

**O'Donnell, Mary Beth**



EP 16# 0267

**From:** LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 02, 2014 8 45 AM  
**To:** O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
**Subject:** nonconforming lots

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

for your file

---

**From:** Carol Levanen [<mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, September 01, 2014 2:39 AM

**To:** Fred Pickering; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.

**Subject:** Re: nonconforming lots

Thanks Fred,

In addition, while looking through old documents, I found there were proposals that 2.5 acres or smaller had to have fire sprinkling systems, and hook up to CPU water if they were 1500 feet within a line. This was multiplied with more lots, times 750 feet So, a 4 lot short plat area would be required to hook up if the distance was 3000 feet. As long as there is a non-conforming lot ordinance, the potential for abuse by the county is great. In looking through the large collections of maps in my newly created county map book, I noted that there is so much inconsistency among all of the maps, that they are basically useless. But, they all consistently show that the rural area has a massive number of small parcels and we know that the majority of them were created long before the GMA.

Best Regards, Carol

**From:** Fred Pickering <[fredp@yacolt.com](mailto:fredp@yacolt.com)>

**To:** Carol Levanen <[cnldental@yahoo.com](mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Sunday, August 31, 2014 12 32 AM

**Subject:** nonconforming lots

A good meeting and talks the other night.

After thinking a little overnight and taking a quick looking at the code there are several restrictions that jump out

The 40 and 80 acre timber zones have 50 foot set backs. It can be hard to meet these on narrow lots. A 100 foot lot leave you no place to build. New lots in a forest zone need to be 140 feet wide. Which leaves you a 69 foot spot to build on.

A 5 acre zone set backs are (20) feet, and fifty (50) feet for accessory buildings (barns)

A 2.5 acre zone set backs are ten (10) feet, and fifty (50) feet for accessory buildings (barns)

*So 2.5 acre lots in a forest zone has a much grater set back requirements than it would if it was zoned right. For some reason there are more restrictions on other usages such as B&Bs in a forest zone have to be smaller than in forest zones than it would in a 2.5 zone.*

*The parcel size should be the driving force not that the fact that lots have trees on them or was it just that some planer thought it would be nice if it is zoned forest.*

*The other thing it requires an eighty acre + parcel to create an additional lot in a 40 acre zone. A 79 acre parcel can not be divided.*

I did not see any 80 acre parcels in the 40 acre zones that I looked at.

If a land owner in a 40 of 80 acre zone has a hardship there is not way that they can sell part of the farm to save the rest. It is also very dificult to sell large parcels and if you do have to sell a large parcell a much larger part of the sale goes to taxes, so less net icome from the sale.

All of the above lower the value of miss zoned parcels, but some how this lower value does not seem to show up on our tax statements.

Should we be giving drawing up a map as to what the zoning should look like other than just tell them what is wrong with what they have.

Just a few of my thoughts.

Fred.....