



## City Council Meeting Minutes

Vancouver City Hall | Council Chambers | 415 W. 6th St.  
PO Box 1995 | Vancouver, WA 98668-1995  
[cityofvancouver.us](http://cityofvancouver.us)

Anne McEnergy-Ogle, Mayor • Bart Hansen • Ty Stober • Erik Paulsen • Sarah J. Fox • Diana H. Perez • Kim D. Harless

### August 11, 2025

#### Workshops: 5:15- 6:00 p.m.

Vancouver City Hall - Council Chambers - 415 W 6th Street, Vancouver WA

*The City Council Meeting was held on 8/11/2025 at 5:15 PM in the Vancouver City Hall, Council Chambers 415 West 6th Street, Vancouver, WA 98660.*

*Workshops were conducted in person in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting in person, via the live broadcast on [www.cvtv.org](http://www.cvtv.org) and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, or [www.facebook.com/VancouverUS](http://www.facebook.com/VancouverUS).*

*View the CVTV video recording, including presentations and discussion, for workshops at: <https://www.cvtv.org/vid/link/38207?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=2769>*

#### **Downtown Redevelopment Assessment**

(Approximately 45 minutes)

Chim Chune Ko, Principal Project Manager, Patrick Quinton, Economic Development Director, [ChimChune.Ko@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:ChimChune.Ko@cityofvancouver.us), [patrick.quinton@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:patrick.quinton@cityofvancouver.us)

*Staff led Council through a discussion of the Downtown Redevelopment Assessment.*

#### **Council Dinner / Administrative Updates (6:00 - 6:30 PM)**

#### **Regular Council Meeting**

6:30 PM

Vancouver City Hall - Council Chambers - 415 W 6th Street, Vancouver WA

*This meeting was conducted as a hybrid meeting with in person and remote viewing and participation over video conference utilizing a GoToMeeting platform. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting in person, via the live broadcast on [www.cvtv.org](http://www.cvtv.org) and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, [www.facebook.com/VancouverUS](http://www.facebook.com/VancouverUS). Public access and testimony on Consent*

*Agenda items and under the Community Forum were also facilitated in person and via the GoToMeeting conference call.*

*Vancouver City Council meeting minutes are a record of the action taken by Council. To view the CVTV video recording, including presentations, testimony and discussion, for this meeting please visit:*

[https://www.cvtv.org/vid\\_link/38209?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=6508](https://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/38209?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=6508)

*Electronic audio recording of City Council meetings are kept on file in the office of the City Clerk for a period of six years.*

## **Pledge of Allegiance**

## **Call to Order and Roll Call**

*The regular meeting of the Vancouver City Council was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor McEnery-Ogle. This meeting was conducted as a hybrid meeting, including both in person and remotely over video conference.*

***Present:*** Councilmember Harless, Councilmember Perez, Councilmember Fox, Councilmember Paulsen, Councilmember Stober, Councilmember Hansen, Mayor McEnery-Ogle

***Absent:*** None

## **Approval of Minutes**

### **Minutes - August 4, 2025**

***Motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Councilmember Harless, and Yes: 6, No: 0, Abstaining: 1, to approve the August 4, 2025, Meeting Minutes. Councilmember Perez abstained.***

## **Community Communication**

This is the place on the agenda where the public is invited to speak to Council regarding any matter on the Agenda not already scheduled for Public Hearing. (Separate instructions are provided for offering testimony on Public Hearing when applicable.) This includes the option to testify about Workshops. Members of the public addressing Council are requested to give their name and city of residence for the audio record. Speakers are to limit their testimony to a total of three minutes for all items combined. RCW 42.17A.555 and City Council Policy 100-32 prohibit the use of public facilities to support or oppose any ballot measure, or to support or oppose any candidate for elective office. Any violation of these rules could result in a suspension of speaking privileges during public comment periods at City Council Meetings for 90 days or longer for multiple offenses.

*Mayor McEnery-Ogle opened Community Communication and received testimony from the following community members regarding any matter on the agenda not scheduled for a Public Hearing:*

- *Bruce Barnes, Vancouver*

*There being no further testimony, Mayor McEnery-Ogle closed Community Communication.*

### **Consent Agenda**

The following items will be passed by a single motion to approve all listed actions and resolutions. There will be no discussion on these items unless requested by Council. If discussion is requested, the item will be moved from the Consent Agenda and considered separately – after the motion has been made and passed to approve the remaining items.

*Council pulled items 3 and 4 for discussion.*

#### **1. Contract Amendment - Onsite Sodium Hypochlorite Generation Units C-101827**

##### **Staff Report: 171-25**

Request: On Monday, August 11, 2025, authorize the City Manager, or designee, to finalize and execute Amendment No. 1 to contract C-101827 between the City of Vancouver and TMG Services, Inc. to increase the not-to-exceed amount by \$1,200,000 to a total of \$1,500,000.

Mehrin Selimgir, Civil Engineer, [Mehrin.Selimgir@cityofvancouver.us](mailto:Mehrin.Selimgir@cityofvancouver.us)

***Motion approved the request.***

#### **2. Resolution Adopting the Clark County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan**

**A RESOLUTION adopting the Clark County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.**

##### **Staff Report: 172-25**

Request: On Monday, August 11, 2025, finalize and approve the resolution for the Clark County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

William Elder, Environmental Services Manager, Julie Gilbertson, Solid Waste Supervisor, Will.Elder@cityofvancouver.us, julie.gilbertson@cityofvancouver.us

***Motion adopted Resolution M-4349 to approve the request.***

**3. Ordinance Amending Vancouver Municipal Code to Provide Impact Fee Deferral for Multi-family Residential Development**

**AN ORDINANCE** of the City of Vancouver relating to changes to the City's Impact Fee Ordinance; adopting an amendment to section 20.915, of the Vancouver Municipal Code (VMC); allowing for a deferral of traffic and park impact fee payment, providing for severability, and setting an effective date.

