I'd have with that was the comment that there is a possibility of putting a couple of pieces together and trying to develop 20,000-square foot lots, but in this current climate and if they're on septic and availability of sewer and everything else, I don't know that that's a real high risk.

And that risk is always out there and we've always identified it when we've had this type of issue in front of us that something like that could happen. Someone could come in and build a bunch of homes and hurt the desirability of the area because that's just more that a commercial developer or someone might have to buy out. But, again, given that current climate, we're probably not a real high risk.

I think the area should be commercial, but I'm in support of staff's recommendation to take a look at it in 2016 and see if we can resolve some of the issues that are out there.

DELEISSEGUES: Ron.

BARCA: I also feel that there will become an appropriate time as the intersection becomes with more trips and the WinCo side starts to develop which will kind of create a demand for additional commercial.

But my concern right now I think as I stated in our workshop previously is putting more inventory into the system right now when there's a lot of commercial that's already there and wanting to me appears to be the particular detriment that perhaps Mr. Anderson if I was to look at it in that fashion, there are already people that are in line, there are already people with reasonable parcels that are trying to generate commercial development and their zoning is there in place.

So I think review of the 2016 we'll have a much better idea about what type of inventory the area is short of and if it looks like the community commercial is still the appropriate designation, we'll have an opportunity to do it. But I'm in favor of staff's recommendation at this time.

DELEISSEGUES: Steve.

MORASCH: Well, I may be a little more optimistic than Jeff. I'm really torn. I'd like to see it go commercial. I'm not as concerned as Ron is about jumping ahead of other people in line because I'm looking at some CC&Rs here that are apparently recorded that require 80 percent of the owners to sign them before it could actually go commercial.

So I think even if the zone was moved to C-3, there's a lot of steps it would have to go through before this property could jump ahead of property that's already commercial. On the other

hand, I don't know that the record shows that there's the needed demand that we're supposed to have under the comp plan.

So while I would really like to vote yes on this, I'm not sure if I can because I'm not sure if the code or the comp plan criteria have been met.

DELEISSEGUES: Valerie.

USKOSKI: Is this property still in urban holding?

ALVAREZ: No.

USKOSKI: Well, I guess that was my one question. I don't know that I have a whole lot more to add other than what's already been said. George.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, George.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, I'm in agreement with what's already been said.

ALLEN: And as I said last time we saw this it's a question of timing and strategic planning and I really have a problem with going on a Band-Aid approach versus a comprehensive strategic look at this and 2016 promises to be sort of a more comprehensive approach to it than today.

And then of course this particular property is also slated for annexation by the City of Vancouver very soon, so I really have a little bit of a problem spending a lot of money doing something now that will probably go back to the City of Vancouver.

But then also there's no evidence as pointed out by the staff and some of the other folks that there is lack of commercial area. And originally why it was brought into the picture was because of the Lagler contiguous property and that is not the case today so this would be just a fragmentation of consideration and analysis and that would not serve the purpose of the strategic and/or regional or countywide planning.

And then if there's still septic out there and there's some of the CC&Rs as we saw today that would prohibit this and they would have to go through many, many steps to accomplish something that they're proposing today so what is the rush, why don't we wait until 2016 when we can look at it from a more comprehensive approach.

ANDERSON: Can I ask one quick question, please?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, wait a while, we'll see. Yeah. Are you through, Milada?

ALLEN: And right now to intensify the proposed uses that may not happen until 2016 anyway, we might as well wait for the more comprehensive approach at that time.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I pretty much agree with the majority of the people up here. I think

that it definitely will go commercial, there's no doubt about it, it's a matter of timing.

And I think right now there's so many empty commercial enterprises that are looking for tenants, let alone areas that are zoned commercial with no structure or infrastructure, that we've got a huge inventory and backlog of commercial opportunity shall we say in Clark County that I think it would be very hard to find a developer that would want to come in and do all the development work and buy the property to put in the infrastructure to get the sewer, the transportation, you're talking millions of dollars in a time when the economy is such that it just doesn't seem feasible.

So I think it's a matter of timing. There's no doubt in my mind that eventually this will be as you envision it, but I just think right now there's no great rush to do that and I think it would be good to look at it in light of all the other changes that we may want to make in the comp plan when the time comes and make sure that it fits into the overall plan for the County.

So any other comments? If you have a quick comment come forward or a question.

ANDERSON: After listening to what you've just --

DELEISSEGUES: Well, you'll need to come up to the mic so we can --

ANDERSON: That's okay. After listening to what you just said I don't think so really. I cannot but help but agree with the 2016 approach to reviewing this process. The only question I had, and this was just really a rhetorical question for you all to think about, was if in fact there was no infrastructure here in the first place, it would require millions of dollars to bring in all these improvements, why was it zoned commercial in the first place and what was the plan with that and what happened exactly.

So I wonder exactly how much of an impediment that really is, the lack of infrastructure there now, to zoning it commercial. That's what I wanted to say.

ALLEN: And from my understanding it was because it was considered as part of a bigger piece with Lagler property being as the majority of that proposed commercial area.

ANDERSON: To me it's a -- and the light industrial was in support --

DELEISSEGUES: Well --

ALLEN: And that's economies of scale. Here we are we just have a little remnant of what was originally proposed, so on the little remnant the expense would be much higher and the economies of scale no longer apply.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, we don't want to get into a long discourse on that because nobody can --

ANDERSON: Nobody can predict this.

DELEISSEGUES: Exactly. Things have changed considerably, too, since then so I think right now we're looking at a whole different prospect for the immediate future. Okay, thank you. Does anybody want to make a motion or any additional comments?

BARCA: I'll make a motion to accept staff's recommendation.

ALLEN: For denial?

BARCA: For denial.

ALLEN: Second.

DELEISSEGUES: That's the recommendation they made I think for **denial**. Moved and seconded we pass on to the Board of Commissioners a recommendation to support the staff's recommendation of denial at this point in time. Any other comments? Discussion on the motion? Roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MORASCH:	NO
VARTANIAN:	YES
ALLEN:	YES
USKOSKI:	YES
BARCA:	AYE
WRISTON:	YES
DELEISSEGUES:	AYE

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

BARCA: Glad we got that election out of the way, now I can sleep tonight.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, it took five meetings for that. I move we adjourn.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, if nothing further we'll adjourn.

BARCA: Second.

WISER: I think Gordy had something under New Business.

DELEISSEGUES: We're going to adjourn and then listen to Gordy so it's off the record.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at:

[http:// www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html](http://www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/commission/06-meetings.html)

Proceedings can also be viewed on CTVV on the following web page link:

<http://www.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/>

Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter

Sonja Wisler, Administrative Assistant