



CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Vancouver City Hall | Council Chambers | 415 W. 6th St.
PO Box 1995 | Vancouver, WA 98668-1995
www.cityofvancouver.us

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Mayor

Bart Hansen • Ty Stober • Erik Paulsen • Sarah J. Fox • Diana H. Perez • Kim D. Harless

June 13, 2022

WORKSHOPS

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

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 and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, or www.facebook.com/VancouverUS.

View the CVTV video recording, including presentations and discussion, for workshops at:

https://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/34709?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=3147

4:00 - 5:00 pm Water Resiliency Strategy

Chris Malone, Public Works Finance and Asset Manager, 360-487-7711

Summary

Staff led Council through a discussion of the Water Resiliency Strategy.

5:00 - 6:00 pm Community Visioning Update

William Cooley, Community Engagement Manager, 360-487-8617

Summary

Staff led Council through a discussion of the Community Visioning and Strategic Plan Update.

COUNCIL DINNER/ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

COUNCIL CONSENT AGENDA MEETING

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 and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, 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/34711?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=5720 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 McEnerny-Ogle. This meeting was conducted as a hybrid meeting, including both in person and remotely over video conference.

Present: Councilmembers Harless, Perez, Fox, Paulsen, Stober,
Mayor McEnerny-Ogle

Absent: Hansen

Councilmember Fox attended remotely.

Councilmember Paulsen motioned to excuse Councilmember Hansen from the Council meeting, seconded by Councilmember Stober, and carried unanimously to approve the absence.

Proclamation: Juneteenth

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle read and presented a proclamation to Karen Morrison, Founder and Executive Director of Odyssey World International Education Services and Jasmine Tolbert, President of NAACP Vancouver, WA, proclaiming June 19, 2022, as Juneteenth Freedom Celebration Day.

Community Communication (1-5)

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened Community Communication and received testimony from the following community members regarding Items 1-5:

- Terence Ibert, Vancouver
- Margaret Milem, Vancouver
- Beverly Tyler, Vancouver
- Wynn Grcich, Vancouver
- Kimberlee Elbon, La Center, WA
- Glenn Yung, Vancouver

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

Consent Agenda (Items 1-5)

Council requested Items 2 and 4 to be pulled.

Council discussed Items 2 and 4 with staff at length.

Motion by Councilmember Paulsen, seconded by Councilmember Stober, to approve Items 1-5 on the Consent Agenda. Amended by Councilmember Fox, seconded by Councilmember Perez to vote on Item 2 separately.

The vote was carried unanimously to approve Items 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the Consent Agenda, and the approval includes both options for Item 4.

The second vote carried 5-1 to approve Item 2 on the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Fox voted No.

1. Designation of TV ETC and CVTV respectively as the education and government access providers on the Comcast cable system

Staff Report: 075-22

A RESOLUTION relating to cable television and to the designation of Clark Vancouver Television ("CVTV") as the governmental access provider on the Comcast cable system for Vancouver and Clark County.

A RESOLUTION relating to cable television and to the designation of the Vancouver Educational Telecommunications Consortium ("TV ETC") as the

educational access provider on the Comcast cable system for Vancouver and Clark County.

The City and County have a cable television franchise agreement with Comcast of Washington, V LLC that was effective on July 1, 2013. Under the terms of this agreement, Comcast provides channels for Public, Education and Government (PEG) programming, and it is the responsibility of the City and County to designate authorized entities to provide programming on those channels.

Organizations that are designated as access providers have authorization to broadcast programs over assigned channels on the Comcast cable system. They are also able to apply for annual PEG grants, administered by the City, for equipment and other capital expenses associated with producing and broadcasting programming.

TV ETC is a consortium of K-20 educational institutions operated by Educational Service District 112 and is the current educational access provider for Vancouver and Clark County. CVTV, operated by the City/County Cable Television Office, is the current government access provider for Vancouver and Clark County.

The City/County Telecommunications Commission ("Commission") recommends organizations to serve as access providers to the City Council, per VMC 5.19.320(7). The Commission met on June 1, 2022, to review designation applications and annual reports and to receive presentations from the applicants. Based on their review, the Commission is recommending re-designation of TV ETC and CVTV, respectively, as the education and government access providers for Vancouver and Clark County.

Request: On June 13, 2022, adopt resolutions approving The Vancouver Educational Telecommunications Consortium (TV ETC) as the designated educational access provider and Clark Vancouver Television (CVTV) as the designated government access provider for Vancouver and Clark County on the Comcast cable system.

*Aaron Lande, Program and Policy Development Manager,
360-487-8612*

Motion approved the request.

- 2. Amendment to a contract with PBS Engineering and Environmental Inc. (Contract # C-79788) to complete the design, update environmental permitting, and provide construction support related to the NE 137th Avenue transportation improvement project**

Staff Report: 076-22

AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager or designee to execute a contract amendment with PBS Engineering and Environmental, Inc. (hereinafter "Contractor"), for the provision of design, permitting, and construction support services; providing required Terms that such contract amendment be for a term of not more than five (5) years; providing for severability; and setting an effective date.

In 2014, PBS Engineering and Environmental Inc. (previously HDJ Design Group) of Vancouver, Washington was selected as the most qualified firm to provide professional services to improve NE 137th Avenue project from NE 49th Street to NE Fourth Plain Boulevard through a competitive selection process (RFQ 2-14). The City of Vancouver awarded a contract in the amount of \$1,215,033.75. The contract was intended to use available grant funding and progress the design to the 75% level.

The City of Vancouver requested a fee proposal from PBS Engineering and Environmental Inc. for additional services to advance the design from the 75% level to final bidding and construction documents, update environmental permitting, and to provide as-needed support during construction.

PBS Engineering and Environmental Inc. provided a proposal and fee schedule for additional professional services dated May 6, 2022 (attached). The additional fee is \$964,695.33, and with the addition of this amendment the total contract price will be \$2,179,729.08.

Request: On June 13, 2022, approve the ordinance on the first reading, setting the date of second reading and public hearing for June 27, 2022.

Ryan Lopossa, Streets and Transportation Manager, 360-487-7706

Motion approved the request.

3. **An Ordinance adding Section 3.08.100 to the Vancouver Municipal Code ("VMC"), amending other sections of the VMC to provide a uniform methodology for adjustment of certain City fees and charges pursuant to the consumer price index**

Staff Report 020-22

AN ORDINANCE of the City of Vancouver relating to the annual adjustment of certain City fees and charges to reflect changes in the consumer price index; adopting legislative findings, adding Section 3.08.100 to the Vancouver Municipal Code to provide a uniform methodology for adjustment of certain

City fees and charges pursuant to the consumer price index, effective in 2023; amending Section 1.01.080 of the Vancouver Municipal Code to clarify that the City Clerk may update fees and charges to reflect Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustments authorized by the VMC, amending Sections 11.60.160, 14.04.090, 16.40.070, 17.08.130, 19.11.040, 20.180.050, and 20.915.050 of the Vancouver Municipal Code to incorporate by reference the methodology set forth in new Section 3.08.100; approving and ratifying adjustment of certain City fees and charges for 2022 to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for 2021, providing for severability; and setting an immediate effective date.

The VMC currently provides several differing and inconsistent methodologies for the annual adjustment of fees and charges to reflect changes in the consumer price index. In addition, the regional Consumer Price Index for the Portland-Salem, Oregon-Washington Metropolitan Area for Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) referenced in Sections 11.60.160 and 20.180.050 of the VMC no longer exists. Harmonizing these provisions will ensure consistent application of CPI adjustments in future years. Additionally, implanting the 2022 adjustments in a series of two steps (one in the first fiscal quarter, with a second increase in the third fiscal quarter) will afford City Staff time to communicate these changes to effected businesses.

Request: On Monday, June 13, 2022, approve ordinance on first reading, setting date of second reading and public hearing for Monday, June 27, 2022.

*Natasha Ramras, Chief Financial Officer, 360-487-8484;
Jonathan Young, City Attorney, 360-487-8500*

Motion approved the request.

4. **Housing Code Update**

Staff Report: 077-22

AN ORDINANCE relating to zoning code text changes allowing for increased options for housing types and densities citywide; amending Vancouver Municipal Code (VMC) 20.410, 20.420, 20.810, 20.927, 20.945, and adding new sections 20.815 and 20.950; providing for savings, severability and an effective date.

Proposed changes are summarized below. All were recommended for approval unanimously by the Planning Commission at an April 12 public hearing, except where otherwise noted:

1. *Creation of standards for a new R-17 zoning district allowing single family homes on 2,000 to 5,000 square foot lots, subject to access and streetfront requirements, and compliance with existing Narrow Lot*

standards. Streetfront and access standards would also be applied to existing R-9 and R-6 zoning districts. Requires Planning Commission review and Council rezone approval through public hearing process to be established in specific locations.

2. *Creation of standards for a new R- 50 zoning district allowing multi-family homes at densities up to 50 units per acre. One parking space per unit would be required in the new R-50 zone, and for new developments in existing multi-family zoning districts. Requires Planning Commission review and Council rezone approval through public hearing process to be established in specific locations.*
3. *Changes to parking standards for multi-family and specialty housing in response to new state requirements. Allows market rate apartments within ¼ mile of transit lines running every 35 minutes, or anywhere in CX zone, to provide 0.75 parking spaces per unit. Allows long term income-restricted housing affordable to households making 60% Area Median Income (AMI) or less to provide 0.75 spaces per unit citywide. Allows senior and disabled persons housing to provide no parking citywide for residents, but adds parking requirements for staff and visitors. Would require site plan review to implement.*
4. *A density bonus for income-restricted housing projects in response to a new state requirement. Allows density bonuses (up to 50% for single family homes and 100% for multi-family homes) for housing projects affordable to households earning up to 80% of Area Median Income. Would require site plan or subdivision review to implement.*
5. *New standards allowing cottage cluster developments in single family zones, whereby higher densities are allowed, but with smaller than normal homes with cottage features oriented around common open spaces. Subdivision or site plan review would be required to implement.*
6. *Updated requirements for minimum setbacks between new apartments and existing single-family homes, requiring apartments to be setback five feet from property lines, plus an additional three feet for every one foot of building height above 35 feet, up to a maximum requirement of 15 feet.*
The Planning Commission split 3-3 and thus did not advance a recommendation. Those voting against an updated and increased setback for taller apartments noted that doing so would reduce housing opportunities. The proposed change noted above and included in the ordinance is the original staff recommendation.
7. *New micro-housing standards allowing apartments with shared kitchen and bathroom facilities without on-site staff.*
The Planning Commission voted 4-2 to recommend new standards allowing micro-housing apartments with shared facilities, but with an added limitation that micro-housing developments not be eligible for the new affordable housing density bonus allowed by proposal #4

above. The two votes against wished to allow eligibility for the affordable housing density bonus if threshold standards were met. Based on Council comments at the May 12 workshop, two ordinances are provided at the June 13 first reading, one allowing micro-housing to be eligible for the affordable housing density bonus, one not allowing eligibility.

8. *Updated ADU standards allowing historical garages within side and rear building setbacks to be converted to ADUs if they meet all other ADU and building standards and are no taller than 15 feet.*
9. *Although not subject to public hearing review, City staff are also developing expedited building permit review processes for new single family homes providing features that facilitate aging-in-place.*

Public comment through the process has been mixed and varied, with parking and densification being the most common concerns. Comments received prior to the May 16, 2022 Council workshop are summarized in the workshop staff report. Those received since are listed in Attachment C of this memorandum. Development community comments were in favor of the overall project, with concerns about single family home garage width limitations and alley provisions in #1 above, and allowances for larger cottages in #5.

Request: On June 13, 2022, approve either attached ordinance A (does not allow micro-housing apartments to be eligible for an affordable housing density bonus) or ordinance B (allows micro-housing apartments to be eligible for an affordable housing density bonus if thresholds are met), setting date of second reading and public hearing for June 27, 2022.

Bryan Snodgrass, Principal Planner, 360-487-7946

Motion approved the request.

5. Approval of Claim Vouchers

Request: Approve claim vouchers for June 13, 2022.

Motion approved claim vouchers in the amount of \$4,030,434.29.

