

**O'Donnell, Mary Beth**

---

**From:** Karen Wood <kwood@pacifier.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 08, 2015 3:50 PM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** EIS Alternatives Comments



CP16#0629

These comments are related to the open house I attended at Hockinson High School on April 1, 2015. I previously submitted comments on the three alternatives presented at the October 2014 open houses on November 17, 2014, so will focus these comments on new information presented at the April 1 open house.

I appreciated the overview provided by Oliver on the alternatives. He said the council needs to decide which alternatives to study in the environmental review. I am concerned about the reduction in minimum lot sizes proposed in Alternative 4. It would encourage subdivision and development of property outside the established urban growth boundaries on resource and rural lands. This is counter to the intent and goals of the Growth Management Act and looks like spot zoning. I am sure Alternative 4 would be appealed if any of it ends up in the preferred alternative and would not be likely to be upheld by the Growth Management Board. Therefore, I do not think it is a good use of County staff and resources (my tax dollars) to study Alternative 4 and then have to defend it during appeal. I am also concerned that Alternative 4 will require a full environmental impact study rather than the supplemental EIS, resulting in more time and money spent on the comprehensive plan update. It would be better to use this comprehensive plan to encourage farming in Clark County rather than encouraging development where it does not belong.

Councilor Madore said the reduction in size of parcels proposed in both Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 is being given by land owners' desire to subdivide their land. This does not seem to me to be adequate justification for the changes proposed in Alternative 2 and Alternative 4, considering the negative environmental and other impacts it would have. The current zoning has been in place since the first comprehensive plan in 1994. The landowners who purchased property since then are aware of the restrictions on their property. I expect few of them are original landowners. Just because a nearby property was subdivided before the 1994 comprehensive plan doesn't justify subdividing more property. What is left of the larger rural, agriculture, and forest resource land parcels need to be preserved, not subdivided.

After the open house, I drove north about a mile to the 40-acre ranch where my mother raised horses in the 1970's and 1980's. I was dismayed to see how much development has occurred around it since the last time I drove by, with many large parcels split into small acreage. I'm certain the only reason that my mother's ranch hasn't been subdivided are the requirements of the Growth Management Act to preserve resource and rural lands. I think it is important for our quality of life that what is left of rural, agriculture, and forest resource lands continue to be preserved as determined by previous comprehensive plans. We also need to keep growth inside urban growth areas where it is less expensive to provide infrastructure and other services, reducing the burden on taxpayers. Therefore, I strongly oppose the reduced parcel sizes in Alternative 2 and Alternative 4.

Karen Wood  
14910 NE 46<sup>th</sup> St  
Vancouver, WA 98682