

To: Mayor Turk and Councilors

From: Sarah Fox, Senior Planner

Date: March 18, 2019

Summary:

This preliminary report is intended to provide comparable data on three areas of the city in order to select an area for further study.

Subarea plans are detailed plans that are prepared on smaller geographic areas of a city. The boundaries of a subarea can follow the boundaries of a neighborhood, zoning area (e.g. Downtown Zone), transportation corridor or other special districts of distinction.

For the purposes of this preliminary report, both the Downtown and Bridge Village areas are defined by their commercial zones (DC and MX). The North Shore area more closely follows the area that was analyzed during the 2012 comprehensive plan amendments and lies to the northeast of Lacamas Lake and west of Everett Street (SR-500).

A subarea planning effort includes the following tasks at a minimum:

- Define the geographic boundaries
- Define goals and timing
- Designate lead and support staff
- Create a task force of stakeholders and other citizens
- Plan a public engagement strategy
- Data collection and analysis

- Identify opportunities and constraints
- Provide findings and recommendations to legislative body
- Create an action plan and economic toolbox to achieve goals

The city conducted a subarea planning process for the North Dwyer Creek Master Plan (2000). There have been several amendments to that planning area since 2000. The most recent amendments in 2013 included a road dedication and extension of Larkspur, and the conversion of a portion of the area from LI/BP to multifamily.

The last page of this report includes a worksheet with topics that are informed by the goals and policies of the city's comprehensive plan, <u>Camas 2035</u>. The purpose of that section is to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each subarea based on the city's goals and policies. Depending on the discussion at the workshop, a low or high score may be a reason for selecting one area over the other. A low score may indicate a higher need for subarea planning, and alternatively a higher score may indicate a greater desire for a particular goal to be attained in the area to contribute to overall city goals.

	Downtown	Bridge Village	North Shore
Area (acreage)	47.09	13.71	670
% of Area Citywide	0.53%	0.15%	7.53%
Number of Properties	232	32	38
Number of Property Owners	178	27	22
Public Ownership	5.31 acres (City) ¹	1.0 acre (Clark County)	82.63 acres (City)
Average Property Value	\$410,299	\$263,134	\$557,264
Demographics Regional Transportation	Note 3	Note 4	Note 5
Council (TAZ Data) Households 2010	285	230	83
Households Forecast 2035	296	624	679
Employment 2010	1066 [22.63 Jobs per acre]	25 [1.82 Jobs per acre]	15 [0.02 Jobs per acre]
Employment Projected 2035	1132 [24 Jobs per acre]	28 [2.15 Jobs per acre]	1344 [2.0 Jobs per acre]
Land Data			
Comp Plan	Commercial	Commercial	Various
Zoning	Downtown Commercial (DC)	Mixed Use (MX)	BP 45%
			MF-18 9%
			MF-10 13%
			CC 11%
			R-7.5 22%
Overlay Zones	Gateway Corridors; and Gateways	Airport Overlay Zoning; Gateway Corridors; and Gateways	Airport Overlay Zoning; Gateway Corridors; and Gateways