**Staff Report: 173-25**

Request: On Monday, August 11, 2025, advance the ordinance, setting the date for the second reading and public hearing for Monday, August 18, 2025.

Bryan Monroe, Associate Housing Project Coordinator, bryan.monroe@cityofvancouver.us

*Council requested amendments to the language of the ordinance and staff report for the second reading on August 18, 2025.*

***Mayor McEnerny-Ogle read the title of the ordinance into the record.***

***Motion approved the request.***

**4. Ordinance Amending Vancouver Municipal Code to Provide System Development Charge Deferral for Multi-Family Residential Development**

**AN ORDINANCE** of the City of Vancouver relating to changes to the City's Water And Sewer Use – Regulations And Charges Ordinance; adopting an amendment to section VMC 14.04, of the Vancouver Municipal Code (VMC); allowing for a deferral of utility system development charges for connecting to city utility services, providing for severability, and setting an effective date.

**Staff Report: 174-25**

Request: On Monday, August 11, 2025, advance the ordinance, setting the date for the second reading and public hearing for Monday, August 18, 2025.

Bryan Monroe, Associate Housing Project Coordinator, bryan.monroe@cityofvancouver.us

*Council requested amendments to the language of the staff report for the second reading on August 18, 2025.*

***Mayor McEnerny-Ogle read the title of the ordinance into the record.***

***Motion approved the request.***

## **5. Approval of Claim Vouchers**

Request: Approve claim vouchers for August 11, 2025.

***Motion approved claim vouchers in the amount of \$8,420,529.91.***

## **Public Hearings**

The following item(s) are scheduled for public hearing. Members of the public addressing Council are requested to give their name and city of residence for the audio record. Unless otherwise announced by the Presiding Officer, speakers are to limit their testimony to three minutes for each public hearing.

## **6. 2025 Site Specific Rezone - 58th Street**

**AN ORDINANCE** relating to Comprehensive Plan and Zoning for the City of Vancouver; amending the zoning map designation from R-22 to R-50 at a 1.6 acre property at 7711 and 7809 NE 58th Street, tax lots 107971000 and 107982000; providing for severability; and establishing an effective date.

### **Staff Report: 165-25**

Request: On Monday, August 11, 2025, upon second reading and a public hearing, finalize and approve the ordinance approving the 58<sup>th</sup> Street rezone to R-50.

Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner,  
bryan.snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the Quasi-Judicial Hearing for the 2025 Site Specific Rezone - 58th Street.

Nena Cook, City Attorney, provided an overview of the guidelines of conducting the hearing invoking the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. Ms. Cook stated the Council would be asked to disclose any ex parte communication or other Appearance of Fairness issues pertaining to the matter.

Ms. Cook then asked each member of the Council to disclose any direct or indirect benefit they could derive from the decision and determined there were no messages requiring disclosure.

All of the Councilmembers reported nothing to disclose.

Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner, provided an overview of the 2025 Site Specific Rezone - 58th Street.

*Council discussed the item briefly with staff.*

*Jason Taylor, PLS Engineering, representative to the applicant, provided an overview of the 58th Street Rezone application.*

*Mayor McEnery-Ogle opened the public hearing and received testimony from the following community members:*

- *Dave Gardiner, Vancouver*
- *Doug Roby, Vancouver*
- *Charles Brasher, Vancouver*
- *Mary Renaud, Vancouver*
- *Anastasiya Kozlovska, Vancouver*
- *Jay Renaud, Vancouver*
- *AnnMarie Taylor Haldeman, Vancouver*

*There being no further testimony, Mayor McEnery-Ogle closed the public hearing.*

***Motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Councilmember Paulsen, and Yes: 6, No: 1, Abstaining: 0, to agree with the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the ordinance proposing a change to the zoning map designation for the property from R-22 to R-50. Councilmember Stober voted No.***

## **7. 2025 Site Specific Rezone - Bella Grove**

**AN ORDINANCE** relating to Comprehensive Plan and Zoning for the City of Vancouver; amending the zoning map designation from R-18 to R-30 at a 6.2 acre property at 13401 and 13309 NE 59th Street, tax lots 107812000 & 107814000; providing for severability; and establishing an effective date.

### **Staff Report: 166-25**

Request: On Monday, August 11, 2025, upon second reading and a public hearing, finalize and approve the ordinance approving the Bella Grove rezone to R-30.

Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner,  
bryan.snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the Quasi-Judicial Hearing for the 2025 Site Specific Rezone - Bella Grove.

Nena Cook, City Attorney, provided an overview of the guidelines of conducting the hearing invoking the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. Ms. Cook stated the Council would be asked to disclose any ex parte communication or other Appearance of Fairness issues pertaining to the matter.

Ms. Cook then asked each member of the Council to disclose any direct or indirect benefit they could derive from the decision and determined there were no messages requiring disclosure.

All of the Councilmembers reported nothing to disclose.

Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner, provided an overview of the 2025 Site Specific Rezone - Bella Grove.

*Council discussed the item briefly with staff.*

*Jimmy Buell, applicant, provided an overview of the Bella Grove Rezone application.*

*Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the public hearing and received testimony from the following community members:*

- *Bruce Barnes, Vancouver*

*There being no further testimony, Mayor McEnerny-Ogle closed the public hearing.*

***Motion by Councilmember Fox, seconded by Councilmember Paulsen, and Yes: 7, No: 0, Abstaining: 0, to agree with the Planning Commission's recommendation and approve Ordinance M-4510 amending the zoning map designation from R-18 to R-30.***

## **Communications**

### **A. From the Council**

### **B. From the Mayor**

Mayor's Appointment to C-Tran Composition Board

*Mayor McEnerny-Ogle appointed Councilmember Paulsen as the representative for the C-Tran Composition Board.*

### C. From the City Manager

#### Adjournment

8:17 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

*Anne McEnerny-Ogle*

6C89D9089EC5424...

Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor

Attest:

DocuSigned by:

*Natasha Ramras*

493E940414AF4BD...

Natasha Ramras, City Clerk

The written comments below are those of the submitter alone and are not representative of the views of CVTV or the City of Vancouver, its elected or appointed officials, or its employees.

**From:** [Randall Franklin](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Walnut Grove Association 58th Rezone Testimony  
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 12:07:58 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Attn: 58<sup>th</sup> St Standalone Rezone August 11<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing

To The City Council:

I'm writing to update the Council about our Walnut Grove Neighborhood Association's interest and involvement in the 58<sup>th</sup> St Rezone Project. We had a workgroup research and collaborative process. I would like to share our findings.

Based on the comments heard at our July 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, as well as research done by our workgroup members and compiled on August 10<sup>th</sup>, Walnut Grove Association has expressed unanimous opposition to R-50. Quantitative, qualitative, expert, and narrative data were collected, totaling the engagement of estimated **70 Walnut Grove members**. The following concerns were raised in opposition of R-50:

- **Parking: a large parking lot creates heat islands**, which are detrimental to the health of the elderly and people with medical conditions, as well as all of us. Walnut Grove was already identified by the Urban Forestry Commission as an area of priority for increasing trees and shading; cutting them off in the name of a parking lot that would be required for R-50 would be antithetical to that goal, concentrating heat right next to our green spaces and backyards. R-22 would de-prioritize a parking lot and bring the focus back to preserving existing green space.
- **Walnut Grove is rich with senior-focused living facilities, a major memory care center, and a Vancouver Housing Authority** affordable housing apartment for seniors on 58<sup>th</sup> St, just a few steps down from Shaffer Park. While the planned parking lot is already large for R-50, it still only provides for one or less parking spaces per unit. Most families have two cars, and may on occasion— at no fault of their own—want to invite guests over with additional cars. We're already seeing parking on residential streets from prior high-density developments, accidents, and near misses. Our concern is that the planned parking spaces planned at Shaffer Park to increase park goers from senior facilities and the surrounding neighborhood will simply be taken up by residents and their guests from across the street, defeating the purpose of Shaffer Park expansion and subsidizing their parking with our Shaffer Park funds.
- Additionally, **dense traffic expected under R-50 increases safety risk for the children walking to school and seniors trying to access green spaces**. A flashing crosswalk is a band-aid style fix for a problem that should not be created in the first place, while we can still avoid it. Recognizing the narrow width of 58<sup>th</sup> St, and the development of Shaffer Park, we want to prioritize pedestrian infrastructure and bike lanes to access the park and deprioritize car

traffic. Thus far, the conversation around this rezone has centered around simply somehow fitting pedestrians back into a road that will prioritize 340+ new cars; that goes against the values set during Shaffer Park neighborhood workshops in the past years. The focus should be on the safety of current senior residents and families. We already have a problem with street racing and accidents and are working on exploring Traffic Calming programs as an association in various places throughout 58<sup>th</sup> and beyond. Our fear is for the elderly, disabled VHA residents or retirees becoming afraid to go to Shaffer Park because of needing to cross with flashing lights, hoping that each of the hundreds of cars will stop on any given day and not speed past. R-50 would create the maximum possible traffic volume and thus be inappropriate in the absence of traffic calming projects that we are exploring with the City. Any proposed retail space will further exacerbate traffic and should be included in traffic and impact studies.

- **We are not transient:** at the benefit of “going into the future,” Council is risking detriment to the past, the history, the current residents of 5, 10, 20+ years. People who grew up here, people who retired here, people who lived most of their life here. People who are finding their footing and intend to stay for decades, give their homes to their children. We ask Council to pay reverence to these residents, rather than erasing us in the name of an enigmatic “future;” a future in which our voice needs to be included, too, not just Applicant’s. Many of us were already displaced by Applicant’s prior projects due to increased traffic, noise, and other concerns, and that is just R-22. R-50 would amplify that more than two fold. As taxpayers of decades, we demand recognition, and protection of our peace.
- **Noise and safety:** going back to the issue of “we are not transient, we are a permanent community,” the guaranteed noise pollution and increased traffic on a pedestrian rich 58<sup>th</sup> St are both recipes for displacement of many of us. Our hope is that the Council will choose not to displace residents and taxpayers of decades, people who have taken care of this land with our money, labor, love, and soul, to allow space for luxury apartments, a for-profit business. Our seniors and families deserve quiet and safe streets. We are not reducible to the number of units, or number of dollars of impact fees; we are Walnut Grove, we are human. Our hundred-year-old trees, our wildlife, our Shaffer Park, the health of our Stormwater Facility are not reducible to “No Significance,” as stated in SEPA. Many of us hope to share this humanity with you.
- **Fire safety:** Some residents raised questions about the preparedness of our fire department to fight fires in a 5-or-more-story building, which requires specialized equipment, though our fire department hasn’t even been made aware of the potential development yet. Height and density are growing in Walnut Grove, yet funding and staffing at the fire department is on a downslope.
- **R-50 is unprecedented:** With rich green spaces and value of quiet and community, Walnut Grove is not the right place for the experiment of R-50, which is meant for commercial and higher density neighborhoods.

In addition to a unanimous opposition to R-50, a majority of members expressed opposition to R-35 as similarly non-incremental. Majority of Walnut Grove is R-18 and R-9, with a duplex to the east being the only R-22 for decades. R-22 developments only recently started being approved with caution, and R-30 has already been denied in this neighborhood in 2021, citing that R-22 is better fitting and safer for our neighborhood as described above. Our Association also recognizes the City’s need to increase multifamily housing; this will be

effectively accomplished by R-22 zoning, going from two single family homes to 35-44 units is already progress.

