

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

SSR

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 10:51 AM
To: 'Troy Uskoski'
Cc: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Michael Tapani; Jay Vroman; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Alvarez, Jose; Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: 2016 Growth Management Act FR Zoning- Gabriel Rd



Good morning Troy:

Thank you for your email and request. In response, Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan as required by state statute. At this time in the process, our focus is on what needs to be decided next. In other words, the selection of alternatives to be studied and analyzed in the environmental impact statement. Staff will docket your request and encourage you to follow the process by watching out for upcoming meetings, work sessions, open houses, public notices, and hearings relating to the plan update.

You may also submit comment through the county's website at:
<http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/getinvolved.html> I thank you for your interest in the Clark County planning process.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: Troy Uskoski [mailto:tuskoski@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 11:12 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Michael Tapani; Jay Vroman
Subject: RE: 2016 Growth Management Act FR Zoning- Gabriel Rd

Dear Director Orjiako,

First of all, a special thanks to both you and Councilor Madore for taking the time to meet and speak w/ us tonight at Ridgefield High School. It was nice to hear you and speak to Councilor Madore in person. It's been great to see the GMA process open up for more comment, although I'm sure the last minute flurry of activity has made your lives crazy!

Thank you for the informative written response to our original re-zoning request (our original letter is already part of the record and is only attached for reference). In your letter dated 03/20/2015, you note that our initial request de-designates forest resource land and that WAC 365-190-060 states that the classification and designating of forest resource lands must be coordinated as a county or region-wide process. If we had initially known that one of the alternatives offered would include smaller FR lot sizes we would have asked for the smaller compliant zoning classification instead of requesting a R-5 designation.

From my introduction to Alternative 4, it appears that the areas zoned as forest resources will remain intact, but FR lot sizes may change. I am writing to revise our request to ask for the smallest proposed FR-designation (R-10 at this time) allowed, which would more closely match the neighboring parcel zoning of R-5.

My reasoning is thus. Although the most recent proposal re-zoning us to FR-20 would give me the ability

to split my property (parcel # 267189000), I don't believe it would give Michael Tapani (parcel # 986029713) or Jay Vroman (parcel # 267197000) the same option with theirs. Mr. Tapani has definitely expressed the desire to be able to sell or give a piece of his property to his son.

We are fairly close to the rural center of Fargher Lake and are currently bordered both by R-5 zoning and also non-compliant lots within the current FR-80 zoning. Our properties have ready access to public power and water w/ the pertinent easements to the property lines. There are many outlying lots at the farther reaches of the county (ex. Rotschy Rd., Allworth Rd, and Dole Valley) without access to public water that are being proposed to change to FR-10 under Alternative 4, so I am hoping that you will take our request into consideration.

Please include this email as a document for the 2016 GMA records.

Thank you,

Troy Uskoski
360.609.1861

From: tuskoski@hotmail.com
To: david.madore@clark.wa.gov; tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov; jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov
Subject: 2016 Growth Management Act FR Zoning
Date: Tue, 10 Mar 2015 17:44:53 -0700

Dear commissioners,

I thought I'd write a note following up on my comments at the commission meeting last week and prior to the workshop tomorrow, which I cannot attend. Last June/July, I submitted comments online and also drafted a letter to the commissioners which I both emailed and sent via certified post. For the record, I again submitted a copy of the letter at the meeting last week.

Prior to last week's meeting, I scanned Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, and was disappointed to see that they didn't contain much in the way of options for large rural landholders currently zoned FR-40 or FR-80. The suggested alternatives appear to bring many previously platted lots into conformance, but don't seem to offer many re-zoning options beyond that.

Jay Vroman (Parcel # 267197000), Michael Tapani (Parcel # 986029713), and myself (Parcel # 267189000) currently own adjoining properties zoned FR-80 immediately adjacent to properties zoned R-5. We are in favor of rezoning that would allow us the flexibility of splitting a piece or pieces from our existing parcels. Seeing nothing that better supports our request, we are in favor of Clark County Citizens United Alternative 4 being added to the SEIS.

It would be nice to see an option going forward that would allow greater flexibility for large lot stakeholders. What is decided now will impact us all for years to come.

Thank you for your time,

Troy Uskoski
360.609.1861