


Schroader, Kathy



From: Alina Ahola/McElveny <macbun@q.com>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 1:03 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Fwd: GMA Citizen Comment letter --parcel #205384

From: "Alice Chandler" <chandler1970@live.com>
To: "Donna Andrews" <donnaandrews0411@gmail.com>, macbun@q.com
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2015 9:57:25 PM
Subject: FW: GMA Citizen Comment letter --parcel #205384

Here is the letter that my mom sent to the county this evening

Steph

From: chandler1970@live.com
To: comp.plan@clark.wa.gov
CC: oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov
Subject: GMA Citizen Comment letter --parcel #205384
Date: Thu, 19 Nov 2015 21:22:17 -0800

Regarding Parcel #205384

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

We would like to express our gratitude for all of your efforts in updating the Growth Management Plan. Clark County is making overdue, in what we believe are necessary changes in the GMA 1994 zoning. We firmly believe alternative 4 for rural and forest zoning is a change in the right direction for the affected land owners of Clark County. My two sisters and I are owners in common of tax parcel 205384000, which is 49.05 acres east of Hockinson.

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. 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 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.

My two sisters and I inherited 49.05 acres in common from our parents whom originally desired us to pass it on to our future generations, as they did to us. The current proposal of zoning changes would place an unnecessary burden on our 6 adult children, and 10 grandchildren 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 has for generations. It is not realistic to expect 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 our siblings lots, which were divided in the 1970's and 1980's from our parents' quarter section into 10 acres or 11 acre minimum lots. The remaining 49.05 acres of our parents' land was still being lived on and managed by our mother at that time. The only reason my mother 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. We want to divide our inheritance as our mother stipulated: approximately 16 and 24 acres to 2 sisters, and 8.91 acres to me, which would not meet the 10 acre minimum for a build-able lot. It is inconceivable for a single lot of 8.91 acres to be prohibited from building simply because it does not and cannot meet a 10 acre minimum requirement; though it is the property of single owner and surrounded by parcels of smaller acreage where building was allowed.

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 our 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.

Our 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 father's family members were all raised here as well as my 6 siblings, our children, many cousins, and me. Those of us still living here are mostly retired and will require the assistance of our offspring and their families to care for the large lots bestowed upon us. 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, and to provide close care of my aging siblings and I.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our requests.

Alice Chandler