Overall, we ask the Council to bring more emphasis to the human impact of R-50 in Walnut Grove, which will show detriment. The Council and Manager form of government is meant to represent the residents and taxpayers of Vancouver and be a voice for the *public* at *public hearings*. Nevertheless, with our collective voices backing up individual testimony, we have faith that we speak from lived experience and that, as one of our members said, “we will be protected even if we’re not rich developers.”

While we attempted to invite the City Planner, Bryan Snodgrass, to our workshop for questions and a discussion, we did not receive an RSVP. Whereas our testimony is limited to 3 minutes, in contrast to the Applicant, we still speak with gravity of a unanimous opposition of about 70 Walnut Grove residents from our July 30<sup>th</sup> meeting and further opposition expressed to our workgroup. Thank you, Council, for your time in addressing our Association and our concerns. We are kindly asking for the Council to stand with us in recognizing the history, safety, and humanity of Walnut Grove. We oppose R-50.

Respectfully,

Ana Kozlovska, Jay Renaud, Mary Renaud, AnnMarie Haldeman, Inna Kozlovska, Dave Gardiner, Cheryl Hummel, Charles Brasher, with support of R.S.

Walnut Grove Neighborhood Association 58<sup>th</sup> Rezone Workgroup

**From:** [Ana From Walnut Grove](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Walnut Grove Association 58th Rezone Testimony  
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 12:00:17 PM

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Attn: 58<sup>th</sup> St Standalone Rezone August 11<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing

To The City Council:

I'm writing to update the Council about our Walnut Grove Neighborhood Association's interest and involvement in the 58<sup>th</sup> St Rezone Project. We had a workgroup research and collaborative process. I would like to share our findings.

Based on the comments heard at our July 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, as well as research done by our workgroup members and compiled on August 10<sup>th</sup>, Walnut Grove Association has expressed unanimous opposition to R-50. Quantitative, qualitative, expert, and narrative data were collected, totaling the engagement of estimated **70 Walnut Grove members**. The following concerns were raised in opposition of R-50:

- **Parking: a large parking lot creates heat islands**, which are detrimental to the health of the elderly and people with medical conditions, as well as all of us. Walnut Grove was already identified by the Urban Forestry Commission as an area of priority for increasing trees and shading; cutting them off in the name of a parking lot that would be required for R-50 would be antithetical to that goal, concentrating heat right next to our green spaces and backyards. R-22 would de-prioritize a parking lot and bring the focus back to preserving existing green space.
- **Walnut Grove is rich with senior-focused living facilities, a major memory care center, and a Vancouver Housing Authority** affordable housing apartment for seniors on 58<sup>th</sup> St, just a few steps down from Shaffer Park. While the planned parking lot is already large for R-50, it still only provides for one or less parking spaces per unit. Most families have two cars, and may on occasion—at no fault of their own—want to invite guests over with additional cars. We're already seeing parking on residential streets from prior high-density developments, accidents, and near misses. Our concern is that the planned parking spaces planned at Shaffer Park to increase park goers from senior facilities and the surrounding neighborhood will simply be taken up by residents and their guests from across the street, defeating the purpose of Shaffer Park expansion and subsidizing their parking with our Shaffer Park funds.
- Additionally, **dense traffic expected under R-50 increases safety risk for the children walking to school and seniors trying to access green spaces**. A flashing crosswalk is a band-aid style fix for a problem that should not be created in the first place, while we can still avoid it. Recognizing the narrow width of 58<sup>th</sup> St, and the development of Shaffer Park, we want to prioritize pedestrian infrastructure and bike lanes to access the park and deprioritize car traffic. Thus far, the conversation around this rezone has centered around simply somehow fitting pedestrians back into a road that will prioritize 340+ new cars; that

goes against the values set during Shaffer Park neighborhood workshops in the past years. The focus should be on the safety of current senior residents and families. We already have a problem with street racing and accidents and are working on exploring Traffic Calming programs as an association in various places throughout 58<sup>th</sup> and beyond. Our fear is for the elderly, disabled VHA residents or retirees becoming afraid to go to Shaffer Park because of needing to cross with flashing lights, hoping that each of the hundreds of cars will stop on any given day and not speed past. R-50 would create the maximum possible traffic volume and thus be inappropriate in the absence of traffic calming projects that we are exploring with the City. Any proposed retail space will further exacerbate traffic and should be included in traffic and impact studies.

- **We are not transient:** at the benefit of “going into the future,” Council is risking detriment to the past, the history, the current residents of 5, 10, 20+ years. People who grew up here, people who retired here, people who lived most of their life here. People who are finding their footing and intend to stay for decades, give their homes to their children. We ask Council to pay reverence to these residents, rather than erasing us in the name of an enigmatic “future;” a future in which our voice needs to be included, too, not just Applicant’s. Many of us were already displaced by Applicant’s prior projects due to increased traffic, noise, and other concerns, and that is just R-22. R-50 would amplify that more than two fold. As taxpayers of decades, we demand recognition, and protection of our peace.
- **Noise and safety:** going back to the issue of “we are not transient, we are a permanent community,” the guaranteed noise pollution and increased traffic on a pedestrian rich 58<sup>th</sup> St are both recipes for displacement of many of us. Our hope is that the Council will choose not to displace residents and taxpayers of decades, people who have taken care of this land with our money, labor, love, and soul, to allow space for luxury apartments, a for-profit business. Our seniors and families deserve quiet and safe streets. We are not reducible to the number of units, or number of dollars of impact fees; we are Walnut Grove, we are human. Our hundred-year-old trees, our wildlife, our Shaffer Park, the health of our Stormwater Facility are not reducible to “No Significance,” as stated in SEPA. Many of us hope to share this humanity with you.
- **Fire safety:** Some residents raised questions about the preparedness of our fire department to fight fires in a 5-or-more-story building, which requires specialized equipment, though our fire department hasn’t even been made aware of the potential development yet. Height and density are growing in Walnut Grove, yet funding and staffing at the fire department is on a downslope.
- **R-50** is unprecedented: With rich green spaces and value of quiet and community, Walnut Grove is not the right place for the experiment of R-50, which is meant for commercial and higher density neighborhoods.

