

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 12:36 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW Exhibit B Rural Comparison docx

fyi

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