Community Forum

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the Community Forum and received testimony from the following community members:

- Jim Karlock, Portland, OR
- Laurel Pascual, Vancouver
- Wynn Grcich, Vancouver

- Janie Wilson, Vancouver
- Kimberlee Elbon, La Center, WA
- Justin Forsman, Vancouver
- Ramona Arnold, Vancouver
- Terence Ibert, Vancouver

There being no further testimony, Mayor McEnerny-Ogle closed the Community Forum.

Executive Session Re: Pending Litigation and Potential Litigation (1 hour)

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle announced the Council would be entering executive session from 8:04-9:30 p.m. for the purpose of discussing pending litigation and potential litigation. No action was taken.

DocuSigned by:

Anne McEnerny-Ogle

6C89D9089EC5424...

Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor

Attest:

DocuSigned by:

Natasha Ramras

BCF6734E40E94AE...

Natasha Ramras, City Clerk

Adjournment

10:31 p.m.

From: [Dana Allen](#)
To: [City Council](#); [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
Cc: [Newbold, Jeri](#)
Subject: Comments regarding HOUSING CODE UPDATE 077-22
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 11:52:52 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from dallen@clarkpud.com. [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.

Dear Council,

Regarding Agenda Item 4 of the June 13th City Council Meeting, specifically proposed change #8 of the Housing Code Update,

ADUs closer to the property line than standard setbacks, and even those meeting standard setbacks can present conflicts with safety clearances from existing power lines, particularly overhead lines. Clark Public Utilities would like the homeowner to be aware, existing overhead utility lines (primary and secondary voltage) may provide additional complexities and significant impacts to their project that are best resolved prior to issuance of final building permits.

The changes as we understand them, only affects exiting structures and is limited to 15', however this may still trigger a conflict if changing the roof line or max height of the building in close proximity to power lines.

We are seeing customers with final building permits in hand that are surprised and frustrated when additional safety clearances from existing overhead lines are pointed out.

To ensure building applicants are aware of any existing utility lines, we are suggesting one of the following are required with the application:

- Show any existing utility lines (overhead and underground) on their proposed site plan

Or

- Include a site review letter with application materials, that has been signed off by the utility, regarding the planned remodel.

Sincerely,

Dana Allen

Clark Public Utilities

Construction Services Manager



From: [Alyn](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Submission: City Council Contact Form
Date: Sunday, June 12, 2022 3:27:11 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.



City Council Contact Form

Submitted date: Sunday, June 12, 2022 - 3:27pm

Contact Information

First name:

Alyn

Last name:

Spector

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Street address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

98664

Inquiry Information

Subject:

Share an opinion about a City project or initiative

Recipient:

All of Council

Message:

Greetings,

My name is Alyn Spector, and I am writing as a Vancouver citizen concerned with recent electrification proposals being explored in my community. I believe in the value of well-planned decarbonization efforts. Reducing our carbon impacts is an essential and worthwhile goal, and we must each do our part to reduce our GHG impacts and fight climate change. This means diversifying our electric generation sources, and pursuing renewable fuels (both gas and electric) paired with lower carbon baseload energy, and robust energy efficiency. However, forced electrification of private homes and buildings is not the answer. I love my gas stove and fireplaces and do not want to

have to convert them to electricity. What I do want is options by my gas provider to purchase lower-emission gas fuels such as renewable natural gas, and over time, a conversion of the gas pipeline to mainly renewable and decarbonized fuels inclusive of hydrogen. I have seen this solution work in Denmark. Recently, I was able to travel to DE as part of a tour of decarbonized gaseous fuels paired with carbon capture. I was greatly impressed by the whole-economy, non-politicized solutions offered.

I work in the energy sector so this plan was on my radar. However, I doubt my neighbors or others in the community that would be most impacted by electrification are aware of the City's electrification aspirations. It will be essential that all voices in the community be heard where livelihoods and personal budgets would be impacted.

I'm currently saving for my two children for college, and am trying to get some funds in savings as we're facing with an ever-growing cost of goods and services. Electrification might feel like a brief political and environmental victory, if passed, but homeowners, renters, and small businesses will be the ones left footing the bill. Worse yet, electrification may not even result in the decarbonization impacts desired.

It's my understanding NW Natural is working hard to lower the carbon impact of its business. Their rates are affordable and I'm happy with their service for my gas stove, fireplace, and water heating. I am far less pleased with my electric rates, and am unsatisfied with the heating and comfort level provided by my electric heat pump.

I want the City to pursue environmental solutions, but I also want those solutions to be well-planned, pragmatic, and based off the needs of its citizens. Allow me to retain my choice of heating and cooking equipment. Don't place me in a situation where I have to spend my dwindling discretionary income as a result of laws that pick winners and line the pockets of electric HVAC dealers instead of allowing me to spend that money on household needs, savings, and education for my kids.

We must also be careful that any laws passed support continued grid reliability and resiliency and support energy affordability and security.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Alyn Spector

Upload a file:

From: [Terence Ibert](#)
To: [Holmes, Eric](#); [Snodgrass, Bryan](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [City Council](#); [City Council](#); [Harless, Kim](#); [Perez, Diana](#); [City Council](#)
Subject: Proposed housing code update: R-17 is not R-17
Date: Sunday, June 12, 2022 4:38:51 PM

You don't often get email from terence_ibert@yahoo.com. [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.

Mr. Holmes and Mr. Snodgrass,

In a review of your [Staff Report 077-22](#) for the Housing Code Updates this Monday (Consent Agenda Item #4 for City Council), there was a change in the minimum square footage requirement for the proposed new low-density zoning district R-17.

- R-17 is now proposed at a *minimum of 2,000 square feet* per unit.
- R-17 before this change was a minimum of 2,500 square feet per unit.

At 43,560 square feet per acre, this minimum square footage change would accommodate **21.8 units per acre**, making the new zoning district effectively R-22, not R-17.

Given that the *existing higher-density residential zoning district R-18 standard maxes out at 18 units per acre*, this new R-17 district zoning now could be much denser. As such, R-17 would now not be considered “low intensity” per the documented purpose of the low-density code (see page 1 of [Chapter 20.410](#)). We also already have R-18 and R-22 as part of the higher density residential standard (see [Chapter 20.420](#)).

