

Schroader, Kathy



From Steve Foster <stevefoster5093@gmail.com>
Sent Friday, September 11, 2015 9:32 AM
To Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject Comprehensive Plan Update

I request that this opinion in support of Alternative 1 to the Comprehensive Plan Update be submitted to the Public Record

The Growth Management Act provides for development to occur in urban growth areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner. The GMA also is designed to protect the rural and agricultural character of the rural element as previously defined. My understanding is that all cities in Clark County have agreed that all of the projected growth can, and should, occur within the current urban areas.

It is also my understanding that much of the many acres made available in 2007 (Comprehensive Plan Update) for urbanization and development went unused as a result of the ensuing recession. There is sufficient acreage available in defined urban clusters to meet the population growth numbers expected in the next 7 years.

Alternative 4 seems to be pandering to the special interests of a few. Public policy should not be rewritten based upon the demands of a few citizens who are crying because they cannot realize a return on the investment in land generations ago. Wouldn't it be wonderful if each of us who has invested in the stock market, a 401K, a retirement plan could have some guarantee that local officials would change existing laws in order for me to realize my investment in such plans?

In addition, I oppose Alternative 4 because it would decrease agricultural production capacity and impinge on current and future farm viability. Parcelization reduces the profitability of agricultural operations in many ways.

Sincerely,

Steve Foster