

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

[REDACTED]
* 7 0 5 9 8 5 *

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2014 11:39 AM
To: Barnes, Ed; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Orjiako, Oliver; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Comp Plan Update - Public Comment (CCCU)
Attachments: Carol Levanen_08-26-14.pdf

Hello,

Attached please find written comments submitted by Carol Levanen during the Board's Hearing of Aug. 26 (public comment time).

Thank you,
Rebecca

cc'd Board
Oniako
O'Donnell

Rec'd 8/26/14 - public comment
(Carol Levanen)

Clark County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington

August 26, 2014

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. often receives calls from landowners who are processing a land division and tries to help allow the process to go smoother. Previously, lands five acres or larger were legally created by a segregation process. A surveyor created a legal description, which was filed with the auditor's office. When and if the land was sold, the new owner's responsibility was to apply for a building permit, provide a water source, and construct a driveway. Now, the short plat process has a whole new very expensive meaning. But, proportionality must legally apply to such a process.

A pre-application conference, short plat application, post decision review and the final plat permit must now occur, with each one requiring a fee. The landowner must hire someone to go through those processes, which is expensive. Under these applications, one must provide potable water, build roads, and go through many expensive procedures, that could amount to eighty items. Here is an example of the overreaching requirements.

A man died from cancer and the widow decided to sell her home to her children and build another home on the land. The land was approximately 20 acres and was in a five acre zone. The woman saw she could divide the land into three parcels, one for the existing home and children, one for her new home and one to help pay the expenses and decided to begin a short plat process. After many years, the process is still not finished and the county keeps putting up road blocks. One condition was that she deed a very large thirty foot easement, down one side of her property to Clark County. This requirement is illegal, under state law, unless the county pays for it. A partial list of requirements is included in this report, but there may be some that have not been mentioned. These are the expenses she has incurred so far, all in the name of regulation.

County permit fees - \$16,215.00	Consulting firm - \$28,318.00
Geotech study - \$1,000.00	Engineering - \$6,262.00
Three wells drilled \$26,241.00	Signs - \$44.44
Electric - \$2,053.00 after pro-bono help	Septic - \$89.00
CPU - \$215.00	Attorney - \$3,988.75
Driveway construct - \$14,830 after pro-bono help	Survey \$14,351.00

The total to date is \$113,607.00 and the short plat is not complete yet. The children are waiting to purchase the home and the woman pays to live in an apartment. Development requirements and associated costs are close to equaling what she would receive from the sale of the third parcel. She has lost all of the value of that lot, which will not generate any financial aid to her. There is something wrong with this picture. The short plat ordinance needs to be fixed. Only safety, survey and legal documents should be included in the process of simply dividing acreage, for whatever purpose, be it agriculture use, forest use or housing, with the building permit addressing the development process.

Sincerely, 
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, Clark County Citizens United, Inc.