Why was the change made? Combing through the past session notes for the Planning Commission, the details are sparse for the change. I could only find mention that “it was in response to the Commission, as feedback from development stakeholders” when it was introduced in the [1/25/22 session](#). In the following 2/22/22 session that was available for public comment, which I attended, I do not recall the change to 2,000 square feet ever being made during the presentation. As of this writing, your [project page](#) also still reflects the older 2,500 square feet minimum.

Since the square footage minimum is the most significant aspect of R-17 and is now absent from your slideware used in socialization and review since that 1/25/22 session, the change would not have received the attention from the public that it deserves.

Thank you,

-Terry Ibert

Carter Park Resident



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: [Haygood, Jaynee](#)
To: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
Subject: Written Testimony for 6/13/22
Date: Sunday, June 12, 2022 7:41:12 PM

Hi,

Unfortunately, I will not be able to provide my testimony in person tomorrow. However, please see my below testimony for the 6/13/22 City Council meeting regarding Harper's Playground.

Thanks,

Jaynee Haygood
PRAC Chair

Thank you Mayor and Councilors, June 9, 2022

As a Parks and Recreation Advisory Commissioner I have had the immense privilege of seeing the impacts our parks have in our communities. I was excited to see the Waterfront construction and now I am able to enjoy the beauty and connection it brings to Vancouver. I heard neighbors share their concerns and excitement about Dubois Park. Now as I visit Dubois Park I can see the enjoyment it brings to their community. I can't help but feel a sense of pride to have been a part of it. Today, you have a truly incredible opportunity before you to make a significant impact with the proposed plan for Marshall Park.

As a paraeducator at Shahala Middle School, and hopefully soon-to-be teacher, I have had the honor of working with special needs students on a daily basis. I cannot emphasize enough the importance Marshall park will have on our community. As I walked through Marshall Park and heard Cody (with Harper's Playground) talk about all of the planned amenities and activities, I began to cry. I thought of one of my students who is in a wheelchair. Everyday, weather permitting, we head over to Fisher Basin Park where she sits in her wheelchair and watches the other students climb the stairs, go down the slides and swing from the bars. I closed my eyes and pictured her playing on the new playground at Marshall Park. I could see her smile with this amazing grin that lights up the room. She was actively participating in play. She was having fun with her classmates. She was included. It was such a powerful image in my mind and my heart.

As we continued our walk around Marshall Park, I realized I had only been thinking about the kids using Marshall Park. However, *parks aren't just for kids*. I watched as parents played with their kids, laughing and having fun. It was at this moment in which I realized parents who were disabled would now be able to play with their children. As a parent, I can

recall the trips to parks with my children where I got to be a kid again. I went down the slides. I swung on the swings. I teetered and tottered. This time together with my children created memories that will last a lifetime. Marshall Park will now allow disabled parents to create those treasured memories with their children.

Another important role this inclusive playground will provide is to bring a community who has been confined to the sidelines to become an active participant in play. Non-disabled children will now have an opportunity to interact with disabled children who they have never been able to interact with before on the playground. According to the Playworld article, "Life Lessons You Can Only Learn on the Playground," playgrounds provide children with opportunities to learn numerous life skills. These skills include leadership, greater creativity, teaches independence, improves cognitive functions and responsibility. All of these skills will only be enhanced by becoming a more inclusive environment for our families.

Upon review of the Vancouver Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services website it states, "Parks, trails and natural areas are a critical part of what shapes quality of life *for everyone* in the City of Vancouver." By joining forces with Harper's Playground, Marshall Park will take one step closer to truly help shape the quality of life for everyone.

Jayne Haygood
PRAC Chair

From: [Ramona Arnold](#)
To: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
Subject: forms submitting pre council meeting June 13. 2022
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 5:20:47 AM
Attachments: [city council agenda community forum.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from myarrow1950@gmail.com. [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.

Please review the information I am submitting here before the council meeting today.
I have registered online to speak and address the council during the community forum portion of the meeting.
I have not yet received any instruction yet as to how to do this remotely however
Ramona Arnold


**MARIE ANTOINETTE TOBYANSEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW**

SPANISH SPRINGS, NEVADA 89441

September 10, 2020

City of Vancouver, WA
Customer Service

Vancouver, WA 98668-8995

**Attention: Program Manager
Peggy Sheehan**

Re: Payoff for Accounts 9070002 and 7000017

Dear Ms. Sheeton:

The purpose of this correspondence is to discuss the indebtedness of Ramona Arnold for the above accounts reflecting two loans encumbering her home located at 3618 V St., Vancouver, WA. A copy of payoff quotes prepared by your office is enclosed for your review. The initial loan was for down payment assistance applied to the purchase price. After the purchase Ms. Arnold realized she needed a second loan for housing rehabilitation as the home needed numerous repairs to make the home safe. To that end, she applied for and received a second loan from the city..

Needless to say, these loans were a Godsend and accomplished the intended purpose for Ms. Arnold, a low-income woman suffering from certain disabilities. Through the years she has been thankful to have a home. That said, at this time, due to her declining her health, the home has become increasingly difficult for her to maintain. That's because the house is somewhat dilapidated needing never-ending repairs; and, the large yard requires perpetual gardening,

Some of the maladies she has been diagnosed with include a heart blockage, shortness of breath, pulmonary hypertension, neuropathy (idiopathic) which causes weakness and pain in her legs, and a recent surgery that caused increased digestive and esophageal problems. In addition, she has suffered from clinical depression and a chronic anxiety disorder for most of her life. Unfortunately, the above problems have been exacerbated by her age as she will attain her 70th birthday October 22, 2020. As a result of her age and declining health, as an essential worker in the health care field, she can only work 2 days per week. This supplements her small monthly social security retirement benefit which is only \$1082.00. Further, with the above conditions she realizes that her working days are close to being over.

To that end, she knows she needs a change in her housing situation. She has researched possible solutions to her housing problems and determined she needs to purchase a small home needing minimum repairs and very low maintenance. In anticipation of making a needed change, she learned about reverse mortgages. Her plan was to sell her present home and use her equity and a reverse mortgage to purchase a home without needing to make mortgage payments. This plan would also allow her to stop working in the near future when she is unable to continue her employment.

..

