

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** Bridget McLeman <bridget.mcleman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 16, 2015 4:33 PM  
**To:** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** Re: GMA Comment  
**Attachments:** GMA 3 copy.pdf

I apologise - for some reason the setting inserts attachments as open documents. If this doesn't work please email me - - and I'll try again!  
Sorry

Bridget

On Sep 16, 2015, at 4:25 PM, Schroader, Kathy <[Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov)> wrote:

- > Can you please send this in another format such as word or pdf files. We cannot open the file you sent us.
- > Thanks
- >
- > Kathy Schroader, Office Assistant II
- > Community Planning Department
- > 360-397-2280, X 4958
- > [kathy.schroader@clark.wa.gov](mailto:kathy.schroader@clark.wa.gov)
- >
- >
- > -----Original Message-----
- > From: Bridget McLeman [<mailto:bridget.mcleman@gmail.com>]
- > Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 1:10 PM
- > To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
- > Subject: GMA Comment
- >
- > Please accept this as my comment on the proposed alternatives under the GMA process:
- >
- >
- > This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
- >

## Comments on Clark Clark Growth Management Act

One of the first calls I answered as a volunteer mediator with Community Mediation Services some 15 years ago, was from a pilot who had moved to a home in a rural area north of Battle Ground. He wanted to be able to sleep in peace and quiet. But his morning sleep was disturbed by the rooster crowing in the very early morning at the farm next door. He hoped to resolve the issue by offering to buy a cover for the rooster's cage (like one might do for parrots and perhaps other caged birds to fool them into thinking it was still night). Entirely logical from the perspective of a non-rural home owner. Entirely impractical from the perspective of a farmer.

I thought of this story often as I both listened to testimony on the desirability of changing our current growth management plan to reduce lot size and increase development, and as I explored the back roads of the county in my quest to understand more about what was being proposed.

“McMansions” tend to be incompatible with various farms, wineries, tree farming and the like. We see it play out every week at Council meetings where homeowners on Livingstone Mountain rail at the degradation of their environment by the quarrying commercial enterprise. By adopting Alternative 4, we will be setting on a path to replicate this problem in multiple areas of the county.

I can not imagine the long term cumulative effects of the increase in numbers of lots under Alternative 4. It has not been insufficiently analyzed to understand the unintended consequences of changes that, once made, are likely to be irreversible - everything from flood plains to soil composition, viability of watershed drainage patterns to timber preservation and erosion control.

At the same time, in practical terms, Alternative 4 requires an investment in wells, sewage, roads, public transportation and the like that will be significant and are, as of now, un-costed and un-budgeted.

If we accept that some home owners lost property rights under the last GMA, I don't evidence of exploring adoption of local zoning tools (including TDRs etc) that could address the possibly valid grievances. I do not believe that those who bought restricted lands after that time should profit from the radical changes of Alternative 4 at a cost to Clark County citizens at large.

While I write in favor of Alternative 1 of the Growth Management Act, I also believe the additions in Alternative 3 will not damage the vision of development in Clark County set out in Alternative 1.

I would also be in favor of requesting an extension of the current GMA for one additional year to include specific provisions to address valid versus speculative profit making resolve the divisiveness of the current ill-conceived Alternative 4 with a new more broadly representative County Council.

I don't envy you your task in choosing a preferred alternative. Our remaining unspoiled county is our heritage. The priorities and goals of the earlier plan are not yet realized. We should not abandon our vision with a poorly analyzed last minute alternative that was developed without a vision of how we see the county as a whole. Thank you for your work on our behalf.

Comments submitted by           Bridget McLeman, Ph.D.  
  11401 NE 29th Avenue  
  Vancouver, WA 98686

Please let me know if you would prefer this electronically: [bridgetmcleman@gmail.com](mailto:bridgetmcleman@gmail.com)