In addition to a unanimous opposition to R-50, a majority of members expressed opposition to R-35 as similarly non-incremental. Majority of Walnut Grove is R-18 and R-9, with a duplex to the east being the only R-22 for decades. R-22 developments only recently started being approved with caution, and R-30 has already been denied in this neighborhood in 2021, citing that R-22 is better fitting and safer for our neighborhood as described above. Our Association also recognizes the City’s need to increase multifamily housing; this will be effectively accomplished by R-22 zoning, going from two single family homes to 35-44 units is already progress.

Overall, we ask the Council to bring more emphasis to the human impact of R-50 in Walnut Grove, which will show detriment. The Council and Manager form of government is meant to represent the residents and taxpayers of Vancouver and be a voice for the *public at public hearings*. Nevertheless, with our collective voices backing up individual testimony, we have faith that we speak from lived experience and that, as one of our members said, “we will be protected even if we’re not rich developers.”

While we attempted to invite the City Planner, Bryan Snodgrass, to our workshop for questions and a discussion, we did not receive a response. Whereas our testimony is limited to 3 minutes, in contrast to the Applicant, we still speak with gravity of a unanimous opposition of about 70 Walnut Grove residents from our July 30<sup>th</sup> meeting and further opposition expressed to our workgroup. Thank you, Council, for your time in addressing our Association and our concerns. We are kindly asking for the Council to stand with us in recognizing the history, safety, and humanity of Walnut Grove. We oppose R-50.

Respectfully,

Ana Kozlovska, Jay Renaud, Mary Renaud, AnnMarie Haldeman, Inna Kozlovska, Dave Gardiner, and others, with support of C.H., R.S.

Walnut Grove Neighborhood Association 58<sup>th</sup> Rezone Workgroup

**From:** [Ana From Walnut Grove](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [City Attorney Emails](#)  
**Subject:** 58th St Rezone Testimony: Transit Overlay  
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 11:40:05 AM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Attn: 58<sup>th</sup> Rezone Transit Overlay Discussion

Dear Council:

Units:

In 2021, Sunlight Rentals (“Applicant”) provided information to City Staff and City Council regarding site plans for 63<sup>rd</sup> St/62<sup>nd</sup> St Sunlight Meadows. The discussion revolved around “roughly 45 [units] under the proposed R-22 zone,” and “future redevelopment of 0.3-acre corner mobile home property [abutting future R-22] feasible but probably less likely in near term.”

45 Units. That was the information given to City Council upon voting to approve R-22 in 2021.

In 2022, Sunlight Rentals submits an application to develop “76 units” in the proposed 45-unit location, utilizing the aforementioned “corner mobile home” property. Their application is approved to build 125% of capacity, citing the Transit Overlay District; 60 units allowable normally, 76 units at 125% bonus.

**Sunlight Meadows today is proudly advertised as a 78-unit complex. Not 45 as City Council and the public were told during rezone hearing.**

R-50 allows 50 units per acre. Applicant once again claims they will only build 77 units. In approving a rezone, the Council should be aware of all possibilities and implications of this rezone. Again, this brings up the undermentioned 125% “Transit Overlay” bonus. On 1.6 acres alongside 58<sup>th</sup> St, R-50 allows 80 units, but with the bonus that Applicant has utilized in the past and is well aware of, the **actual total could be 100 units**. That’s a question of 44 units under R-22 (including the 125% bonus) versus 100 units. More than a two-fold increase; wholesale, non-incremental. This information is not included in neither the traffic study, environmental study, nor elsewhere upfront. It is disingenuous not to mention the Transit Overlay District.

They don’t have to build all 100. But they have built at over 125% density in the past.

Height:

Prior to Planning Commission’s May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting addressing 58<sup>th</sup> St rezone, Sunlight Rentals proposed a four-story 77-unit complex. During the Public Hearing, their representative admitted to actual plans of a 5-story building, not 4, and no commitment to number of units.

Responsibility to the Community:

Finally, in 2022, the City reached out to Sunlight Rentals to install speed bumps on 62<sup>nd</sup> St of the Sunlight Meadows development to address concerns of abutting homes about increased traffic on their residential street. But staff admitted that Applicant isn’t “technically” required to install speed bumps, it would be a negotiation.

In 2025, there are no speed bumps along all of 62<sup>nd</sup> St. The responsibility of calming increased traffic created by 78 units on the residential 62<sup>nd</sup> St now falls on the City's Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program—incurring additional costs to the City. The City decided against installing speed bumps based on a traffic study likely done before Sunlight Meadows was at full capacity. The people left to struggle with the consequence of this are the residents of 62<sup>nd</sup> St, who have near misses, accidents, and decreased safety, even considering banning street parking altogether due to Meadows residents parking on their streets.

Now, the City is once again relying on Applicant to negotiate traffic and pedestrian safety improvements to 58<sup>th</sup> St. And relying on Applicant to negotiate with abutting homes. But City again admitted they don't "technically" have to negotiate. Precedent shows that when Applicant wasn't required to do community and street improvements, they chose not to. Precedent speaks louder than intention. The story has changed, and keeps changing, and the precedent is not reassuring.

It's time for accountability.