MARIE ANTOINETTE TOBYANSEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW

September 10, 2020

Page 2

That said, numbers have never been Ms. Arnolds's forte. Accordingly, she was shocked to learn she owes you approximately \$73,000 and she owes Shell Point Mortgage approximately \$110,000 on her primary mortgage for a total indebtedness in the amount of about \$183,000. Additionally, her financial situation worsened earlier this year as she was unable to work for several months when Covid 19 first invaded the country because she is in a high-risk health group. Consequently, the bottom line is dismal. The current value of her home is approximately \$240,000. Considering costs of sale, she will be lucky to net \$50,000- \$60,000 with the current encumbrance.

I have read many governmental publications regarding Washington's housing assistance. I am impressed with the pro-active programs available for persons such as Ms. Arnold. It seems your state understands the difficulty associated with procuring *affordable decent housing* for persons that are low-income, elderly or those persons who have special medical needs. This is essential considering the cost of housing.

To that end, I was hoping there might be a program such as a grant that might forgive a percentage of her loans to reduce her indebtedness to the City of Vancouver. If that is available it would be a great help keeping Ms. Arnold housed and independent. With a little more cash in hand she will be able to have sufficient equity to purchase another **modest home** that is not in need of repairs or excessive maintenance utilizing a reverse mortgage.

As an aside, Ms. Arnold has mentioned a program that covers approximately 30% of the broker fees in real estate transactions for Essential Medical Workers. I researched that possibility but was unable to find further information re this program. As Ms. Arnold is an essential medical worker perhaps she would be eligible for this program too..

Ms. Arnold is currently being assisted by a professional mortgage broker. His name is Greg Peterson at Fairway Mortgage. He has agreed to help qualify her for a reverse mortgage utilizing the equity from her current home provided she has sufficient equity..

I am hopeful something can be worked out. As mentioned, Ms. Arnold simply wants a modest home that is safe and low maintenance. With no mortgage payment she will be able to pay her taxes and insurance and basic expenses without having to work when the time comes for her to retire. Any help you can provide will be greatly appreciated.

I will call you next week to discuss this matter further.

Very truly yours,

Marie A Tobyansen

cc: Ramona Arnold
Enclosure.

To Vancouver City Council members. 2/13/2022

VP D22 T20

I am writing you today to please consider my concerns and my situation that has to do with your effort to help this city's residents and citizens with housing, in my case elderly residents whose housing needs have over the years significantly changed.

I have lived as a single parent, adult, and resident in Vancouver, WA since 1985. In 2007 I was given the opportunity to buy the small house I have lived in since 2007. The City offered two programs that helped me buy my home, the down payment and the home repair program for repairs. I have thus had these two loans put at the back of my mortgage of \$105,000 balance currently. The two loans are roughly \$60,000.

I have always worked and will continue as long as my legs let me stand. But it was my lack of vision I suppose that did not let me look ahead from that age to the changes physically at my current age of 71. I truly did not see ahead of the possible changes that would happen with me and did not foresee the health problems that have come my way.

I worked hard to contribute to my community, volunteering, paying taxes, and physically working on my house to be aesthetically and in every way a good neighbor and a positive for my community and the city.

I work because I have to make ends meet. In 2007 and throughout these years since I hoped for the betterment of my life in my marital status, savings, health. But these dreams and ambitions did not come to fruition. In the meantime, I have always stayed grateful to be able to work, be independent, for this house I have loved, and for my physical ability to keep it up over the years.

But now my age is catching up with me. Savings are small, the car is old and I am trying my best to just keep myself safe so I can continue to work. My family is no longer nearby.

A year ago I suffered a hemorrhagic stroke. I was off work for about a month and thankfully recovered with some cognitive memory deficits, Working is harder for me however as I must travel doing medical exams, and there is no room for error. Thus I only work 2 days, with 5 days needed to recover physically.

I know the time is coming when I can no longer keep up a house. Sadly I see how my front and back yards reflect the lack of effort I once put into it for myself and my neighbors to enjoy.

There has been a focus locally on helping citizens with housing. And I am especially grateful homelessness is being addressed locally. What has always bothered me though is still a black and white contemplation in regards to seniors by others?

We either deem them completely down and disabled in every way or fully functioning and capable in every way. But there are an in-between that needs that should be addressed. Because time stops for no one and planning ahead is not always feasible for some.

Age catches up with everyone. That is an axiomatic fact. But not all seniors have the buffers and support to help them as they continue on, despite the best of their efforts.

I don't want to end up in a nursing home relying on and taking from the city, state, and federal coffers for my remaining years. I can work, I can live productively and I can give back still.

A house requires continuous maintenance. As I have other cardiac and health problems I cannot do this anymore without great effort and risk especially in the significant amount of yard that needs seasonal and constant attention.

Rather than rely on and take ongoing from the state, local, and federal funds, I could manage in low maintenance very modest but safe home for my remaining years.

I appreciate greatly the help I was given with these loans.

Yet I imagine that the others like myself who took advantage of these loan programs are years later in very different circumstances with some having prospered, some having married or moving on in better prosperous and protective situations.

But I am in a situation where my loans and mortgage balance would not leave me enough in equity to obtain another home for myself. It was my son who became most concerned about me as I've taken a number of falls. He said 'Mom, you are one fall, car failure, broken bone away from everything coming to a standstill. And he's right. And I have poured over this for the last two years trying to layout options, but without enough equity in selling my home, there are not any.

My son had to move away and is trying his best to help, but a solution escapes us financially. My sisters in other states have pitched in helping me when I've been down or ill or injured. But it is not enough to solve the problem, this problem that keeps me awake at night.

And despite the letters from my sister on my behalf, the help in understanding from your city laon manager Peggy, who has now retired, I fear what will happen if things change for me further personally.

I was told my prior letters, the letter my sister wrote to you on my behalf, may have made a small difference in reducing the shared equity amount. I hope this offered help to someone.

But I am asking you to again please consider looking at and perhaps reducing and excusing part of the bulk of these loans, perhaps with some funding intended for helping in housing needs. And I am asking you to please look at these loans individually and the people behind them and their current circumstances and income, if and when they have to leave their homes because of age or another age-related issue, so they can find a solution in safer housing they can manage to live out their years independently if they are able and without taxing and further taking from their state and local communities.

