

Schroader, Kathy



From: Michael and Dawn <majus@aracnet.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 06, 2015 11:52 AM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: county plan comment

Agriculture and forest lands should not be degraded to R-10 lots, therefore I support alternative 1, although there are some common-sense adjustments that could be made.

Alternative 4, as presented by David Madore will cause great damage to the rural character and livability of Clark County for the following reasons:

- A large increase in property taxes. New roads, fire, police, schools and infrastructure will be required. Simply having your property divided into two buildable parcels will increase your tax, even if you have no desire to build.
- Having so many new buildable lots will result in "urban sprawl" with unmanageable, piece-meal development, spreading resources over the county.
- Quality of life will be adversely impacted. Growth, as would result from Alternative 4, brings an increase in traffic and more noise, light, and water pollution.
- There will be a net loss of farm and forest land, wildlife habitat and wetlands. Wildlife would also be affected by fragmentation of undeveloped land.

The 1999 Comprehensive Plan rezoned land into agriculture and forest land that had apparently been improperly zoned into small lots. Let's not reverse that correction. Land should be rezoned on a case-by case basis, not through a blanket rezone.

Mike Steigelman