Spot Zoning:

100 units in a five to seven story building next to mostly R-9, low density neighborhood is spot zoning, and against zoning law. There will be no benefit, but rather harm (which we as residents expressed extensively), to Walnut Grove, and R-50 will not be more beneficial to housing and human need than R-22 would be. R-50 is largely for the benefit of the developer. Additionally, the Planning Commission voted against this rezone. I ask the Council to review the risk of spot zoning, especially in regards to incongruence of R-50 to lack of necessary infrastructure. We must make decisions based on laws as they currently are written, not what we think the law might be.

Thank you for your time once again.

Best,

Ana

**From:** [Brent Belford](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** August 11 City Council Meeting Comment- 58th Street Rezoning  
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 11:36:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [city council letter.docx](#)

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

Please find attached my comments for today's City Council meeting regarding the proposed 58th Street rezoning. Let me know if there are any issues opening the attachment.

My contact information is:

[REDACTED]  
Vancouver, WA 98662

Thank you,  
Brent Belford

To the City Council:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed 58<sup>th</sup> Street rezoning, a rezoning proposal which has already been rejected by the City's Planning Commission. I previously wrote to the Planning Commission, outlining some of my serious concerns about the potential rezoning and development of a large apartment building in this quiet residential area. Among other concerns I focused primarily on the deleterious environmental impacts, especially to the large stormwater treatment area that immediately borders the properties to the south. The stormwater treatment area already suffers more abuse than the resources allocated to it by the City can handle, and more people, pets, traffic, and construction will be all too destructive to the nature and wildlife.

I have since looked into more information on the City's zoning guidelines, and everything I have read makes this proposed rezoning more and more objectionable and contrary to the spirit and the letter of city zoning codes. City of Vancouver Municipal Code 20.420.025 section E lists five characteristics of areas that are appropriate for R-50 zoning. The properties in question meet zero of these five characteristics:

1. The area is not an urban center.
2. The area does not have "good pedestrian connections" to commercial services and major employment centers.
3. The properties are not near any business or commercial areas, let alone ones that are of "comparable height and bulk" to a potential 70-foot tall building.
4. The properties do not provide a transition in scale with surroundings. The large, 70+ unit apartment complex would be dropped in the midst of single-family homes and would directly border such homes.
5. The area has limited transit service and there are no nearby bus stops, and both 58<sup>th</sup> Street and immediate surrounding streets are absolutely not equipped to handle the whopping 350 daily vehicle trips identified in the traffic study.

It is overwhelmingly clear that the properties do not meet the zoning guidelines as laid out by municipal code. And these guidelines exist for good reason. They promote cohesion and quality of life, and help foster a city worth living in. Neglecting the zoning guardrails will lead to the neighborhood being decimated and its resources overstressed to the point of failure. The City's mission states that it seeks "incremental" change in its mission to increase housing availability, and this rezoning proposal is blatantly not incremental. I urge the council to affirm the Planning Commission's correct decision and reject the 58<sup>th</sup> Street rezoning proposal.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Brent Belford

**From:** [Randall Franklin](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Walnut Grove Regarding 58th St Standalone Rezone  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 2:15:05 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

August 4th, 2025

Dear City Council:

I am writing as a Walnut Grove Neighborhood Association member and contact person to inform the City Council of our re-convening and inquiry into the 58<sup>th</sup> Street Rezone proposal. Walnut Grove Neighborhood Association is City-recognized, and since July 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025 is once again active. On July 30<sup>th</sup>, we had a meeting of over 40 neighbors who gathered to re-establish our Association and reignite a sense of togetherness. Our emphasis was cohesion and a reminder that we are not transient. We are a tightly knit community who lived and will live here for generations; therefore, we intend to take care of our nature, streets, schools, resources, public servants, and each other. The 58<sup>th</sup> St Rezone proposal garnered interest within our neighborhood as a decision that will directly and significantly impact each of these categories, so we introduced this issue into our agenda and ongoing discussions.

From a thorough gathering of perspectives across Walnut Grove and at our July 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, we recognize this rezone as an issue where our Association would appreciate active participation and a voice—including a vote and collaboration with City Staff. My fellow members have expressed overwhelming concern about the appropriateness of this rezone. Several unanswered questions remain regarding who and how will ensure safety on 58<sup>th</sup> St, especially pedestrian safety (of children walking to and from school, parkgoers), regarding fire safety be and preparedness, deterring of parking on our residential streets, accountability to our stormwater facility (draining water directly into waterways), decades old trees, and park outside of impact fees, and accountability to us.

In preparation for our Association's anticipated workshops and vote on this issue (pending board re-election), we are actively working on establishing a temporary workgroup to gather and present our collective stance and questions. Ideally, many of us Association members would appreciate time and opportunity to fully workshop this proposal and present our findings and decision to the City Council. Alongside our own research, meetings, and canvassing, we intend to kindly invite City Staff to collaborate and ask questions, namely regarding currently missing infrastructure. Answers to these questions are important to our livelihood and cohesion.

Thank you in advance, Councilmembers, for your continued dedication to neighborhoods and Associations, and for including our voice in decisions that will impact us most directly.

Best,

Ana Kozlovska

Walnut Grove Association

**From:** [Cynthia LeBaron](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** 58th Street Rezoning  
**Date:** Thursday, August 7, 2025 5:52:54 AM

---

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council Members,

I am writing about my concerns regarding the rezoning request for the parcels of land on 58th Street.

My biggest concern is the added traffic and the safety of the children in the neighborhood. 58th Street is not a main thoroughfare, but rather a neighborhood street. Increasing the number of units allowed on the properties in question will add many more cars driving up and down the street. Directly across from these properties is a park the city is in the process of developing. In addition, Walnut Grove Elementary is just a half-mile away. The safety of pedestrians crossing 58th Street with the additional traffic is an issue. I am especially concerned about the neighborhood children having to cross the street because of the proximity of the park and school.

