

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 3:46 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted



CR16#042

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: GMA update

Comments:

As a concerned citizen of Clark County, WA, I am submitting the following questions and comments about the GMA alternatives.

Process

Did the process used to draw up Alternative 4 comply with the GMA requirements for public participation, and the Home Rule Charter process requirements?

Consider: This alternative was written by a single, small group of special interests, who stood to profit, and one County Commissioner. The county planners, the other commissioners, Clark County cities, and other interested groups and individuals were not given the opportunity to provide input. Alt 4 was then presented (actually pushed) as another alternative to the three existing alternatives that complied with the standard GMA and Home Rule Charter processes.

Property rights

Of the properties plotted into smaller lots with Alternative 4, how many of the current property owners owned their property prior to 1994? These landowners may have a legitimate grievance.

Landowners who purchased their property post-1994 GMA knew exactly what they were buying. If they were speculating, they knew it was a risk. They have not been denied economic use of the property they bought. GMA does not promise maximum profits from property.

Cost of residential growth

What is the real cost of Alternative 4? Alternative 3? Alternative 2?

The costs of residential growth in terms of required services far exceed what comes in via taxes and impact fees. Unbiased studies consistently more than a \$20,000 gap per new home. To pay for this gap, taxes go up or services decline. Before you choose an alternative that adds new residential lots, please obtain concrete, mathematical analysis of the actual financial costs to the people who already live here.

Yes, new residents will spend money and contribute to the community, but they will also add to increased traffic congestion, increased air and water pollution, and decreased options for local food production.

Summary

Alternative 4 should not be considered a viable alternative, due to non-compliance with the GMA and Charter processes, and the loss of irreplaceable agricultural and forest lands. Experts in our planning department have prepared other, better alternatives.

However, I do think some accommodation could be made for property owners who owned their property prior to 1994. Does Alt 2 incorporate this?

In addition, whatever alternative or combination of alternatives you choose, please carefully consider all of the costs to existing residents when providing additional land for residential development. Is it possible we have enough residential land at this time?

Thank you,
Karen Beall
312 Riverview Dr.
Ridgefield, WA 98642

Submitted by:
Karen Beall

Email: karen_beall@comcast.net

Address:
312 Riverview Dr.
Ridgefield, WA