Sincerely,

Ramona Arnold



Vancouver, WA 98663

360 258 2029

PAYMENT STATEMENT - MARCH 2022



Customer Service

Vancouver, WA 98668-8995

City Loan
Received 3/2022

BORROWER

RAMONA ARNOLD

VANCOUVER WA 98663

PAYMENT INFORMATION

Loan Account		9070002
Statement Date		3/10/2022
Payment Amount	+	\$805.27
Past Due Payments	+	\$9,514.84
Late Charges Due	+	\$0.00
Unpaid Interest	+	\$0.00
Unpaid Charges	+	\$0.00
Deferred Charges	-	\$0.00
Total Amount Due	=	\$10,320.11
Payment Due Date		3/31/2022
Late Charge Due After 4/10/2022		\$0.00
Additional Principal	\$	
Additional Trust	\$	
Total Amount Enclosed	\$	

☐ Check here for a change of mailing address or phone number(s). Please provide all corrections on the reverse side.

PLEASE DETACH THE TOP PORTION OF THIS STATEMENT, RETURN IT WITH YOUR PAYMENT AND RETAIN THE BOTTOM PORTION FOR YOUR RECORDS



Customer Service

Vancouver, WA 98668-8995

LOAN & PROPERTY INFORMATION

Principal Balance	\$26,842.30
Reserve Balance	\$0.00
Impound Balance	\$0.00
Interest Rate	3.000%
Interest Paid in 2022	\$0.00
Property Information	3618 V St Vancouver WA 98663

PAYMENT INFORMATION

Loan Account		9070002
Statement Date		3/10/2022
Payment Amount	+	\$805.27
Past Due Payments	+	\$9,514.84
Late Charges Due	+	\$0.00
Unpaid Interest	+	\$0.00
Unpaid Charges	+	\$0.00
Deferred Charges	-	\$0.00
Total Amount Due	=	\$10,320.11
Payment Due Date		3/31/2022
Late Charge Due After 4/10/2022		\$0.00

* To avoid a late charge of \$0.00, we must receive your payment by 4/10/2022 during our business hours. If this date falls on a weekend or holiday, your payment must be received by the next business day.

Remaining balance may not be the payoff amount. Call (360) 487-8410 to obtain a payoff amount.

Make checks payable to City of Vancouver.

Please write your account number on the check.

Payments accepted at Customer Service: 415 West 6th Street, Vancouver, WA 98660.

Payments accepted by mail: Customer Service, PO Box 8995, Vancouver, WA 98668-8995.

Allow sufficient time for mailing. Payments will be credited to the account on the day received at our office.

Call (360) 487-8454 option 5 to pay by credit card.

Call (360) 487-8410 if you have questions regarding this statement.

Please retain these statements for your records.

No payment is due at this time.

Interest does accrue annually.

Full payment is due upon sale or transfer of property ownership.

ACCOUNT ACTIVITY (3/10/2021 - 3/9/2022)

Transaction Date	Pmt Due Date	Reference	Description	Transaction Amount	Distribution					Principal Balance
					Interest	Principal	Late Chgs	Other	Trust	
			Balance Forward							\$26,842.30
					\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	



Customer Service
PO Box 8995
Vancouver, WA 98668-8995

6/8/2022

RAMONA ARNOLD

VANCOUVER WA 98663

You are authorized to use the following amounts to pay off the above-mentioned loan. All necessary legal documents will be forwarded to the trustee for Full Reconveyance upon receipt of payment in full.

Payoff Date	6/30/2022
Maturity Date	4/1/2113
Next Payment Due	N/A
Interest Rate	3.000%
Principal Balance	\$26,842.30
Unpaid Interest	\$0.00
Interest Paid-To Date	7/31/2009
Accrued Interest	\$10,310.02
Unpaid Late Charges	\$0.00
Accrued Late Charges	\$0.00
Unpaid Charges	\$0.00
Prepayment Penalty	\$0.00
Reconveyance Fee	\$300.00
Trust Balance	\$0.00
Payoff Amount	\$37,452.32

We reserve the right to amend this demand should any changes occur that would increase the total amount for payoff. **Please note that this demand expires on 6/30/2022**, at which time you are instructed to contact this office for additional instructions.

Make disbursement check payable to: **CITY OF VANCOUVER.**

Or

Sincerely,

Vancouver, WA

Report: Housing outpaces incomes in Vancouver

By Sarah Wolf

Columbian 6 hours ago

More than a quarter of Vancouver mortgage holders are spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing, according to a new report from Construction Coverage. That suggests an increasing number of local homeowners are cost-burdened by their mortgages. The report examined whether wages were rising at the...



www.columbian.com

Vancouver City Council awards \$6.2M to affordable housing, temporary shelter projects

By FOX 12 Staff

kptv.com 17 days ago

VANCOUVER, WA (KPTV) - The Vancouver City Council voted Monday to award \$6,225,000 to 14 local affordable housing and temporary shelter projects. The city says the funding, which comes from the Affordable Housing Fund, will support construction of 173 affordable housing units, as well as preserve 142 housing units for low-income families and very low-income homeless residents. It will also provide "first in" funding necessary for five housing development and preservations projects to access additional funding.



View more in

[publisher avatar](#)

[Vancouver, WA](#)

[Vancouver City Council awards \\$6.2M to affordable housing, temporary shelter projects](#)

[By FOX 12 Staff](#)

[kptv.com](#)

2021-04-06

Cover picture for the article

VANCOUVER, WA (KPTV) - The Vancouver City Council voted Monday to award \$6,225,000 to 14 local affordable housing and temporary shelter projects. The city says the funding, which comes from the Affordable Housing Fund, will support construction of 173 affordable housing units, as well as preserve 142 housing units for low-income families and very low-income homeless residents. It will also provide "first in" funding necessary for five housing development and preservations projects to access additional funding.

From: [Bev & Ken Tyler](#)
To: [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: Housing Code Testimony
Date: Sunday, June 12, 2022 1:36:59 PM
Attachments: [My Housing Code Statement ken.docx](#)

You don't often get email from tylerknb@comcast.net. [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

I have been advised to contact you as well as submit my testimonial writing to City Council. I request you please ensure submission of this attached document into public record. The document is related to Item 4 (Housing Code Update) slated for reading to City Council June 13, 2022. I will also be testifying in person.

Thank you for your help.

Bev Tyler

(Please note this document has been emailed to City Council as a matter of record even though I am testifying personally.)

My name is Beverly Tyler and I have lived in the Fircrest Neighborhood Association(FNA) for over 30 years. I am a member of the FNA Steering Committee and serve as Development Chair.

My neighbors and I have personally experienced poor apartment layout setbacks causing privacy invasion. I will give examples of good and bad development setbacks. **Neither example change housing density, only apartment project design layouts. Allowing for more privacy in the existing homes backyard which border the new project.**

Example 1 is a poor design:

A Developer's Agreement in the 1980's allowed for a 20-foot set back in my established neighborhood. Three story apartments have been built allowing residents in the 2nd and 3rd stories stark views into existing neighbor's homes and yards. Originally a 6 ft cedar fence was to separate the established neighboring yards and new apartments. A permit was obtained, and an 8 ft wall was installed which helped provide more privacy between the 1st story apartment residents; but did nothing to lessen the direct balcony views into the existing neighbors' yards and homes.

An improved apartment layout design would have been an 8 ft wall between the established neighbors and the apartments. Parking lots and driveways next to the wall, giving more separation between existing homes and apartments buildings. **Same housing density, different design project layout.**

Example 2 is an improved design:

My next example is of FNA working with development project that is currently under construction. The Farmstead (formerly Joe's Farm) on NE 112th Ave on

8.17 acres and will now become 144 apartments, 32 townhomes, a clubhouse, leasing office, fitness room, playground, dog park and parking.

Originally this project layout design proposed a setback of 3 story apartment 20 feet from existing homes that border the project. Ginn, the Developer, FNA and the bordering project neighbors, worked together for a redesign placing the parking lots and driveways between existing homes and the 3 story apartments. This new design layout allows 80 ft setbacks from the neighbors versus 20 ft. A type II variance has been applied which will allow an 8 ft wall versus a 6 ft wall (L4 Landscaping Screening Design only allows for a 6 ft wall). The 8 ft wall will also help prevent noise and excess lighting.

As noted, neither of the examples above prevent appropriate housing density. The difference is in the project layout design.

Please note a reduction in privacy adversely impact the quality of life for occupants and will negatively impact market value of properties.

Thank you for your time.

From: [Kenneth](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Submission: City Council Contact Form
Date: Thursday, June 9, 2022 6:12:23 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.



City Council Contact Form

Submitted date: Thursday, June 9, 2022 - 6:12pm

Contact Information

First name:

Kenneth

Last name:

Harrison

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Street address:

[REDACTED]

ZIP code:

98660

Inquiry Information

Subject:

Share an opinion about a City project or initiative

Recipient:

All of Council

Message:

Sorry but your recent vote to outlaw certian sounds and protesting is same that sharriff in athens Tennessee started with that lead to actual beatings and killing of citizens. Like to upload the story but you system cannot take it from military .com look it up as ben Franklin said if you choose security above liberty you don't deserve either. Any one in office longer than 2 terms want only power

Upload a file:

From: [Michael Beanland](#)
To: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Comment on Proposed Changes to Code 20.912 Fence and Walls
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 10:33:23 AM

You don't often get email from mike@wipoen.com. [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.

During the recent development of The Farmstead, adjacent owners of single-family homes worked with the developer to create changes to the development to reduce the deleterious impact of the development on the neighborhood. A change in the arrangement of the homes and parking to move the parking to the perimeter to lessen the visual intrusion and the addition of an 8-foot concrete privacy/sound wall between the affected single-family homes and the new high-density development made a significant improvement in making the development fit in the existing neighborhood.

The latter item was critical, an 8-foot privacy/sound wall. The current Fence and Walls code does not allow walls or fences over 6-feet high. This is extremely unreasonable where a 35-foot tall high-density development is being built abutting single-family homes. The Fence and Wall code needs to be more flexible to allow adjacent property owners enter into signed agreements to construct mutually-agreed-upon fences or walls.

There is no code issue if adjacent property owners choose to have no wall or fence between properties; or a 4-foot tall one, or a 6-foot tall one. The code arbitrarily establishes 6-feet as some kind of sacred not-to-be exceeded rule. The Fences and Walls code needs to be amended so that "Adjacent property owners may, by mutual written agreement, construct and maintain fences or sound walls higher than 6-feet."

Such language needs to be explicitly included in the Fences and Walls code so that it is not by variance alone that walls and fences over 6-feet are allowed but explicitly states that under a specific set of conditions, such is allowed.

The requirement to obtain a building permit can remain and is reasonable for fences/walls taller than 6-feet where the materials are heavy or massive (concrete, stone, etc.). Building permits should not be required for light-weight constructions such as wood slats or wire mesh. To wit, "Building permits are required for all fences or walls over 6' in height where made of massive materials such as concrete, stone, brick, metal panels, or masonry."

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Beanland, P.E.

Willamette Power Engineering, Inc.

██████████

Vancouver, WA 98684

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: Vancouver aims to go carbon-neutral by 2040 | kgw.com
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 3:33:20 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

A note to council.

Stephanie Obotette | Support Specialist II
[Pronouns: She/Her](#)



P.O. Box 1995 • Vancouver, WA 98668-1995

P: 360.487.8621 | F: 360.487.8625

www.cityofvancouver.us | www.cityofvancouver.us/socialmedia



From: Cathryn Chudy [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2022 2:34 PM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <CMO@cityofvancouver.us>
Cc: Small, Rebecca <Rebecca.Small@cityofvancouver.us>; Lande, Aaron <aaron.lande@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Fwd: Vancouver aims to go carbon-neutral by 2040 | kgw.com

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.

Mayor, City Council and city staff (especially Aaron Lande and Rebecca Small)

Thank you for all of the tireless work and effort that went into accomplishing this for our city and community - much appreciation!

Cathryn Chudy

KGW (local channel 8) scrolled this below it's programming last night!

