

Schroader, Kathy



From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 5 02 PM
To: 'veyseyvv@msn.com'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver, Snell, Marty, Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW
Attachments: 2015_0917_PreferedAlternativeTable_PC_REC.pdf

Vern.

Thanks for getting in touch. I've answered the questions as best I know in red, below

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: VERNON VEYSEY [<mailto:veyseyvv@msn.com>]
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 12:57 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject:

Gordon

I have several questions regarding the progress on the comprehensive plan.

1 I read in the paper that the planning commission made its recommendations including something for exceptions. what are or would be exceptions? No idea. The Planning Commission recommendation from September 17 is attached.

For example I have clients that applied for and received subdivision preliminary approval but were not able to complete the plat because of the cost for final construction. Would that be an exceptions since even with approval and the expense of that work they ended up being denied not because of the plat but because of the change in the plan and the arbitrary time limit on final approval?

2 Would clusters be allowed for timber and farm land with the present designation of AG or FR 20 acre zoning. If so what would or are the conditions? Is the 10 acre thought still alive in the eyes of the council? We don't currently have a cluster provision for ag and forest land. The Board could direct that we develop one. I assume that the provisions would be somewhat similar to those required for clustering on Rural lands. The trick will be proving that subdividing resource lands is maintaining the long-term commercial viability of said lands.

3 Property zoned AG 20 but with legal lot approval for three lots and an overlay of 5 acre lots. I'm not sure what this means. Today you would need 60+ acres to get three legal lots on a parcel zoned AG-20. Would that be rezoned to the 5 acre? In other words if the overlay was to be will there be consideration for that to be changed as a part of this planning process. I suggest checking Councilor Madore's latest proposal for Agriculture land to see what is proposed for this parcel—find the Ag map on the Board's Grid under October 20, 2015.

4. What is the plan for the property that is west of 72nd avenue and north of 119th street since we have significant improvement in 119th? All I can tell you is that there are no changes planned in the comp plan designation or zoning in this area.

5. What are the plans for 179th or is that a reality considering funding and the need for road improvements. There are lots of 'plans' for the areas around the 179th interchange. Unfortunately, the interchange needs to be improved to meet concurrency requirements, and funding for that isn't slated to

come to the county until 2023. Several people want to know about sewer since the City of Ridgefield got an exception and grants to pump to Salmon Creek Plant what does that mean for that area

If we have suggestions for code changes that in my opinion would allow for better development and some differences in zoning determination how do we get them into the process? As always, contact the Board's office

Here are a couple of examples.

1. Don't use property lines for all the determination of boundaries. Consider the geographical and other physical conditions

For example streams can make great divisions. By using them for boundary we avoid crossings and environmental issues, provide great buffers between Zoning types, places for trails and park connections. I know owners, especially in the rural area may have a problem because they have two different zones but access is an issue and making it more of a problem by using property lines rather than mother nature's lines and zoning across these lines makes it more problematic.

2. Be willing to have private roads become county roads so that they may be extended to provide services to proposed development areas.

3. What is it, but how did it get that way and does that mean more of the same. I have a client that was given approval for a cluster subdivision but the remainder cannot be accessed unless they spend lots of money and cause environmental issues with the creek that divides the property. Why not let them sell the property to the neighbor on the other side of the creek and continue the same non-buildable restrictions, on the property. Nothing changes in terms of land use and density. Yes we have things like plat alterations but why when it can be a simple deed with language approved by the county. This method could be used in many circumstances such as the case where a person owns property on two sides of a stream and could sell to the one on the other side for farming or timber.

Just some thoughts.

Vern Veysey

County Commissioner and still concerned citizen.

Yes, one retains their title forever.



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Alternative	Option Description	Preferred Alternative?
Alt. 1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE		
1	The 'No Action' alternative This option re-adopts the current plan, planning assumptions and moves the planning horizon out to 2035.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6 ; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
Alt. 2 COUNTY-INITIATED ALTERNATIVE		
RURAL LANDS		
2.a	Rural Lands Change the comp plan map legend from three comp plan designations to one Rural designation to be consistent with current comp plan-to-zoning matrix table	Motion to Approve. AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2 b	Agriculture Lands. Change the minimum lot size for parcels zoned AG-20 from 20 acres to 10 acres (AG-10)	Motion to Deny. AYE – 4, NAY – 2 Motion Passed
2 c	Forest Lands. Change the minimum lot size for parcels zoned FR-40 from 40 acres to 20 acres (FR-20)	Motion to Approve. AYE – 2; NAY – 4 Motion Failed
2.d	Rural Lands. For parcels zoned R-20, from 20 acres to 10 acres, in some areas.	No Vote Taken
2 e	Rural Centers. Combine rural center commercial (CR-2) and rural commercial (CR-1) into a single comp plan designation of 'rural commercial'	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.f	Urban Reserve. Urban reserve (UR) becomes a true overlay Zoning defaults to underlying zone; some parcels given R-5 zoning. UR code moved to the overlay chapter of Title 40. No change in allowable land uses	Motion to Approve AYE – 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
URBAN LANDS		
2.g	Commercial Lands. Combine the three commercial zones (C-2, C-3 and GC) into a single comp plan (C) designation.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5, NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2 h	Public Facilities. Creation of public facilities zone	Motion to Approve



**Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update**

		AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.i	Urban Holding. Urban holding (UH) becomes a true overlay Zoning defaults to underlying zone. UH code moved to the overlay chapter of Title 40. No change in allowable land uses.	Motion to Approve AYE - 5; NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.j	Battle Ground UGA. Changes comp plan and zoning designations to better reflect surrounding land uses.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.k	Ridgefield UGA. Add the Tri-Mountain Golf Course to the Ridgefield UGA retaining Parks and Open Space (P/OS) zoning and adding an Urban Holding UH-20 overlay.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.l	Vancouver UGA. Remove reference to the Three Creeks Special Planning Area.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2 m	Vancouver UGA. Approve the Discovery/Fairgrounds subarea comp plan map and zoning changes	Motion to Approve AYE – 6, NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2 n	Vancouver UGA. Approve the Salmon Creek subarea comp plan map and zoning changes.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.o	Vancouver UGA. Change some parcels that have a mixed use comp plan designation to a comp plan designation that matches current zoning.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2.p	Vancouver UGA. Remove UR adjacent to the Vancouver UGA and replace it with R-5 and AG-20 zoning.	Motion to Approve AYE – 5, NAY – 1 Motion Passed
2.q	Vancouver UGA. Remove UH in the Fisher Swale area between Vancouver and Camas.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed
2 r	Washougal UGA. Correct mapping error on parcels with city zoning inside the UGA but outside city limits.	Motion to Approve AYE – 6; NAY – 0 Motion Passed



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Alt. 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
Alt. 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



Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

	<p>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.</p>	
--	--	--