

CCd - BOCC, or in a separate session



From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2016 5:45 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject: RE:

for the public record of the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Plan Update, 2016.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2016 4:24 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject:

The elements were never written in the Community Framework Plan

Written in the Comprehensive Plan Update, is Chapter 11; Community Design Element It states; Through the Perspectives Program which began in October 1991 to develop the Community Framework Plan, citizens in Clark County expressed their opinion about the design of their community. Overriding themes from the comments were.

Details written in Mr. Karpinski's Green Alternative Plan

- Preserve open space and natural areas;
- Encourage land development that preserves a sense of place and a feeling of community;
- Encourage development of a transit system;
- Develop a better diversity of employment opportunities and housing;
- Avoid sprawling development; and
- Design criteria are important to the acceptance of higher densities

It is simply wrong to label these Design elements (from 1991) as being indicative of overriding themes from county citizens. They are themes strongly presented in the Karpinski response to county staff in a request to Mr. Karpinski on his preferred elements

The plan that resulted from these elements was deemed unworkable by Judge Payton April - 1997

CCCU recommends revisions here for consideration

1. The overall Clark County Vision be revised to include a reasoned discussion of the relationship of our constitutionally protected property rights in relation to the other 13 GMA goals.
2. Each Councilor develop his or her process for personally assessing the equity of all 14 GMA goals in this plan update
3. The BOCC perform an independent audit to determine if the County's updated Plan, the Policies, land-use regulations, and all processes employed for such will function to improve the overall general health, welfare, safety, economic, cultural, and social vitality. Improvements addressing quality of life issues enjoyed by all county citizens; with equity.
4. If short-comings are noted, recommend needed changes to policies to arrive at balance, equity, and inclusion.
If one segment of Clark County society is being overburdened by regulations, how can this be best remedied?
5. The advancement of policies for the "greater good" (the environmental chapter) should not outweigh the need to protect private property rights
6. At least, provide an honest attempt to balance all 14 goals and not let any particular goal disproportionately outweigh the other goals.

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2016 4:52 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject:

*for the Public Report of the Clark County
2016 Comprehensive Plan Update*

One doesn't see private property rights of land owners discussed in the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the assumption must be, they don't need to be referred to in various chapters on other subjects?

However, protection of property rights is one of the GMA's 14 specifically stated important goals; all of which are supposed to receive equal treatment in the Plan. Property rights receives two sentences in the entire 2 volumes of the county plan, while other goals receive entire chapters on their subjects. This alone is a demonstration on unequal treatment. CCCU has been before this Board every week, nearly 3 years, presenting issues of equity and the need to advance the concerns of rural property owners. According to how this plan was written, you would think that property rights wasn't an issue of concern in Clark County since any mention of CCCU's rural issues have been erased *in the updated plan*.

The GMA calls for control of sprawl. It does not call for or allow the county to intentionally limit growth; or stop it altogether. The GMA says just the opposite. The GMA says to "accommodate" projected growth. How does this plan accommodate any reasonable, affordable rural growth for rural jobs and housing *for the next 20 years*.

The thousands of comments you have heard from CCCU over 3 years should have led the staff to believe that changes to the rural and resource lands are called for. We do not have a county plan that reflects our thousands of testimonies. Please consider our testimonies as "evidence" and require acknowledgment of, or at the very least work some of our concerns *Be written into the plan*.

Sent from Mail for Windows

CCCU opposes the use of Engage Clark County as a means to advance public outreach. Engage Clark County doesn't allow for opportunities to engage in question & answers. In this regard, it stifles public participation. The scope provided is also limited. It is not user friendly.