

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Donna Andrews <donnaandrews0411@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 10:06 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Madore, David
Subject: Alternative 4, timberland east of Hockinson
Attachments: Tax parcel 205384 east of Hockinson.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged



To: planners, counselors and public servants. April 2, 2015

From: Alina Marie McElveny and Donna J Andrews macbun@q.com donnaandrews0411@gmail.com

ALTERNATIVE 4, Tax Parcel #205384000. 49.25 acres co-inherited by 3 sisters. Timberland east of Hockinson

After studying the new interactive map added on Tuesday we have additional comments.

Under the proposal for lot sizes under Alternative 4, the map indicates the planning commission “may” change our designation from current Forest 40 to Forest 10. The proposed policy is this ‘reflects the sizes of lots and character of our neighborhood’. A glance at the map of hills east of Hockinson shows this is not correct.

- A. Let’s consider “our neighborhood” E-W definition as NE 212th Ave on the west to NE 241st Ave on the east. And from NE 159th St north to NE 169th St We did a straw count of **48 smaller rural parcels here**. Eight lots on/near our north border are 2-1/2 acres. Most are 5 acres! Some are forest, some rural.
- B. Count from NE 159th south to NE 139th st (and thereafter angling north of Rawson Road where it intersects with Hinnes at about NE 241st Ave.). We count **115 small rural lots**
- C. So “our neighborhood” would include **163 small lots, most 5 acres, some 2-1/2** . We disregarded the Plum Creek holdings and a few larger pieces.
- D. Historically we would include “Finn Hill” in our neighborhood: North of NE 169th stretching to NE 189th: Wow subdivisions and developments here include **101 smaller lots!** Add that to the 163 above=**274 lots** of 2-1/2 to 5 acres with a few 10 acre pieces thrown in. (again disregard Plum Creek and other very large parcels)
- E. ONLY our Homestead ¼ Section? Maybe the planners were only counting our siblings’ and nephew’s lots within our historic Ahola homestead: **NE ¼ of Section 21 T3 R3E WM**. If this is what is considered our “neighborhood” then family lot sizes of 2.5 acres, 5 , 7.5 acres, 9, 15, 2.2 11, 10, and 21 acres might lead to a conclusion that our remainder lot of 49.25 acres should only be changed to 10 acre minimum. But the character of our neighbors north, south, east and west of the homestead ¼ section reveals a large preponderance of 5 acre lots. Yes, most of these are rural, and not forest.

We think the planners should allow us to make 5 acre minimum lots, like a couple hundred neighbors on our hillside neighborhood. This would permit us to continue our current use tax designation of ‘timberland – minimum 5 acre’, and if we subdivide into 6 acre lots, some of our grandchildren perhaps could build on 1 acre house lot and continue to grow Douglas firs on 5 acres of timberland.