

O'Donnell, Mary Beth



From: Chris Dudley <chrisrushdudley@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2015 7:50 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Alternatives/Community Planning

I own acreage in the unincorporated area.

The fourth option is a potential disaster for our county. Suggesting that it does little more than bring currently legal, non-compliant properties into the zoning limits is disingenuous at best. These lots are already presumed legal. The owners of them face no penalties. Backers of the fourth option pretend that there is a grave problem when non exists.

Clearly, the fourth option is a device that would allow the development of rural properties into McMansion suburbs.

If the fourth option is included for review, will it require a more comprehensive EIS than if the county stuck with option One and made no changes?

Who will pay for the more comprehensive EIS?

Who will pay for the inevitable lawsuits and years of appeals? I will certainly help fight it, for one.

Option One is the most settled in the courts and would presumably cost the County the least money and time. It also has the benefit of maintaining the rural heritage of Clark County, maintaining valuable forest and agricultural land, as well as not adding appreciably to traffic, septic and water quality problems.

Please use option one, with no changes,
Chris Rush Dudley
1717 N Falcon
Ridgefield, WA 98642