

Schroader, Kathy



From: Steve Nylund <steve@deltamotion.com>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:24 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan, Orjako, Oliver
Subject: Comments on options for increasing rural homesites

Dear Oliver and Planning Staff,

I would like to register my support for allowing FR-40 to be zoned to FR-20. However, I have several concerns regarding the proposed rules:

- 1) The requirement for the one-acre sites to be in certain pre-defined locations may work some of the time, but there are so many cases where it might be undesirable. For example, these areas might be the best wildlife habitat, or have wetlands, or slopes. Or maybe this would require removing the best trees too early or eliminating the opportunity to use solar power or heating or a good garden area. And what if someone wanted to take advantage of views, be further from the BPA power line or just simply wanted to be a little further from road noise? It seems impossible to anticipate all of the different factors that could be involved and trying to codify this seems impractical. Many (if not most) people will build close to the road to minimize costs, thereby accomplishing the goal without burdening others. Please don't recommend forcing a predefined formula on every situation. It is important to have flexibility in the placement of home sites.
- 2) Would Option 1 require an expensive cluster process? In order to help make rural home sites available to those of modest means, it is important to have an inexpensive option.
- 3) Finally, does it need to be Option 1 *or* Option 2? Why couldn't landowners choose to do the cluster or a simple division into two 20-acre parcels (And without tightly dictating home sites in either case)? This would allow flexibility to meet the needs of rural families.

Thank you and best regards,
Steve Nylund
19712 NE 174th Street,
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
360-896-4161