

**David Madore**

10 hrs · Edited

Got real facts? Your property rights depend on that answer.

Today, we moved one step closer to ensuring that our 20-year zoning plan is rooted in reality. Today's 3+ hours joint work session included our County Council, representatives from every Clark County city, our Planning Commission, our staff, and numerous organizations all around one table to consider two choices.

The future of our community for the next 20 years should be based on facts that align with reality. Yet, we have two alternate realities that provide wildly different sets of facts. We are to then base crucial decisions on those facts.

One set of facts leads us to do nothing for the rural citizens for the next 20 years. The other set of facts leads us to see the first choice as illegal. Those facts compel us to choose a very different path.

Opinions, philosophies, ideologies, preferences, and politics should not change facts, evidence, history, or truth. The truth should be self-evident. Right?

I am thankful for Tom Mielke's agreement today in that important work session to propose choice B to our community that we think most faithfully represents the truth and provides the most realistic facts that we can trust as reliable.

If our community agrees, then our Comp Plan that defines your zoning and private property rights for the next 20 years will hopefully be based on true facts that align with reality.

Take a look at choice A vs. choice B in this set:

http://clark.wa.gov/.../110915_VBLM_PlanningAssumptionsBasis...

Which set aligns with reality better?

See my November 6 post to participate in this important decision.

Ref	A (existing)	B (proposed)
1	Remainder lots of already developed cluster developments with permanent covenants prohibiting further development shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	Parcels that cannot reasonably be expected to develop should not be counted as likely to develop. Those include remainder lots of already developed cluster developments that are prohibited from further development.
2	Parcels located in areas far from any infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations are counted as rural parcels that will develop.	Parcels located in areas far from any infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations likely to continue should not be counted as likely to develop.
3	Rural parcels including 100% of environmentally constrained areas that lack the necessary area for septic systems and well clearances shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	Rural parcels that have less than 1 acre of environmentally unconstrained land necessary for septic systems and well clearances should not be counted as likely to develop.
4	The adopted "Never to Convert" deductions used by the VBIM inside the Urban Growth Boundaries shall be omitted outside the Urban Growth Boundaries. All built and all vacant rural parcels shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	The adopted VBIM used for urban areas assumes that a percentage of properties that have an existing residence will likely not divide further. That same 30% "Never to Convert" assumption should apply to already built rural parcels as well. The adopted VBIM used for urban areas assumes that a percentage of vacant properties will likely not divide further. That same 10% "Never to Convert" assumption should apply to vacant rural parcels as well.
5	Lots that are up to 10% smaller than the minimum lot size should be considered as conforming lots and counted as likely to develop as provided by current county code.	Same
6	All nonconforming parcels with 1 acre shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	10% of nonconforming parcels with at least 1 acre of unconstrained area will likely develop at the same rate indicated by historical records.
7	The 15% Market Factor used for urban parcels to provide some margin for the law of supply and demand to satisfy the GMA affordable housing goal inside the UGB shall not apply outside the UGB.	A deduction of up to 7.5% is appropriate to provide some margin for the law of supply and demand of rural parcels to help satisfy the GMA affordable housing goal.
8	A 27.7% infrastructure deduction is use for urban parcels. But because rural parcels are larger, the rural infrastructure deduction is assumed to be small. No deduction shall be used for rural parcels for any infrastructure such as roads, storm water, parks, schools, fire stations, conservation areas, lakes, streams, protected buffers, Etc.	Same

Like Comment Share



David Gregory, Tim Lutz, Kenny Smith and 6 others like this.

Chronological

2 shares



Jonathan Johnson The people who came up with the existing plan must think "Big Yellow Taxi" is the most truthful song ever written.

Do they really expect the whole county to be paved over?

Like · Reply · 1 · 10 hrs



Tracy O. Doriot I'm gratified to see that the the County is realizing that the original assumptions were highly flawed as well as the unrealistic and unfair. The current restrictions placed on many rural properties is more than likely not only impractical, and unfair, but illegal. Thanks to all who are working diligently to broaden the available lands inventory. 20 years is a long time folks. If we are to have any chance of providing affordable housing, enough land has to be available to fill the demand. If not, the price will sharply rise as availability continues to decline. If the American Dream is to stand a chance, real buildable land inventory has to be matched to the actual growth rate,

Like · Reply · 1 · 9 hrs