

Schroader, Kathy



From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 6:36 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: FW: Rural property owners don't expect special treatment during the process of the County's 20 year update of the comprehensive growth plan. However, we rightfully expect fairness and a voice in designing the future plans of our properties.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE 2016 CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

From: [susan rasmussen](mailto:susan.rasmussen)
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2016 9:15 AM
To: Letters@TheReflector.com
Subject: Rural property owners don't expect special treatment during the process of the County's 20 year update of the comprehensive growth plan. However, we rightfully expect fairness and a voice in designing the future plans of our properties.

County planning is supposed to carry out their tasks in an even-handed, non-biased manner. By state law, the planners need to include stakeholders that are impacted by land-use regulations. For decades now, the Dept. of Community Development has gone out of their way to wreck havoc on rural property rights, and exclude rural landowners from the process. Primarily, this is the reason behind much imbalance and strife in the County's growth Plan. Those who want to advance one goal only, environmental protection at the cost of rural property rights and a robust rural economy, have advanced their agenda. Despite lawfully elected County Boards coming and going, this attitude has prevailed. As a result, the County's Plan devotes an entire chapter to the environment. You will be hard pressed to find any language on affordable housing, recognition of regional differences, promoting economic opportunities for all citizens, property rights, and an inclusive planning process. These are listed among the 14 GMA planning goals and require equal treatment under state law.

Clark County Citizens United intentionally focused on the needs and desires of rural communities early in the process for this growth plan update. The dominant sentiment of rural landowners, expressing a desire for property rights, has been present before the Board of County Councilors every week over 2 years. The Public Hearing Feb. 16 was packed with overwhelming support for the rural alternative 4 Plan. Clark County Citizens United has established an extensive body of testimony, along with reports and factual data contained within the public record of this update supporting the need for rural updates. It would have been easier to ignore a buzzing hornet.

Yet, these sentiments and pleas for relief were ignored by Councilors Olson, Stewart, and Boldt. 4 of the 5 Councilors were elected to represent more than their constituents in town. Why did the three Councilors find it impossible to support basic property rights of the rural citizens? Councilor Olson brazenly claimed to support rural property rights during her successful bid for County Council, District 2. Councilors Boldt and Olson were in office less than two months and voted on important land-use decisions impacting rural lands over the next 20 years. The entire Board must pay attention to all 14 GMA planning goals and find balance, fairness, and provide relief for rural property owners.

The planners have successfully sold their misguided concepts that conform to their old planning regimen. It has become a way to ensure that the regimen continually is biased against rural property owners. This is an abuse of the citizens. Three Councilors fail to recognize this fact. The County's planning regimen needs to be challenged.

CCCU has never presented testimony before the Board to direct the urban neighborhoods what is best for their future plans

Susan Rasmussen
Clark County Citizens United, Inc