

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 10:09 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: 2015-1116_Presentation.pptx

FYI

From: Madore, David
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 8:44 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: 2015-1116_Presentation.pptx

Oliver,

This looks perfect.

Thank you,

David

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 8:34 AM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Euler, Gordon; Anderson, Colette
Subject: FW: 2015-1116_Presentation.pptx

Hello Councilor

<< File. 2015-1116_Presentation.pptx >>

Attached, please find the draft presentation for tonight open house per your request. Thanks


Oliver

Clark County 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan



RURAL LANDS



URBAN LANDS



TRANSPORTATION



PUBLIC FACILITIES




Public Meetings, November 16 & 17, 2015

Agenda



- 1. Overview – where we are today**
- 2. Purpose of the Public Meeting**
- 3. Proposed changes to Planning Assumptions**
- 4. Questions and Answers**
- 5. Next Steps**


Comprehensive plan progress to date




Environmental Review



Remaining milestones



Environmental Review process



Share your comments

Provide comments online or by email, letter or comment form. Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on November 20, 2015 to be included in the Board hearing materials, however, the BOCC will accept both written and public testimony through the hearing on November 24.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Online | www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments/html |
| Email | Send to: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov Put "Comprehensive Plan Comments" in the subject line. Include your name and mailing address. |
| Letter | Mail to: Clark County Community Planning Comprehensive Plan P.O. Box 9810 Vancouver, WA 98666-9810 |
| Public Meeting comment form | Attend a Public Meeting: Nov. 16, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. Hockinson High School Nov. 17, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. Ridgefield High School |

Population





Table 1: GIS Rural Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) Assumptions

| Ref | A (existing) | B (proposed) |
|-----|---|--|
| 1 | Every possible rural parcel shall be counted as a parcel that will develop regardless of conditions that would likely make such development unlikely. | These rural VBLM assumptions should be used not to reflect what is possible, but to reasonably plan for what is likely. Parcels that cannot reasonably be expected to develop should not be counted as parcels likely to develop. Cluster development remainder parcels that are known to be prohibited from further development should not be counted as parcels likely to develop. |
| 2 | Rural parcels located in areas far from basic infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations should be counted as parcels that will develop. | Parcels located in areas far from infrastructure with long term commercial forestry operations likely to continue should not be counted as likely to develop. These assumptions are not used to authorize or to prohibit the development of individual parcels. Rather, these assumptions should only be used for tallying parcel totals for general planning information. |
| 3 | Rural parcels including 100% of environmentally constrained areas that lack sufficient 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 sufficient area for septic systems and well clearances should not be counted as likely to develop. |
| 4 | History shows that about 30% of dividable parcels with homes and 10% of vacant dividable parcels do not develop further. So those deductions have been applied to urban planning totals for years. But every rural parcel shall be counted as a parcel that will divide to the maximum degree possible. | History shows that about 30% of dividable parcels with homes and 10% of vacant dividable parcels do not develop further. So those deductions have been applied to urban planning totals for years. These same deductions should be applied to rural planning totals as well. |
| 5 | As long as county code allows, lots that are up to 10% smaller than the minimum lot size should be considered as conforming lots and counted as parcels likely to develop. | Same |
| 6 | Although county code prohibits most nonconforming parcels from developing, all nonconforming parcels with 1 acre shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop. | Due to some exceptions from the norm, 10% of nonconforming parcels with at least 1 acre of unconstrained area will likely develop. |
| 7 | A 15% urban Market Factor provides some margin for the law of supply and demand to comply with the GMA requirement to provide a sufficient supply and achieve the affordable housing goal. But a 0% Market Factor shall be used for rural areas. | A 7.5% rural Market Factor should be used to provide a reasonable margin for the law of supply and demand to comply with the GMA requirement to provide a sufficient supply and achieve the affordable housing goal. Implementation of this rural Market Factor is accomplished by deducting this percentage of parcels from the total available rural parcels. Note that this rural Market Factor is half of the urban Market Factor of 15% in order to also satisfy the GMA goal of reducing low density sprawl. |
| 8 | A 27.7% infrastructure deduction for infrastructure including roads, storm water, parks, schools, fire stations, conservation areas, lakes, streams, protected buffers, Etc.. A 0% deduction shall be used for rural areas. | Same |


Table 2: Planning Assumptions

| Ref | A (existing) | B (proposed) |
|-----|--|---|
| 1 | The 20 year urban population is forecasted to increase by 116,591. | Same |
| 2 | The actual urban/rural split has consistently been 86/14 for decades. But a 90/10 split shall be used instead to lower the rural population growth forecast to only 12,955 persons. | The actual urban/rural split has consistently been 86/14 for decades and is a viable policy option. The 1994 approved plan used 80/20. A more moderate policy of 87.5/12.5 forecasts 16,656 new rural persons for this plan update. |
| 3 | The annual county-wide population is forecasted to grow by 129,546 from 448,845 in 2015 to 578,391 in 2035 which calculates to an annual growth rate of 1.28%. | The county-wide population is forecasted to grow by 133,247 from 448,845 in 2015 to 582,092 in 2035. That is a 1.31% annual growth rate. That total is 0.6% higher than choice A. The annual rate is 0.03% higher than choice A. |
| 4 | The choice A assumptions assert that Alternative 1 would add 18,814 new persons in the rural area which is 45% more impact than necessary since choice A forecasts a need for 12,955 new persons in the rural area. | The choice B assumptions show that Alternative 1 can fit 8,182 new persons which is 51% too low. Thus Alternative 1 is not a viable option since it cannot comply with the GMA requirement to provide for the forecasted growth. (8,182 / 16,656) |
| 5 | The choice A assumptions assert that the original draft Alternative 4 map would add 32,987 new persons which is 155% more impact than necessary since choice A forecasts a need for 12,955 new persons in the rural area. | The choice B assumptions assert that the updated Alternative 4 map can accommodate 16,332 new rural persons. That falls within 2% of the forecasted rural population growth of 16,656 persons. Therefore, Alternative 4 is the appropriate choice. |
| 6 | No improvements or mitigations that were identified in the public process should be allowed. Each draft alternative must be accepted or rejected as is. Any revisions would require the process to start over and result in missing the required deadline. | The Alternative 4 updated maps include mitigations that increase the variety of lot sizes including AG-20, preserve large parcels near the UGBs for future employment, and better preserve the rural character. These revisions and planning assumptions should be allowed as proposed. |
| 7 | Cluster options are not necessarily included in any Alternative and therefore may not be available to preserve open space or large areas of habitat. | Rural cluster options are to be integrated into Alternative 4 within the limits of the law per previous direction given by the Board for R, AG, and FR zones to provide flexibility, to preserve open space, and to better provide for larger aggregated areas of habitat. |
| 8 | The existing Alternative-1 map defines 57% of existing R parcels as nonconforming, 76% of existing AG parcels as nonconforming, and 89% of existing FR parcels as nonconforming. It is not realistic since it does not fit the already developed patterns that actually exist. | The updated Alternative-4 map should be adopted to correct the mismatch between Alternative 1 map and the already developed patterns that actually exist, to respect predominant lots sizes, to resolve some spot zoning problems, and to best accommodate the forecasted population. |

2016 Comprehensive Plan Update Proposed Rural Zones




2016 Comprehensive Plan Update Proposed Agriculture Zones



2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Proposed Forest Zones



Thank you!



www.clark.wa.gov/planning/