

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 4:56 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Exhibit B Rural Comparison .docx

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 4:25 PM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine; Horne, Chris
Subject: RE: Exhibit B Rural Comparison .docx

Hello Councilor

There appear to be a misunderstanding on the series of email exchange. I believe that staff have provided you input. Our collective response was on your document dated 11/4/2015 which included PA comments. Our response was emailed to Chris Horne for you but you came down in my office and picked it up during Board Time break. You are aware that the report was presented to the PC on November 5, 2015 at the advice of Chris Horne with the following language "supporting documents for some of the numbers contained in this report were not available upon publication and will be provide at a later date" be included in the email that went to the PC.

Staff send to you multiple emails on 11/5/2015. Staff on 11/10 in an email asked for your methodology on how you arrived at your exclusions and not receiving that staff worked with GIS to help us understand your methodology. We also asked for information on your chart on rural non-conforming lots so we can reconcile that with the building permit information. The development on non-conforming lots data came from GIS. The building permit information available on rural area was cited in the staff report.

Following the Joint PC/BOCC work session you sent staff an email dated 11/11/2015 indicating that the said document should not be published and that staff should not continue to advocate against the policies. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 3:31 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Madore, David
Subject: RE: Exhibit B Rural Comparison .docx

Oliver,

My previous email was referring the document advocating against the proposed rural assumptions and Alternative 4 map that your staff sent to the Planning Commission prior to my knowledge.

Some of the arguments against the rural plan were surprises. An example is an oversight that could have been corrected had you pointed it out ahead of time. That was a single 10-acre parcel that was a spot zone. Your document did not

reveal that the parcel in question appears to be a cluster remainder lot. I was able to address that problem and gladly fixed it once it was revealed that way.

Another example is the argument that some of the information was unsubstantiated because you lacked the necessary data. You did not ask for such data. You have not because you asked not.

I've shared multiple files with GIS to show my work and was not aware that you wanted more. I will proactively provide you with extra detailed documentation that substantiates each of the reports that you doubt.

I ask for the specific fields to be included in the parcel-level records that your staff used to argue against the rural proposal. I can then add them to the database records for comparison.

As you can see from my numerous emails to you, I have repeatedly appealed to you to let me know how I can help support you and address any specific concerns that you may have.

The original choice A assumptions used in the rural VBLM have been policies presumed by staff to be approved by the Board. Not only were some of them not approved, but the Board was not even aware that such assumptions were being used at all. I have not seen any documentation that substantiated them.

I will be happy to examine the data that substantiates the choice A assumptions that staff has been using. I can then compare that substance to the substance for choice B. Please go through the two tables of 8 choice A assumptions each and substantiate each of them. That basis will be helpful to see what evidence supports each one.

Rather than advocating for a zoning map that continues to define most rural parcels as nonconforming, I consider it good policy to better align the zoning map to the real world. That is a policy call that I hope you can support.

Thank you,

David

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 12:24 PM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine
Subject: RE: Exhibit B Rural Comparison .docx

Hello Councilor

I have shared my concerns with you one-on-one with Chris Cook present. Staff is not questioning your numbers. We are concerned with the assumptions you used to create them. There are no actual developments that support them.

Non-conforming lots means lots that do not meet the minimum allowed parcel size. From planning and legal perspective, there is no reason why a lot can't be non-conforming. Uses of the property are allowed based on the code regardless of the parcel size.

Clustering 1 acre in R-5, R10, or R-20 by default creates non-conforming lots, but is allowed by code. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Madore, David

Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 12:00 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Madore, David
Subject: RE: Exhibit B Rural Comparison .docx

Oliver,

Thank you for sharing these points with me directly. Up to this point, I've been finding out about your concerns through planning documents that have been presented to the Planning Commission after the fact

I invite you to substantiate the numbers that you provide here because they conflict the actual parcel-level tables provided by GIS. I will provide you with the actual records from GIS that show every parcel so you can verify that the numbers that I reference are substantiated. I will provide the parcel-level Excel files. I ask you to please do the same

If I understand correctly, our code and zoning map counts all parcels in 1 acre cluster developments as nonconforming. Right?

None of the changes being proposed by Alternative 4 are related to Rural Centers. So I wonder why you refer to them in your email

Please understand that the previous plans are not being challenged. Our focus is on the current update to the existing plan and the option of readopting a zoning map that is grossly mismatched with the actual patterns in the rural community, and a proposal to better fit the zoning map to the real world

If you believe these points are not valid, please provide the specific corrections so we can succeed with the most accurate and fit plan.

Thank you,

David

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 11:35 AM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine; Horne, Chris; Pool, Bob; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Subject: Exhibit B Rural Comparison .docx

Hello Councilor.

Staff and I reviewed the document you sent to me and we provide the following comments. Your conclusions relating to the existing 2007 land use plan cannot be substantiated.

The county has inherited non-conforming lots going back to the 1980 comp plan and zoning map because of the parcelization of land previously allowed with FX zoning, going back to 1960. The percent of the total number of acres that are in conforming parcels for each category are as follows: AG- 67%, FR – 74%; and R-67%

The GMA defines rural as that which is not urban or a resource designation. The variety of rural densities currently provides for R-5, R-10 and R-20. These three rural zones also allow cluster development that allows the creation of parcels as small as 1 acre. These rural clusters are recognized by the state as an innovative zoning technique. In addition we have Rural Centers with 1 and 2.5 acre minimums.

A fair comparison between the adopted 2007 comp plan and the revised alternative 4, particularly for forecasted rural capacity growth should use the same or similar assumptions. The only comparison between the two, using the same methodology that was used in 2007, is the DSEIS.

Best,

Oliver