

Schroader, Kathy



From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 12:11 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Comprehensive Plan

Comments:

Having reviewed the entire document, I strongly object to the inclusion of Alternative 4 as it cannot comply with the Growth Management Act. It is not fair to landowners to even go there, since it cannot pass in the long run. Given the cost and impact of the infrastructure needed to support it, I cannot support alternative 2. Alternative 1 - no change - would give us more time to develop a plan better suited to our community's needs while meeting the requirements of the GMA. Alternative 3 does provide some relief to the cities within the county and may be manageable in terms of infrastructure and impact. retaining the rural character of Clark County, and supporting agricultural is important to me. Also ensuring that we have the large plots of land needed for future industrial growth is critical and would not happen if Alternative 4 is adopted. So in short, Alternative 1 is my preferred, with more work going into developing an update. Alternative 3 would be my second choice. I cannot see how 2 or 4 would benefit the county or be sustainable. Wells are already being impacted, roads and other infrastructure are already a challenge. those are not well addressed in 2 or 4. Thank you,

Submitted by:
Jacqueline Lane

Email: jmlane@msn.com

Address:
24203 ne 59th ave
battle ground, wa