

Schroader, Kathy



From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 4 14 PM
To: Albrecht, Gary, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Lebowsky, Laurie, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy, Wisner, Sonja
Subject: FW Clusters

All

A message from Commissioner Morris

Gordy

From: Elisasue@aol.com [<mailto:Elisasue@aol.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Re: Clusters

Hi Gordy - Thanks for getting back to me so quickly and answering my questions Obviously, I need to go back and read the cluster language -)

I think it's good that you're honoring the Rural Task Force They worked for a very long time And I believe I would have agreed with the Council on the clustering proposal Depending on the lot configuration and road frontage, you could have wound up with some really strange shaped parcels And it still wouldn't reduce the number of new children in schools, the number of new cars on the roads, the number of new wells or the number of new septic

But it was a good effort!

And to all of the planning staff - remember there are hundreds and hundreds of us out here who support you totally! We're just all sorry this horrible episode with Council Madore is unfolding

Keep up the good work - you've got lots of friends!

Betty Sue

In a message dated 5/4/2016 5 20 25 P M Pacific Daylight Time, Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov writes

Commissioner

Great to hear from you

Using the cluster provision in the Rural area requires that platting and zoning be met. For 20 acres in an R-5 zone, this means four five-acre lots, or else using one of the two clustering options (with or without a buildable remainder lot). There is no provision for an extra lot, and uses on the remainder lot are restricted.

The proposal for clustering on Ag and Forest lands is similar, except that the proposal requires clustering for land divisions on the proposed AG-10 and FR-20 parcels. The Board indicated today they want another option to requiring clustering, so we'll put something together and get it posted.

I believe we are at risk by going to the smaller parcel sizes on resource lands, but we are being true to one recommendation of the Rural Lands Task Force. We proposed the cluster requirement as mitigation—to show we are (mostly) serious about protecting resource lands. I believe we are at greater risk if we simply allow Ag and Forest parcels to divide, even with a specified building envelope. But, that is the direction of the Board, and we'll see what happens.

Thanks for asking!

Gordy

From: Elisasue@aol.com [<mailto:Elisasue@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 4:57 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Clusters

Hi Gordy -

I've been reading the proposed cluster ordinance. Is my memory correct that when you cluster in a rural 5 you get an extra dwelling? So if someone has 15 acres they can cluster the development and build 4 homes. Then the remainder lot has restricted uses?

Thanks - Betty Sue

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.