I moved into the neighborhood less than 5 years ago. We chose Walnut Grove because it was a developed, stable neighborhood. Since we moved in, more than 150 new units have been added within a half-mile of our house. While I understand the need for more housing and the redevelopment of older properties, I think it is important to maintain the neighborhood feeling. Increasing the number of units allowed will not be a positive change to this established neighborhood. There are other sites that would be more appropriate for a larger development.

Please vote against the proposed zoning changes for the 58th Street properties.

Thank you,  
Cynthia LeBaron  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Cc:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Walnut Grove - rezone of 58th Street  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 5, 2025 8:54:09 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

- Why are we being railroaded into increasing the number of proposed 80-Plus apartments on 58<sup>th</sup> Street between the parks? But please don't allow them to change to the high density **R50** for such a small area – something never done before!
- Really that area shouldn't have 34 units, by the park.
- Vancouver has never allowed more density than R-35
- And most every family has more than 1 car, did they answer where these people will park? Probably the streets and 58 Street is narrow!
- And what about all the children waiting for buses in that area? Cars are zipping thru there, even with speed bumps.
- Sunlight Apartments has already shown they are sneaky and back-handed to get their way, with the apartments crammed in the end of 62<sup>nd</sup> Street with only **ONE** entrance/exit (couldn't have an opening on 72<sup>nd</sup> because of the school). These children still walk home from school thru the neighborhood! And you allowed for 200-plus person complex (not to mention every adult has a car) to be built in the Walnut Grove neighborhood and by a school?? Incredible.
- WHY IS IT NOW BEING ALTERED to the detriment of the school and the neighborhood by hiding his intentions of making as much money as he can, while devaluating our homes with more apartments, not enuf parking, and crowding in more people.
- And speaking of schools, was there a study done of how this will affect the local schools in attendance and growth?
- Was there an environmental study done at all?
- Behind the area of the proposed new apartments is a marshland and floods in that area.
- 58<sup>th</sup> Street is narrow already, and now has BUMPS but that doesn't seem to slow the cars down much, and now you are adding more cars trying to

get through the streets.

- There is a Senior Living area just down from 58<sup>th</sup> Street on 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, who take walks around the neighborhoods, and drive. And these apartments will provide more traffic.
- AND adding in the building up of the Raymond Shaffer Park, 58<sup>th</sup> street will be a mess for several years.

PLEASE don't change the zoning on 58<sup>th</sup> Street.

A Concerned home-owner, Cheryl Hummel

**From:** [City of Vancouver, WA](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Submission: Contact City Council  
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 9:55:51 AM

---

# Contact the City Council

<b>Name</b>
Ann Steiner
<b>Email</b>
[REDACTED]
<b>Address</b>
[REDACTED] Vancouver 98662 United States <a href="#">Map It</a>
<b>Subject</b>
Request Information
<b>Choose Recipient</b>
All the Council
<b>Message</b>
Concerning tonight's Council Meeting agenda item Public Hearings #6—58th Street Rezone. The testimony given at your August 4, 2025 meeting expressed succinctly my evaluation of the request. R-50 is too too dense for the reasons stated. The neighborhood (within 1/2 mile of the Vancouver Mall) has many two story residences/units: an appropriate designation, for those two properties. Monies gained from the R-50 zone should not be the main reason to approve. I trust you will look at the whole picture of the neighborhood. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. 🌲🌲🌲

**From:** [Ana From Walnut Grove](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [City Attorney Emails](#)  
**Subject:** 8/11 58th Street Rezone Testimony: Precedent  
**Date:** Monday, August 11, 2025 8:27:34 AM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Respected City Council Regarding 58<sup>th</sup> St Rezone:

**On Precedent: Sunlight Rental’s Similar Prior Project in Walnut Grove Rezone in 2021**

On May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021, Sunlight Rentals brought to the City Council a proposition to increase one of their properties from R-18 to R-30 (tax lot 105120000, now called “Sunlight Meadows,” located half a mile from 58<sup>th</sup> St). At the Public Hearing, the Council voted on a more incremental R-22 and rejected R-30. Notable excerpts from 5/17/2021 Minutes:

Councilmember Paulsen stated R-30 to be “a considerable jump in density when looking at the surrounding area of this site, especially as it is transitioning down to a lower density. [He stated] the Council should strive to create transitional zones between changes in density.”

Mayor McEnergy-Ogle “looked at this big jump in density and at other areas zoned R-30 and noted the concentrated transit, walkability, access to grocery stores, and other amenities in those areas. [She stated she] would support the [R-22] motion.”

Councilmember Fox earlier in the process stated, “let’s set the right precedent” in opposing R-30.

Overall, R-30 was seen as going against character of the neighborhood (Walnut Grove) and being too wholesale of a density change, and R-22 was a better fit according to VMC.

The Council denied R-30 rezoning and maintained R-22 as better fitting for the neighborhood character and amenities per code. Just a few years later, with minimal changes to Walnut Grove and the same neighborhood character and limited infrastructure (which is still required by law), the same precedent should apply o 58<sup>th</sup> St less than half a mile away.

Additionally, the 2021 Sunlight Meadows development is located by 63<sup>rd</sup> St, which is a far larger road with more capacity than the underdeveloped 58<sup>th</sup> St. 63<sup>rd</sup> St is a block away from Andresen Road, a major Arterial, in contrast to 58<sup>th</sup> street, which *is* not a major arterial per WSDOT. The 2021 63<sup>rd</sup> St project has a better pedestrian pathway, which 58<sup>th</sup> St doesn’t have at all. Despite these structures, the **Council still voted against R-30 rezoning in 2021**, appropriately citing high density as being too wholesale for Walnut Grove’s character and R-22 being more appropriate.