<https://www.kgw.com/article/tech/science/climate-change/vancouver-sets-2040-carbon-neutral-goal/283-41cc7b64-a4fd-4c7d-935a-447b04539ce2>

Vancouver sets nation-leading goals to combat climate change

The Vancouver city council passed a resolution that sets more aggressive emissions reduction targets than most other U.S. cities.

Author: Tim Gordon

Published: 5:43 PM PDT June 9, 2022

Updated: 6:03 PM PDT June 9, 2022

VANCOUVER, Wash. — City leaders in Vancouver have been working on [climate change](#) plans for quite a while, and this week they unanimously approved a resolution that sets a goal to make the city carbon-neutral by 2040.

Tamping down carbon emissions presents a major challenge, but Vancouver is looking to make the change faster than nearly every other larger city in the country.

"We have set some of the most ambitious climate goals in the country, we are ahead of Seattle and Portland," said Rebecca Small, senior policy analyst for the City of Vancouver, who worked on the city's climate plan.

Those ambitious goals include an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from municipal operations by 2025, an 80% reduction by the Vancouver community by 2030 and finally carbon neutrality by both the city and its residents by 2040.

Only Denver, Colorado has set equally ambitious goals.

The plan to do all this in Vancouver is evolving, but for starters it means getting away from carbon-based fuels for the city's large fleet of vehicles.

It also means switching to renewable power for the city's buildings, not only by buying it from suppliers, but also by bringing renewable power onsite.

"For example, we've just put in a grant to install solar panels on top of City Hall that can offset 5% to 10% of the energy we use in the building," Small said.

Another big part of the plan is planting more trees across Vancouver that cool neighborhoods and offset the carbon footprint, especially in areas that have borne the worst effects of climate change.

KGW talked to a few folks on Vancouver's Main Street who approve, including resident Adam Sullivan.

"(I'm a) five-year resident, and part of what brought me to the area is something like that, so we're a growing urban area and forward-thinking in that regard is something that drew me

here and will keep me here," said Sullivan.

In terms of slowing climate change, there is a lot more to come in terms of solutions. But the goals are set, and Small said, and the city will be ready to meet them.

"We are going to be looking constantly along the way how can make these stronger, what kinds of new technologies have come out that we can adopt that will help is to meet our targets," she said. "We are excited to be at the forefront of this challenge, we think this is the challenge of our lifetimes."

Part of the next phase for the climate action plan is to hear more from community members. Residents can [learn more here](#) and take an online survey as well.

From: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
To: [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: Thank you
Date: Thursday, June 9, 2022 1:36:22 PM

Written comments below for Council.

Amanda Delapena

From: Michele Wollert [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 8:45 AM
To: City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Thank you

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.

Good morning, Mayor Anne and Councilors Stober, Paulsen, Hansen, Perez, Fox, and Harless:

Many of my Shumway neighbors and I are grateful that you **unanimously passed revisions in Vancouver's municipal code that prevent targeted picketing and other means of harassment against City of Vancouver's officials, employees and volunteers who may be targeted for actions or inactions they took on behalf of the City.**

I know that some people have been reluctant to serve in a volunteer leadership capacity for fear of such bully tactics and harassment and I believe these ordinance enhancements may reassure our city employees, officials, and volunteers that the city will better protect them.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Vancouver

June 1, 2022

Honorable City Council
City of Vancouver
Washington

Subject: Fence Around the Farmstead (Joe's Place)

I received an email earlier today from Phil Wuest of Ginn Group. The contents are provided below:

The City of Vancouver will not permit the 8' privacy/sound mitigation wall as proposed. It was allowed on the Acero project because the Acero project was vested to older development code. The Farmstead project is being delivered under current code which the City says prohibits the 8' structure on the property line. We were prepared to install the 8' wall desired by the neighbors but cannot obtain the necessary permission from the City of Vancouver

We continue to believe the 8' wall could be permitted as a noise mitigation wall but the City disagrees. Without the City's permission, we cannot proceed with the 8' wall. We will have to install a 6' wall instead.

Please don't hesitate to reach out to me with question or to discuss. It seems to us that if the neighbors requested this wall during the hearing as a mitigation for light and noise, and where, as here, there is mutual agreement between neighbors, the 8' privacy/sound mitigation wall should be allowed on the shared property line.

We understand that this will not be well received by the neighbors and truly regret that we could not get the City to find a way to allow it. This is a very disappointing outcome.

Phil

I attempted to send an email to the City Council but it appears that all City Council email addresses have been deleted and there is no longer any way to email Council members. The message I received was as follows:

*Thank you for your email. This mailbox is no longer in use. For future correspondence with the Mayor or City Councilmembers, please visit:
<https://www.cityofvancouver.us/citycouncil/webform/contact-city-council>.*

The content of my message was as follows:

I am incredibly disappointed and request the City Council step in and grant a waiver of outdated fence ordinances and codes for this project. The developer and neighbors

affected have worked for months to develop a sound and security solution that was appropriate and acceptable to all. The outdated rules and regulations were never developed to deal with development like this; where a high-density development directly impinges on an established low-density neighborhood. Using outdated rules and regulations to prohibit the agreed-upon solution is a slap in the face of everyone who strove diligently to make this project work. Please do what is right, grant a waiver to allow the agreed-upon solution to go ahead!

To follow up on this email message, the neighborhood association, Ginn Group, and the affected homeowners worked diligently to develop a fencing solution that was acceptable to all and provide the visual, sound, and security features that the homeowners sought. This work resulted in the homeowner's signing agreements with the Ginn Group to allow the construction of an 8-foot tall concrete barrier that provides all the requested features. Irreversible demolition actions have been taken based on that agreed-upon solution.

It seems absurd that the City would step in between the affected parties and deny all the results of their efforts. The only parties affected by this fence are the property owners and the developer, all who agree with the proposed solution. It is even more insulting given that an adjacent property already has an 8-foot concrete wall between it and some of these same homes.

I am requesting that the City Council immediately initiate the needed process to provide a variance, waiver, or exception so that the solution developed by all of the parties affected can be implemented.

If the City cannot find a way to permit the requested fence, it is only reasonable that all construction at the site be stopped until an acceptable solution can be negotiated. Please issue the necessary "stop work" orders.

Respectfully,



Michael Beanland

Vancouver, WA