

To Members of Planning commission

RE: Data received for 25 June meeting

24 June 2024

Sirs,

While I understand the time and effort that goes into being on a board and making decisions, and especially dealing with city government, one must always ask why, and dig deep to get answers, sometimes not what one wants to hear or find out. Further one should be able to put in simple terms the facts and data plus know the other side.

Much information was in the packet, and it is a bit much...

1- Meeting minutes:

- a. "focus areas are more likely to be connected to amenities within a short distance."  
Taken from first bullet point second page,

the term "more likely" is used... is this a wish, or hope, as it is not definitive...

- b. "Staff responded there are several community working groups that include some developer representation that participated in the mapping activity" 4th bullet point second page.

Why was not a number demanded, and which groups, appears vague and again hope full that one can get it by? This means what, are there 20 groups and only 2 commented or what.

- c. Bullet point 6 second page is a concern since did not the Planning department win an award from the state for the Mill Plan proposed project, where it is to be live work walk area.
- d. "How did you determine existing assets in the city and were there any assets that you didn't identify that came through from the mapping activity with the public? Staff responded there were a number of known assets in the project assumptions. We conducted a connected community/15 minute neighborhood analysis to understand where those currently exist, looking at proximity and concentration of businesses, active trip potential, and proximity to Vine stops. That information informed the focus areas. During the mapping exercise, we received input from the public regarding other areas to think about outside of the focus areas. Areas outside of the focus areas will still experience some growth and development." 3rd page 1st bullet point,

I find it interesting that they mention the 15 minute neighborhood here yet in a previous point were not aware of other papers... Are they not current, not up to date, or are they using terms they heard but going down their own path vision.

- e. "The types of jobs in connected and accessible neighborhoods. Staff responded there will be a variety of jobs supporting upward mobility in the neighborhoods. People will often and likely travel beyond their neighborhood for their job." Page 3 bullet 6

Again it appears no data to support a wish, or hope, and talking point, though it is nice they mention jobs... and the fact that they are out of area.

A general comment in reviewing the meeting minutes is previous code and all is mentions and talk of we shall go here or there, but no mention of errors they make, jobs they do not do, and the cleanup of those issues as they blindly move ahead, and to heck with all the issues they have created. I state this from simple facts of allowing sidewalks and walkways to be built without permits, or the roofs to be replaced and never inspected, to see if they meet code, (city got its money for permit though), to a general parking problem, and safety concern for people should there be fire or emergency in some areas as only one way in and out, but well over 200 residences using that road.

In going through the critical area map and presentations, I chuckle, as an area close to me is listed as critical, though building has progressed in this area, and when they built one area they had to pump water out for multiple weeks to lay pipe, which resulted in the neighbor having to deepen well. Further the maps show one pond when in fact there are 3 or 5.

Further page 6 of the presentation talks about the white oak and preservation, are these the same white oaks butchered on Mill Plain by the school? Sounds somewhat fishly that some are to be left, yet others are not. Maybe all in the city should get together to really see which direction they are going, or possibly there is not a consensus, yet those in charge push forth....

While there are too many pages to comprehend in short time, the above are some comments.

TA

Steven Silvey

Vancouver WA.

**From:** [Jini O'Flynn](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Traffic at NE 99th Street and 130th Ave.  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 19, 2024 1:17:54 PM

---

You don't often get email from [jini.oflynn@gmail.com](mailto:jini.oflynn@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.

The intersection of NE 99th Street and NE 130th Ave. is used heavily by the Fire Station, Engine #11, and Hawk Trucking.

It needs to be widened or or maybe a round-about would be appropriate.

The trucks run over the sidewalks the firetrucks blow their horns to clear the area. Both are incredibly noisy.

Thank you,  
Jini O'Flynn  
Prairie View Apts  
12611 NE 99th Street  
Vancouver, WA 98682  
Apt. CC-205  
360-980-6172  
[Jini.oflynn@gmail.com](mailto:jini.oflynn@gmail.com)