	Downtown	Bridge Village	North Shore
Previous Planning Efforts			
	*Camas 2035 (Expanded downtown area to the north and south)	*Lake-Everett Intersection Study (Current 2019)	*Clark County Employment Lands Study-Site #81 229 acres, CWEDA (2016)
	*Building Assessment for Historic Preservation (2017) by DAHP	*Camas 2035 (Expanded the Mixed Use zone and converted residential areas to commercial)	*Lacamas Heritage Properties, 72.7 acres, CREDC (2016)
	*Downtown Vision Plan (2008)		*Lacamas North Shore Comp. Plan Amendments 460 acres (2012)
	*Downtown Design Review Manual (orig. 2008; Rev. 2014)		
	*Downtown Tree Management Plan (2010)		
	*Downtown Parking Committee (Est. 2014) ²		
Zoning code amendments that were targeted within area:	1.) Liquor Establishments, CMC18.43.115, was repealed 7/16/12.	Included more land area as Mixed Use (MX). MX code update effort has not occurred yet.	Prior to 2012 amendments the majority of the area was LI/BP comprehensive plan and zone.
	2.) Added "Specialty industries" that includes craft breweries (2012)		BP zoning code was updated (2013)
Buildable Vacant Land	Approx. 5.77 acres Underused land is either vacant or used for surface parking	Approx. 7.89 acres Comprised of two vacant lots and larger, non-conforming lots	Approx. 1/2 of total area or 402 acres
Transportation			
Summary	City streets are generally wide enough for parking on both sides and have sidewalks. State Route (SR-500) crosses through	Both city streets and SR-500 are generally too narrow for parking on both sides. Substantial stretches without sidewalks and safety concerns with bicycles.	Roadways are narrow, two-lanes wide and generally do not have parking or sidewalks. SR-500 crosses through.

	Downtown	Bridge Village	North Shore
Planned vehicular lanes	Extension of 6 th Avenue is under review along with a roundabout at 6 th & Adams	Roundabouts at key intersections throughout the corridor are being considered.	East-west arterial is planned which will be a "complete street" design.
Multi-modal amenities (Pedestrian and bike)	Sidewalks must be improved for ADA compliance. Bicycle facilities planning is under review.	Lack of sidewalks and bicycle facilities and planning at intersection/roundabout underway	Lack of sidewalks and bicycle facilities
Parks			
Existing park areas	None	Round Lake park Separated from Lacamas Lake	Boat launch area
Planned park areas	Downtown Gathering Place (SU- 10)	None	Neighborhood park (NP-17) Sports Field Complex (SU-13)
Existing trails	None	Round Lake Trail	None
Planned trails	(T-2) Trail would cross east to west and connect downtown to Forest Home Park and to the Columbia River.	(T-3) Lacamas Lake North Section will connect area to Lacamas Lake	(T-3) Trail will replace Leadbetter Road (T-27) Trail would be part of east- west vehicular road design. (T-28 and T-32) Trails would connect the upper T-27 with lakefront.

Notes:

¹15 properties owned by the City ² Downtown Parking Committee. This is a responsive committee and does not undertake parking planning efforts

^{3.} Downtown TAZ Identified as 402 and 403

^{4.} Bridge Village TAZ Identified as 417

^{5.} North Shore TAZ Identified 483 and 659



Downtown



Bridge Village



Worksheet

This section of the report is intended to help weigh the strengths and weaknesses of each subarea based on the city's goals and policies. Use the "other" section to add your own criteria. Please be prepared to discuss the reasons for your scoring at the workshop.

Subarea Plan Goals & Strengths [Score each item on a scale of 1 to 3—with 3 as the strongest reason to support.]			
Economic Goals	Downtown	Bridge Village	North Shore
Area will attract high-tech, sustainable and innovative industries (ED-1.2)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Area will expand year-round recreational services and tourism industry (ED-1.4)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Significant opportunities for redevelopment and infill (ED-1.3)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Infrastructure is planned or in place to support new business (ED-1.5)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Ready partners for recruitment of new industries and business expansion	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Development standards are in place for high-quality designs that are environmentally responsible (ED-1.8)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Housing			
Significant opportunity to increase housing diversity or affordability (H-2)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
High potential for housing connected to grocery stores, parks/trails, and employment (LU-3.2; 3.5; 3.6)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3

Urban Parks & Open Space			
Will increase green infrastructure (tree canopy, raingardens, etc.)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Level of opportunity to improve park and trail networks (LU-4)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
High potential amenities to the public (e.g. gathering place, parks, community center) (LU, Sec. 1.4.5)	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Other?	1.2.3	1.2.3	1.2.3
Total Score for Each Area:	Total	Total	Total