

Schroader, Kathy



From: LISA <irwin36@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 1:44 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy
Cc: tim rodgy @ gmail; lirwin.rodgy@gmail.com

Site specific request for rezone of property in the Alternative 4 for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan updates.

Property Identification Number: 181553000

Site Address: 19115 NE 42nd Ct., Ridgefield, 98642

Abb. Legal Description #117 SEC 12 T3N R1EWM 5A

We have lived at 19115 NE 42nd Ct. in Ridgefield for 25 years and have watched areas adjacent to our neighborhood, especially to the south and west, and more recently to the north develop into smaller parcels (1/2-2.5 acres). The proposed re-zoning plans for our immediate neighborhood **are not consistent** with other neighborhoods in our 20-block radius. The neighborhood immediately to the west has been developed into 2.5 acre homes and very recently homes along NE 29th Ave (between 179th and NE 199th) have been built on one acre parcels. In several sections along the periphery of our 20-block radius are homes built on 1-2.5 acre parcels or less.

Prior to 1994, our property was zoned 1 and 2.5 acre parcels. For over 20 years now we have been zoned UR-10 holding. This practice of leaving the UR-10 overlay in place for this length of time is an abuse of the urban reserve overlay. This is illegal per GMA. As we age, we want the ability to sub-divide our property into a smaller parcels, 1 or 2.5 acres so that we can stay in our community while downsizing into a smaller, one level home. This property is part of our retirement and we never imagined that 25 years later as the North County developed we would still be placed in urban-10 holding, or even five acres zoning, zoning which is inconsistent within or adjacent to our immediate neighborhood.

With growth around Legacy Salmon Creek Hospital, WSU-V, and within the Discovery corridor and major road and utility expansion to the north, south, and west, it seems that we should be zoned as our neighbors are at 1 to 2.5 acres.

We are highly opposed to having our property zoned as it has been for well over 20 years. Most of us built our homes on one section of our property with the concept that we would be able to sub-divide for the purpose of future land valuation or to build a smaller one level home when we retire.

We would very much appreciate your consideration of re-zoning our area to reflect the North County growth needs and our desire to use our property in a way that will allow us to stay in our community. We request that our property be rezoned to 1-2.5 acre density in the Alternative 4 plan, and the urban reserve overlay be removed.

Lisa Irwin and Timothy Roddy