



Regarding Parcel #205384

Also Regarding Parcels #205410, #205450, #205456, #205451, #205455, #205461, 205460, #205459, 205466

I would like to express my gratitude for all the staff efforts regarding updating the Growth Management Plan here in Clark County. It is my personal opinion that Clark County could be making necessary changes in the GMA 1994 zoning that could and will have a substantial impact on my immediate family, my loved ones, and myself. I firmly believe alternative 4 for rural and forest zoning is a change in the right direction for the affected land owners of Clark County.

I have been extremely privileged for the fact that my great grandparents originally homesteaded the above referenced parcel, and through their generosity, gifted shares of the property to my mother and her siblings. My parents built a home on the property they received and as a result, I was allowed to grow up close to my family and enjoy the beautiful forest setting the parcel provides. It was my grandparents dream and intent that my sister and I would also be able to build homes on the property and provide to our children an experience close to that which we were so blessed to receive.

An inequitable 40 acre minimum zoning was applied through the GMA to our family's section of homesteaded land which has been handed down from our forefathers, and consists mostly of timber growing property. My husband and I want to build a home on this property as I always hoped and dreamed I would. The alternative 4 forest maps would designate our property as a 10 acre minimum zoning. This zoning is inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhoods which are more commonly sectioned in 2.5 and 5 acre minimums, which we believe is more appropriate for our personal organic growth and rural community development. We simply want that which is congruent with our neighboring properties and we are willing to be taxed accordingly.

When my Mother and her two sisters inherited 49.05 acres in common from their parents, they desired to pass it on to us and our future generations, as was done for them. The current proposal of zoning changes would place an unnecessary burden on my husband and I, as well as our children whom will one day have the responsibility of managing this land in ways in which we hope will provide them the opportunity to live and flourish here as our family had for generations. It is not realistic to expect us or them to manage the property with any measure of expected responsibility if they are required to do so in common.

We are again requesting our family, and other families like ours receive the same zoning options that are congruent with the neighborhoods that surround us.

The GMA zoning of 1994 overlaid a 40 acre minimum on all the parcel's lots, which were divided in the 1970's and 1980's from my grandparents' quarter section into 10 acres or 11 acre minimum lots. The remaining 49.05 acres of my grandparents' land was still being lived on and managed by my grandmother at that time. The only reason my grandmother didn't divide the property years earlier is that she used it for income and could not have perceived that GMA changes would deprive her of her original intent to pass the land to future generations. 75% of our neighbors – on former large farms north, west and south of our homestead properties and former timberland east along Bonanza Road – were long ago subdivided into 2.5 and 5 acre lots.

Ease of Management and Tax Clarity

In one of your work sessions, a county official said that it's perfectly legal and good to separate acreages into smaller parcels, "for tax purposes" so family members would receive and pay their own individual bills. This is just a part of managing smaller lots or timber acreage. My husband and I wish to build on a 7.5 acre parcel that my parents have expressed their willingness to pass to us, but due to overbearing GMA requirements we are in a state of limbo.

We appreciate the value of green space, clean air, clean water, continuing our family's stewardship and practice of careful selective logging (since 1951) on these acres (no clear-cuts, and planting of Douglas fir on former orchards and pastures.) A good and beautiful side effect is habitat for birds and wildlife, which can be easily attained with 1 home per 2.5 and 5 acre parcel. If you walk the perimeter of the 160 homestead, and look into surrounding 2.5 and 5 acre parcels you will see various trees, gardens and orchards, which preserves with the rural character we cherish while providing suitable land for sustainable home-ownership.

My great grandfather homesteaded this land in 1896 and it is still owned and managed by our family. Currently there are 6 family members living on the 160 acres with lots varying from 5 to 22 acre parcels. My grandfather's family members were all raised here as well as my mother's 6 siblings, my sister and I, and my many cousins. Those still living there are mostly retired and will require the assistance of me and my cousins to adequately care for the large lots bestowed upon them. Caring for this land responsibly has always required multiple family members which is an additional reason we are requesting the ability to separate it into smaller parcels. Our children desire to share in the management of our land, to build their homes and raise their families here also, and to provide close care of my aging parents and their Mother and Fathers.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our requests. This is so much more to us than trying to sub-divide to increase profit potential. My husband and I are currently living in a small rental property we own in Hockinson in hopes that we will be able to build on a 2.5 or 5 acre lot on this parcel in the next year and a half. Building a home for me and my family on this property has always been a dream of mine and I'm hoping with a GMA plan that recognizes organic growth and the precedent set by the surrounding properties, that my dream will soon be a reality.

Respectfully,

Stephanie J. Misner
18013 NE 159th St
Brush Prairie, WA 98606

Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 8:27 AM
To: 'Stephanie Misner', Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: RE: GMA citizen comment

Good morning Stephanie

Thanks for your comment. Staff will include in the comp plan index. Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

From: Stephanie Misner [<mailto:stephaniemisner@live.com>]
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 7:58 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: GMA citizen comment

Please see the attached letter for citizen comment regarding the Growth Management Act.

Thank you,
Stephanie Misner

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

Schroader, Kathy

From: Stephanie Misner <stephaniemisner@live.com>
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 7:58 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: GMA citizen comment
Attachments: GMA Letter-2.docx

Please see the attached letter for citizen comment regarding the Growth Management Act.

Thank you,
Stephanie Misner

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone