



Councilor Tom Mielke signaled his support for the planning assumptions and Madore's Alternative 4 at a Nov. 9 work session.

"Our rural property zoning map is broken," Madore posted on his Facebook page on Friday. "Tuesday marks the day we can take a big step to fix it."

The Planning Commission voted last week not to recommend Alternative 4 of the growth plan, which would reduce the minimum allowed parcel size of rural, agricultural and forest lots across Clark County, as well as components of Alternative 2 that reduce property sizes. The commission also did not recommend Madore's new planning assumptions.

Madore says his proposed changes will correct the county's existing planning assumptions, which he said are "unvetted." However, the Clark County council unanimously approved those assumptions in April of this year.

According to the draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzing the impacts of the existing proposals, current zoning could lead to the creation of 7,073 new lots. Alternative 4, meanwhile, could create 12,401 new lots. Madore's proposals state that current zoning could create 3,325 lots, while Alternative 4 could create 6,638 new lots. Planning staff said at last week's meeting that they were unable to verify and replicate Madore's assumptions.

Madore's proposals have been criticized by those who say it is too late in the planning process to introduce new planning assumptions. The county must have its plan completed in April in order to make the June 30 deadline for the state Department of Commerce to accept it.

Planning Commissioner Karl Johnson said he sympathizes with the desires of rural property owners who have been clamoring for the right to subdivide their property, but the county "can't get a grasp of the data" prepared by Madore.

"I think Councilor Madore's positions are, he's trying to do too much too quickly," Johnson said.

What adoption of Madore's proposals could mean for the overall process is unclear.

"We are wrestling with the question of whether the latest proposal is a new alternative ... or whether is another version of Alternative 4 developed with different planning assumptions," Gordy Euler, deputy director of Clark County Community Planning, said by email Monday. "Either way, it can be argued that a new draft (environmental statement) should be prepared."

**Michele Wollert**

The county public records portal, thanks to multiple fulfilled requests, is full of well-documented arguments against Alternative 4. It is also overflowing with emails from Madore to Community Planning staff and the acting manager, directing them, chiding them, and suggesting verbatim language to place in their reports or ordering them to leave critical information out, so as not to "confuse" us, the "governed."

David Madore is an appalling one man override of the Charter, with a punitive, autocratic, micromanaging style that he sells as leadership. He will not be re-elected.

35 days and we will have a new county chairperson and a new councilor. I anticipate Madore's death-grasp on good governance will loosen considerably.

Reply ·  1 · 29 mins · Edited

**Loren Lee**

Yes...we can't afford "4 More Years of Righteous Incompetence". And we will be paying for Madore's current incompetence for many lawsuits to come.

Reply ·  1 · 33 mins

**John Laird**

Works at Retired Journalist

If I had a growth plan that was strongly opposed by every city in the county and was opposed by the local Planning Commission and had no input by or support from experts in the county Planning Department ... I would abandon my growth plan. But I guess I don't think the way David Madore thinks.

Reply ·  6 · 52 mins

**Robert Ives**

Vancouver, Washington

In a rational system, this vote would be tabled until the full council is seated. However...Madore. This is the equivalent of a tantrum.

Reply ·  4 · 1 hr

**Jim Mains**

Partner and Director of Strategy and Campaigns at High Five Media

When a political leader blatantly ignores the community, the voters and his own planning council he needs to be voted out of office. You have burned this community long enough. If the last election wasn't clear enough the next one will be.

Reply ·  5 · 3 hrs

**Richard Bullington**

Aspiring Genealogist at Retired

I'd just like to remind those who complain about "planners" ignoring the will of the people and "ramming their ideas down our throats", that the State law is quite clear regarding exurban development. The State understands that to allow non-conforming properties to be FURTHER sub-divided is a financial sinkhole that its subsidiary governments cannot properly service.

So it's not the "Clark County Planning Department" who is to "blame" for these peoples' "problems". There is nothing blocking them from selling their parcels intact. Since they haven't been thrown off the non-conforming lots, they're "grandfathered" in AS IS. To allow further sub-division would be outright violation of the ruling RCW's.

We don't want the State suing Clark County for another \$15 million because we don't play nice, do

we?

The good news is that David Madore could pay the fine himself. One wonders if he'd do it to prove a point.

Reply ·  3 · 7 hrs



**Thom Rasmussen** ·

Salmon Creek, Washington

After the County gets sued AGAIN by the State, maybe he could get Benton to help negotiate a settlement since he did such a good job with DES. Or maybe they could just do it right the first time.

Reply · 52 mins



**John Ley** ·

Camas, Washington

"Alternative 4 of the growth plan, which would reduce the minimum allowed parcel size of rural, agriculture and forest lots across Clark County, as well as components of Alternative 2 that reduce property sizes."

IF my understanding of the various Alternatives is correct, Alternative 4 took the "urban" growth recommended in Alt. 3, and then added in a rather comprehensive "fix" for the rural land owners. That would be a more correct way of describing Alt. 4.

Alt. 3 addressed the cities needs & requests for growth, which was not done in Alt. 2.

Alt. 2 only tweaked around the edges, "some" rural land owner concerns. It ignored the various cities requests, and was not comprehensive in it's "fix" of rural land owner issues.

Reply ·  1 · 10 hrs



**John Ley** ·

Camas, Washington

"Planning Commissioner Karl Johnson said he sympathizes with the desires of rural property owners who have been clamoring for the right to subdivide their property, but the county "can't get a grasp on the data" prepared by Madore.

"I think Councilor Madore's positions are he's trying to do too much too quickly," Johnson said."

While it's "nice" that Karl sympathizes with rural property owners, why didn't the Planning Commission "fix" the problem during their years long process?

As Don McIssac testified in the early Nov. Planning Commission -- "not only has the door been closed to rural land owners for the last 20 years. It's been rusted shut."

How come the Planning Commission didn't open the door and try to address rural land owner concerns?

Reply · 10 hrs



**John Burke** ·

Vancouver, Washington

The Planning Commission didn't address rural property owners concerns because it is The Planning Commission, not The Property Rights Protection Commission.

This body seems to understand what being the government is all about, here expressed by this quote from the 2009 movie Pirate Radio:

"You see, that's the whole point of being the government. If you don't like something you

11/24/2015

Madore's growth proposals poised to be adopted Tuesday | The Columbian

**simply make up a new law that makes it illegal."**

Reply · 3 hrs



**Thom Rasmussen** ·  
Salmon Creek, Washington

**John Burke** , are you sure that came from that movie? It sounds more like what Madore is trying to do.

Reply · 56 mins