

**O'Donnell, Mary Beth**

---



**From:** Greg Weber <confluencewinery@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 26, 2015 2:19 PM  
**To:** Madore, David; McCauley, Mark; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** Plan 4 support

Commissioner Madore and Staff,

Thank you for the presentation last night, it's clear to me that plan 4 is the best initial proposed plan to serve the rural property owners in this county. I do support plan 3 that addresses to expansion of the smaller city UGB's and would like to see that in addition to plan 4, though see a need to enhance and look more closely at some of the parcels in plan 4. My parcel is a R-10 remainder parcel that is 21plus acres in size. It was clustered in 1990 as a 20 acre AG piece that was later changed by the AG remand to R-10 in 1997. There is a 20 acre parcel directly to the south ( our address is 19111 NW 67 Ave) that is on the plan 4 proposal to be moved to R-1. Our parcel is slated to be R-5. The difference is our parcel has PUD water to our site, the parcel to the south does not (it is also a AG 20 remainder that was changed to R-10). This is not consistent. In addition, it is critical that the potential for developable space within a parcel be considered in applying the proper zone. For example, my parcel as many large parcels around me have several acres in wildlife area and buffer space that will never be developed, only the part of my parcel surrounded by existing 1 acre parcels is my developable space. This would make the most sense.

In addition, my parcel being divided nearly a century ago should not be restricted for another unforeseeable time time frame that would make it 40-50 years total between development, with services available!! That is unacceptable, we need to enhance plan 4.

David, thanks for your time on the phone this morning, it is nice to see this important issue being addressed and corrected.

Greg Weber  
Owner  
Confluence Vineyards and Winery  
Direct: 360-887-2343  
Cell: 360-608-1135

Sent from my iPad