**Loud precedent for 58<sup>th</sup> St**

The currently questioned 58<sup>th</sup> St area is even less developed than the area next to 63<sup>rd</sup> St, and all concerns about character of Walnut Grove are still applicable within that half a mile. Namely, in contrast to the location of Sunlight Meadows on 63<sup>rd</sup>, the 58<sup>th</sup> St development will

require travel through a park zone, a residential zone, and a school zone before reaching a major arterial (Andresen). Additionally, there is no pedestrian path on majority of 58<sup>th</sup> St, which is a bare minimum code requirement for high density development. There isn't adequate access to public transportation on 58<sup>th</sup> St compared to 63<sup>rd</sup> St. Finally, there is far less access to commercial zoning nearby; all housing immediately surrounding is single family, mostly low-density R-9, plus two park zones, and the tallest buildings in all of Walnut Grove are two story duplexes.

If the City Council found Walnut Grove to be unsuitable for R-30, then applying the same reasoning, R-50 in Walnut Grove is a blatant overreach and should be rejected by precedent. R-30 was found to be non-incremental at the time, which objectively makes R-50 (more than a two-fold increase) *overwhelmingly* non-incremental. Again, high density goes against character of Walnut Grove, and the area does not have enough infrastructure to support basic pedestrian and public transport access, let alone robust access as is required by VMC.

Notably, there has been no change in circumstance since 2021. The same housing crisis argument was brought to the Council in 2021, but the Council still saw that the facts show Walnut Grove isn't right for such wholesale development. We had a housing crisis then, and we have a crisis now. It still doesn't change the fact that Walnut Grove wasn't and still isn't the right fit according to VMC for anything above R-22.

### **R-50 is new: let's set the right precedent**

R-50 is an unprecedented zone for City of Vancouver; it has never been built before. Precedent is permanent and will be used and cited as a blueprint for all future R-50 developments.

Going off existing precedent, Walnut Grove was found to be unfit for R-30 just a few years ago. So, it clearly is not the right neighborhood to have the first ever R-50.

Per VMC, R-50 zoning is designed to fit into a neighborhood with existing high density, existing tall height, and surrounding robust public transport access and robust road conditions to support high density, or to be built around urban and commercial zones. Walnut Grove goes squarely against all of these VMC code requirements, and any leniency demonstrated in the approval of the first ever R-50 would invite future propositions for non-incremental development for all of Vancouver. This is worrying in the context of the upcoming Comprehensive Plan draft; we as Vancouver cannot be writing such sweeping and permanent precedent while we're *actively* figuring out our future codes, laws, and Comprehensive Plan. A quasi-judicial body is **required** to make decisions based on the law **as it is written**, and based on precedent, *not* based on ideas about what future law *might* be. And the precedent in Walnut Grove is strong, with R-30 denied just a few years ago.

Walnut Grove wasn't the right fit for R-30 in 2021. It surely isn't the right fit for R-50 in 2025. If the Council strives "to create transitional zones between changes in density," then R-50 goes against this value. Thank you for taking the time to consider the importance of precedent of a similar proposition within Walnut Grove, the facts of which are still applicable to 58<sup>th</sup> St.

R-50 goes against existing precedent and law. Let's set the right precedent for other future R-50s.

Best,

Ana Kozlovska

**From:** [VPOG President](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Prop 5 Written Testimony  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 6, 2025 2:15:17 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Vancouver City Council,

As the President of the Vancouver Police Officers' Guild, I am writing in strong support of Proposition 5. I happen to be out of town this week and couldn't be there in person; however, this initiative is very important. This initiative is essential to addressing our city's critical need for increased law enforcement staffing. Every day, our officers work tirelessly to serve this growing community with dedication and professionalism. Yet, I continue to hear from residents who no longer call for help with "minor" concerns because they fear no one will respond. That is not only disheartening—it is unacceptable.

While reported crime trends may appear to be declining, we know many incidents simply go unreported. When people stop calling the police, it's not because the problems have gone away—it's because they've lost faith in our ability to respond. Vancouver has grown dramatically over the past decade, but our police staffing has not kept pace. Washington State already ranks last in the nation for officers per capita, and Clark County is at the very bottom within the state. This is not sustainable, especially as Vancouver approaches becoming the third-largest city in Washington.

We understand that voters are cautious about new taxes. But this proposition is not about expanding government—it's about restoring public safety. Our department has operated with far too few officers for far too long. With annexation on the horizon and continued population growth, now is the time to invest in the future. Recruiting, hiring, and training new officers takes time, and we cannot afford to wait until the need becomes even more urgent.

Proposition 5 is a necessary and timely solution. The Vancouver Police Officers' Guild is committed to working closely with City leadership to meet the evolving needs of public safety in our community. I urge you to support this measure—for the safety of our neighborhoods, the strength of our community, and the future of Vancouver.

Sincerely,



**Jeff Anaya**  
VPOG President



**From:** [Wynn Grcich](#)  
**To:** [Rebecca Messinger](#); [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Watch "Doctor exposes COVID-19 'vaccine lies' at fiery Senate hearing: 'They lied, billions were made'" on YouTube  
**Date:** Sunday, August 10, 2025 4:28:42 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

<https://www.youtube.com/live/PC7mleox8zw?si=qJYt1dipimLSkIdE> .send to council members and Melnick. Put on public record and confirm that you did. Thanks from Wynn

**From:** [Wynn Grcich](#)  
**To:** [Rebecca Messinger](#); [Victorialeeferrer@gmail.com](mailto:Victorialeeferrer@gmail.com); [City Council](#); [Vern Jeremica](#); [Justin Forsman](#)  
**Subject:** Watch "The Toxic Truth: PFAS Chemicals in Your Water, Food, and Backyard" on YouTube  
**Date:** Monday, August 4, 2025 5:19:06 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

<https://youtu.be/rDxvF624dS4?si=MwmpRqji8zIF33lZ>. Please share with council members and Melnick. Put on public record and confirm that you did. Thanks from Wynn.