

Schroader, Kathy



From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:48 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Oct. 20 Comp Plan Comments
Attachments: Alexander_Valerie_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Allen_Milada_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Boynton_Stephen and Lissa_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Edwards_Ron_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Levanen_Carol_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Levanen_Carol_10-27-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Marshall_Sue_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Rasmussen_Susan_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Reisbick_Margaret_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Starke_Gretchen_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Tweet_Margaret_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf

Hello,

Here are your copies of written testimony submitted during the Oct. 20 Comp Plan hearing. There's also one from Carol Levanen that was submitted on Oct. 27 during general public comment.

Also, I've mailed a packet of information to Cindy Holley (sign-in sheets, written testimony, maps, etc.).

Thanks and have a great day. :)

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council
Board of County Councilors
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov

No mention of 9AM deadline, PUBLIC Hearings first, general
phone comments? update comments later.

For the Oct. 20 Public Hearing on the Growth Management Plan Tuesday Oct 20, 2015

From Margaret Tweet, Citizen, Camas, WA
2919 NW 34th Circle

Reject Planning Commission
recommendation

It is unclear what comments citizens are allowed to make on what topics, and what comments may not be included in the record. What is classified as a "general" comment? What comments will be stricken from the record? How have potentially affected owners been notified via a mailing? Please consider the following.

25 years of no action for rural Clark county.

1. **A grandfather clause** to allow longtime property owners the use options they had when they purchased the property, as other counties have done. Protects property rights
2. **Smaller lot sizes and ability to divide.** Yes.

At a town hall held recently, one citizen explained that they had a 20 acre parcel and were not able to divide the lot for any reason, including for family members. If a resident owns property, they should be able to pass it on in parcels to family. It also increases the housing density & promotes a variety of densities.

Family caring for family- Proximity is important when caring for children or aging family members. Allowing for dividing lots allows families to care for one another through various phases of life. A permit to place a mobile home has to wait for a disability to occur. What if a mobile home isn't suitable or desired for housing? It is much harder to accomplish anything if a medical hardship occurs. This Plan does not adequately consider caring for family, and passing on a place to live for future generations. Family could move in to help out, then be forced out of the home since there is no way to divide the parcel in smaller lots. Large families require more lots. The plan needs to be flexible. Family gardens are a valuable source of natural food fostered in rural areas.

Medical and/or economic hardship may require selling a portion of a property to save the rest, or a family business. The county should not prevent families and business from dividing a property in order to keep the business going, and keep a house.

Small businesses often require space- Smaller lot sizes allow for more and varied small businesses to start in Clark County, supporting residents with jobs. Whether it is a repair shop, a small farm or garden, or another sort of small home based business, the county should allow for such start up efforts, not prevent it. Small farms can either support a family or have enough to share. It needn't be commercial to be a farm that is feeding the community healthy produce. Small farms can be commercially viable. Promotes economic opportunity for all citizens

Lewis: Chelan County have more options for rural landowners

Stricter than state requires? Over-regulation stifles growth and jobs. Opportunity fosters creative growth. Please keep Clark County rules no stricter than state requirements. If the state and the courts do not require 5-acre minimum lot sizes, neither should the county.

Housing- Smaller lots provide more housing opportunities. Affordable housing requires available land.

Ridgefield and Washougal increase residential zoning- Yes

Article on how few starter homes avail. Rents are going up, difficult to buy home.

TriMountain Golf Course- The county has taken years of losses when Ridgefield could not keep the golf course. Will transfer to city limits mean transfer of any future profits away from county and to the city?

Alternative 4 offers the most flexibility for improving job and housing opportunities in Clark County.

Overall, property rights should be respected, and communications kept open for input. Public outreach with residents is vital, and any rules on how and when comments are allowed to be clearly communicated. Thank you for your consideration. Growth rates & estimates fluctuate

IP the most accurate assumptions produce the best results as plans modify and correct if needed.



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

AII.3 CITY-REQUESTED UGA EXPANSIONS		
3.a	Battle Ground. Add 80 acres, now designated R-5, to the UGA for jobs.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
3.b	La Center. Add 17 acres, now designated R-5, for a school site.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
3.c	La Center. Add 56 acres, now designated AG-20, for jobs.	Motion to Approve AYE – 3; NAY – 3 – TIE VOTE – No Recommendation
3.d	Ridgefield. Add 111 acres, now designated AG-20, for residential.	Motion to Deny AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
3.e	Washougal. Add 41 acres, now designated R-5, for residential.	Motion to Approve AYE – 2; NAY – 3 ABSTENTION – 1 Motion Failed
AII.4 RURAL, AGRICULTURE, AND FOREST LANDS CHANGES		
4.a	Rural Lands. Eliminate R-10 and R-20 zones unless publicly owned property. Create R-1 and R-2.5 zones. Maintain R-5 zone.	Motion to Deny AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
4.b	Agriculture Lands. Eliminate AG-20 zone unless publicly owned property. Create AG-5 and AG-10 zones.	Motion to Deny AYE – 4; NAY – 2 Motion Passed
4.c	Forest Lands. Add FR-10 and FR-20 zones to existing FR-40 and FR-80 zones.	Motion to Approve AYE – 2; NAY – 4 Motion Failed
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS		
	A Motion was made for the councilor's to allow for a process for flexibility and opportunity for land owners who continuously owned	Motion to Approve AYE – 4; NAY 2 Motion Passed

yes
yes.

yes
yes
yes
yes



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

yes	property prior to the 1994 plan to possibly divide their property. The vote was 4-2 to approve. There was discussion as to whether the effort, discussion of the process will come to the PC work session, meetings, etc.	
-----	---	--