

O'Donnell, Mary Beth



CP16#0085

From: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2014 2:01 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Euler, Gordon
Subject: FW: Planning Assumptions
Attachments: Vacant Buildable Lands Model.docx

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Olson [<mailto:jolson@olsonengr.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2014 8:17 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Planning Assumptions

Please accept my comments on the Planning Assumptions and Vacant Buildable Lands Model.

Jerry Olson
1111 Broadway
Vancouver, WA 986
360-695-1385

Short Treatise

on the Vacant Buildable Lands Model

By Jerry Olson

April 14, 2014

- 1) Business Park should be classified as an **industrial** use for purposes of estimating jobs per acre. Twenty jobs per acre on the average is way too high for BP, and in addition, this zone has been recently redefined.
- 2) By looking at the example map, it clearly shows how **peninsulas and islands** of non-critical lands have been created, and no accounting of these unusable portions has been made.
- 3) Building values used in the model should be stated in **dollars**. The average citizen has no idea what the **10th percentile** would be.
- 4) Port properties should be **specifically calculated as an override**. They all know what land is usable, and what the **job projections** are for each port. Vancouver is specifically unique, with dedicated habitat areas, covenants with environmentalists, and usable flood plains. The building value per acre may be low enough to put part of it in underutilized, but still be fully developed.
- 5) Many commercial and industrial properties have existing uses that have **low building value per acre**. These might be auto sales, asphalt plants, or nursery sales for example. These would be mapped as vacant or underutilized, and thus **overstating the buildable inventory**.
- 6) All of the **vacant and underutilized property** is projected to **develop to full density** of jobs per acre, **ignoring the loss of the existing jobs** there now.
- 7) The residential assumption is that **50% of constrained lands will develop to full density**. Any lands that will be filled may be compensated by critical lands not identified on the inventory.
- 8) The residential **deduction for infrastructure** accounts for the streets, easements, storm ponds, and tracts in subdivisions. It also includes all the parks, schools, fire stations, hospitals, jails, police stations, swimming pools, trails, open space, tot lots, etc. A former review of existing developed neighbor hoods showed that that number was **closer to 45%, instead of the 27.5% used**. This was before storm ponds, and the new ancient forest standard.
- 9) The **mixed use** designations are **not very feasible** outside core areas, particularly when in places like a mile out of Battle Ground. This adds jobs and residents to the plan without the likelihood

of them ever being built. For example, one was foreclosed by a bank after obtaining approval, determined to be unbuildable, and resold as a residence on acreage.

- 10) The assumption that **80%** of commercial, mixed use, and business park lands designated as **critical areas** will **develop to full density** is insane.
- 11) The assumption that **50%** of **industrial critical lands** will develop to full density is equally not defensible.
- 12) The assumption of **20 jobs per acre** on commercial and **9 jobs per acre** on industrial are too high. The Port of Vancouver has been using 3-4 jobs per acre on all of its waterfront land.
- 13) The last time around, the City of Vancouver dumped **10,000 jobs** into the formula as expected to come out of **downtown redevelopment**. There was no justification.
- 14) The 2004-07 plan resulted in about **45,000 jobs** and **45,000 residents** assumed to be working or housed on newly developed **critical lands**.
- 15) Look at the maps to see how much of this inventory is **critical**, and assume that 50-80% of these critical lands will develop.
- 16) The population projection of **1%** is the growth rate over a very severe recession. Clark County has not grown less than **2% for 40 years prior to that**.
- 17) All of these assumptions are aimed to **restrain the growth** of the Urban Growth Boundary at a time when our economy needs to regenerate.