

O'Donnell, Mary Beth



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 3:21 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: Comments on Mar 25 Comp. Plan proposed changes

A letter from Mr. David Taylor – a City of Ridgefield Council member to Mark relating to Alt.4 for our record and index. I don't think that staff was promoting any particular alternative. Thanks.

Oliver

From: McCauley, Mark
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 2:57 PM
To: 'David Taylor'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Home, Chris
Subject: RE: Comments on Mar 25 Comp. Plan proposed changes

David, thank you for your comments. We will ensure they become part of the official record. Mark

From: David Taylor [<mailto:davidptaylor@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2015 2:51 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Madore, David; Tom.Milke@Clark.WA.gov; Stewart, Jeanne
Subject: Comments on Mar 25 Comp. Plan proposed changes

April 1, 2015

To: Mark McCauley
Acting County Manager
Clark County, Washington

I am writing to express my personal concern at the County Plan for the proposed changes to the Clark County Comprehensive Land Use Plan as presented at the Ridgefield open house on Wednesday evening March 25. There were four plans presented but Mr. Madore and staff was promoting what they called Option 4.

After considering the four options presented for Ridgefield and the small cities, Option 4 is the most damaging to growth in the county and to the small cities. Option 4 would allow the larger and intermediate acreages to be broken into smaller parcels for residential use, for lots as small as five and ten acres. The problem with this option is that orderly growth within the county ceases.

The cities of Ridgefield, Battleground and Camas/Washougal are areas that are growing because there is a demand for the area. Builders and developers are well aware of this and have been providing the new residences to support that demand. The proposal also has a substantial negative impact on land that is desirable for commercial and job producing uses that look for large tracts to create industrial parks and retail zones.

The proposed county changes in Option 4 would lock-in the small cities in by eliminating the larger tracts surrounding the cities that the cities rely on for orderly expansion in the time of an increasing demand for the living environment we provide. My impression is that the Urban Growth boundaries under the Comprehensive Growth Plan were established to promote an orderly growth within the city boundaries and that updates of that plan are required as needed to provide room for future expansion as needed. These plans are necessary to eliminate a sprawl into agricultural lands without having adequately developing cities within their own boundaries.

There is a large open area along I-5 between Salmon Creek and Ridgefield that is prime for development. Breaking these properties into ten or fewer acre parcels for a single family use locks out or at least makes it all but impossible to go back and develop these properties for their best use in the communities once they have been divided. A couple of years ago, a study was done when the North County cities

were considering a regionalized Sewer Plan by joining with the CCRWWD as the single provider of sewer services for these communities. A study was made which showed that the City of Ridgefield had over 100 twenty-plus acre parcels within two miles of a major road for potential development of commercial/industrial properties. It also showed the availability of properties for residential development purposes to support a twenty-year or more growth plan. On the basis of that and other factors, the city of Ridgefield ceded its Sewer system and treatment plant to CCRWWD because the cost of following that expansion was prohibitive for the small city of Ridgefield. As a result the CCRWWD is in the process of building a \$19,000,000 sewer line from Ridgefield to tie it into the Salmon Creel Plant.

Consider the following:

- What are the county tax revenues that come from city and neighborhood development versus what is derived from five to ten acre single family parcels? The R-8 to R-13 zoning in the developable properties annexed into the cities results in a tax base of \$2 to \$2.5 Million per acre. The small single family mini-mansion properties for a ten acre parcel may result in a \$.75 to \$1.25 Million for the parcel or \$125,000/acre.
- Providing county services to these smaller ten acre parcels is many times the cost of developed residential properties. Since they are all in the county, consider the increased cost of a County maintained road system in perpetuity. A County Sheriff patrolled area versus a city patrolled area, increasing the cost of operating the Sheriff's Dept. Maintaining the Barrow Ditches in the Public Right-of-Way in these areas at an assessed tax revenue of \$125,000 per acre.

- Look at providing Utility and sanitary services to these acreage residential communities. Increased cost of Providing Electrical services to the PUD base on revenue density per mile of power line. Mind you, Utility rates are uniform for all customers in the system, therefore the high density residential customers with lower service costs subsidize the rural acreage properties in their rates, No natural gas service to these areas so what you have is an environment that relies on electrify for heat (even a heat pump has a COP of 1.0 at 38 degrees F. and relies on expensive Resistance heat for temperatures below that) putting a larger demand on the electric distribution system. Oil heat with the delivery trucks on the road in season with the potential for accidents and oil spills. Or Simply, The use of wood burning stoves that are not that efficient and don't help the environment. And forget about providing sewer services. The entire area as proposed will be on septic tanks and drain fields.
- A depressed tax base for these "mini-farms when they pull nine of ten acres into Farm use based on minimal (two Lamas) or non- existent crops.

Based on what I heard at the meeting I see no significant advantage to Option 4 and many detrimental issues with adoption of this option to satisfy property owners who bought too much land and want to profit from this change by selling portions of their property to pay for their original investment. That is a decision they made when they bought the property. Let them live with it.

I heard yesterday, less than 24 hours after the meeting that Option 4 has changed since the meeting to allow smaller divisions of the mini acreage properties. I would consider that a 'Bait and Switch' tactic by the county.

My personal preference and with the people I talked to was that we would prefer the No Change option plan and let business take its own course within current land use policies. The cities need the ability to grow as the demand continues for the style of living and environment the small cities offer.

David P. Taylor
Councilman, City of Ridgefield
1180 N. 1st. Ave
Ridgefield, WA 98642
Ph.360-887-2200

CC: Commissioner David Madore, County
Chairman @ david.madore@clark.WA.gov

Commissioner Tom
Milke @ tom.milke@clark.wa.gov
Jeanne Stewart @ Jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov