

Schroader, Kathy



**From:** Euler, Gordon  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2016 8:55 AM  
**To:** 'Dave Halme'  
**Cc:** Wiser, Sonja; Schroader, Kathy; Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** RE: Update of 40.210.010

Dave:

Thanks for providing comments on the comp plan—we'll get these into the record. Responses as best I can give them at this point are below, in red.

Gordy

**From:** Dave Halme [<mailto:dave@hficonsultants.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2016 2:25 PM  
**To:** Snell, Marty; Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon  
**Subject:** Update of 40.210.010

Marty, Oliver and Gordy,

I have reviewed the proposed code revisions and would like to suggest several changes. First, I am pleased that the recommendations from the Rural Land Task Force were considered and included in the 2016 Comp plan update. Combining all rural residential into the R comp plan designation provides land owners and the County the opportunity to down zone rural residential parcels when appropriate. The creation of the FR-20 and AG-10 designations will provide some rural land owners with additional opportunities; especially the opportunity to create an additional lot on resource land for aging parents. **Thanks! We are following up on the wishes of a prior Board that this be looked at in the next comp plan update.**

I applaud the action to require cluster divisions in both the AG-10 and FR-20 zones and the requirement for a forest management or agriculture plan for the remainder lot. **We may or may not be successful with the smaller parcel sizes, but we do feel this approach is worth a try.**

I would suggest that you revise the code language in E.3 (5) which states *"to avoid critical areas, including fish and wildlife habitat, riparian corridors, geographical hazard areas, areas of significant natural vegetation, wetlands, prominent hillsides, meadows, ridges, and any buffer associated with above"*.

First, the proposed code language implies that areas of significant natural vegetation, prominent hillsides, meadows and ridges are critical areas, when they are not, and the terms themselves are so broad that it would be difficult to develop a cogent definition. . Secondly, the areas listed can be the very place that a cluster lot should be located to minimize impact of timber and agriculture production.

I would suggest that the language be revised as follows:

***"to avoid critical areas, including fish and wildlife habitat, riparian corridors, geographical hazard areas, wetlands, shorelines and any buffer associated with above"***. **I don't necessarily disagree with your idea. What we did was borrow language right from the cluster provision for Rural lands (Section 40.210.020(D)(3)(c), and we'd logically want to change it there as well. However, there is no direction from the Board to do so.**

Lastly, I would suggest that Guest House be approved by Review and Approval R/A rather than Conditional Use Permit. I do not believe it necessary to require a costly Conditional Use approval for a guest house on resource land. **This isn't an issue we are dealing with in the comp plan update. More discussion about housing types in the rural area will be happening later this year.**

Dave

**David Halme  
HFI Consultants  
10 South Parkway, Suite 201  
Battle Ground, WA. 98604**

**Office 360-723-5523  
Cell 360-607-5595  
dave@hficonsultants.com**

