

susan rasmussen
to susan rasmussen

*for the public record of
the county's comp. plan
up state*



Property rights are one of the Growth Management Act's 13 goals, which are supposed to receive equal attention. CCCU strongly urges this, and future boards to not allow concern for the environment to supersede concern for property rights any longer. The GMA forbids that. It says just the opposite, that all 13 goals must be given equal protection....balance of the goals is required.

In fact, there is nothing in the GMA that suggests, concerns for the greater good should override property rights. The law clearly says that property rights must be given the same protection and consideration as the environment.

The GMA spends more language discussing the need for a healthy rural character than it does on almost any other issue. The GMA clearly says, "Opportunities to both live and work in rural areas," are to be provided.

Rural areas are defined as those areas under county jurisdiction that aren't designated for agriculture, mineral resource, or forest lands. However, the use of rural lands for ag or forests isn't forbidden. The county has an obligation to assure the state mandated opportunities to live and work in rural areas is accommodated. This means that an adequate supply of land to support those endeavors must be provided. The use of urban holding and reserve overlays imposed on the rural landowners over 20 years is an abuse of the rural lands, and a violation of GMA. In essence, there has been an illegal building moratorium imposed on those landowners over 20 years. This needs serious attention

No place in the draft SEIS is there a discussion on the environmental impacts of a too tight supply of rural lands. There is a very flawed report of the various land supplies in the rural areas of the county in terms of adequacy of those supplies to allow the county to achieve the goals providing for traditional rural lifestyles.

The report is flawed due to inconsistencies considered in the land capacity analysis that fail to accurately give a reputable buildable rural lots estimate. The fact that this method of estimating land capacity has been used before does not make it advisable. Wetlands, buffers, setbacks, remainder lots, easements need to be accounted in figuring how many residents and jobs Clark County rural areas can accommodate. Failure to apply the proper methodology makes a drastic difference. This has led the cities, planners, planning commission, and past BOCC's to wrongly declare there is a plentiful supply of buildable land. In the real world, this method doesn't work because you can't ignore these factors at the county permitting counter... you can't build on that land due to restrictions.

Why would the draft SEIS include these factors when estimating rural land capacity...knowing full well that you can't build there? Why weren't the factors applied and the land dropped from the land density calculations? There is only one logical explanation. The draft

report intentionally inflates the buildable rural lot analysis by pretending one can build on the factors. This method results in drastic overcounts for the rural lot capacity estimates. By including all the non-buildable lands, you're creating an artificially high density estimate in the rural areas. This is not legal under GMA planning as it prohibits opportunities to both live and work in these areas.

If we are to have a realistic picture of what the rural land capacity analysis looks like, and what it can accommodate, there must be changes to consider in the analysis.

Sent from Windows Mail

Schroader, Kathy

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 2:52 PM
To: Madore, David, Mielke, Tom, Stewart, Jeanne, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Comp Plan Comments Rec'd Dec 15
Attachments: Rasmussen_Susan_12-15-15 Comp Plan Comments pdf

Hello,

I've received the attached comments from Susan Rasmussen at the Dec 15 board hearing

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council
Board of County Councilors
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE 360-397-2232, ext 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov