

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** Greg Weber <gregnjae@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 17, 2015 10:54 AM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** Support Plan 4

Commissioners, Planning Commission and Staff,

I have owned a 20 acre parcel in Ridgefield for the past decade and I fully support Plan 4 as a start in moving toward a future for rural land owners. The status quo does not. I also support Plan 3 for the needs of the cities, but find it hard to believe that one or the other is a viable choice, both must be considered as options to move forward. I have spent the past several months listening to testimony, personally speaking as well and taking in as much balanced information as possible. There always will be environmental and infrastructure impacts from development but it seems opponents of Plan 4 disregard the fact that site plan review, environmental assessments, traffic impact fees and additional taxes will be generated from any further development, new development is not free. Also the potential lots created by Plan 4 need to be further assessed. My neighbor has an 80 acre parcel currently zoned AG-20. Under plan 4 it is proposed to become AG-10. It would seem he can go from currently 4 parcels to 8 parcels. However, 50 percent of his property is in a wetland and high quality riparian buffer so only 40 acres could ever be developed, so actual lot potentials are a wash. Remember, we live in the northwest and much of our land in Clark County will always be in wetland, flood plain and riparian buffer areas and always be in open space. The property owners of these lands are and will continue to pay for the open space for the public to enjoy. There was a common theme that people enjoy and want to protect the open spaces and rural character of our rural communities. However, the majority of these perspectives were from people who did not own rural lands. There is nothing against anyone purchasing rural lands and keeping it in open space, but it is unfair to hold the property owners hostage for what others simply "like". Several testimonies made it very clear a frustration of having no ability for land to be divided for children and grandchildren over the past two decades--waiting 20 more years is not acceptable. There is a strong movement for small rural farms, which I support for those who wish to do this, but make it it VERY CLEAR, this is a way of life--not a livelihood. Purchasing property for 100k an acre or more, will not yield a return on investment from a farming, let alone a family wage income and retirement, the notion that we need to keep open space available for this as a viable business practice is farce. Rural property owners do not consistently have the drive, ability or time to live a rural farming way of life. Once again, those who choose to can and those to choose a reasonable ability to subdivide their rural lands should have the option as well. Plan 4 is not a "sweeping" county wide land development proposal, but it addresses the need to create appropriate zoning designations for rural parcels, improperly zoned, and address lot sizes that are non conforming which needs to be addressed now, not in 20 years. It is time to roll up our sleeves and go to work in fixing the zoning mess we have in our rural areas. Even in plan 4 there are issues to address, my parcel should be designated as R-1 in plan 4, not R-5 to give reasonable consistent lot configuration and keep the undeveloped portion as open space. I wish also to grant the county access to Whipple Creek for a future trail system. There are a lot of positive opportunities the county can take advantage if the county can embrace Plan 4 and absorb Plan 3 into it to benefit all parties involved. It frustrates me that the cities supported Plan 3 and not support plan 4. This is simply because the future to expand city growth boundaries would be hampered if there was further division of adjacent rural parcels, which once again holds rural land owners hostage based on what the cities would "like". There is a need to protect open spaces for future business and commercial growth, but these spaces are very specific and limited, using this as an excuse to not address the majority of what would clearly be rural future home sites once again holds the majority of rural land owners hostage. Many rural land owners purchased their properties as part of their retirement, allow family members to build a home, to diversify investment and have some sort of financial incentive. The current land use plan gives little hope for rural land owners future, in other words, rural land in Clark County is a bad investment under the current plan if continued for another 20 years. The time to address these issues is now upon us.

Thank you for all of your efforts in this process!!!

Respectfully,  
Greg and Jae Weber  
Owners: Confluence Vineyards and Winery  
19111 NW 67th Ave. Ridgefield, Wash. 98642  
360-887-2343

Sent from my iPad