David Madore
9 hrs  Edited

Rural zoning plan to be selected Tuesday

I posted this six page draft proposal on the Grid, not as a foregone conclusion, (it’s not) but for the following reasons
http://clark wa gov/ /BOCCHearing_ComplPlan_PreferredAlterna

The draft proposal is a preliminary starting point that may be changed as the Board hears public testimony and deliberates before deciding on a specific preferred alternative and selecting specific policies

The draft proposal is provided to maximize transparency and open government to help equip citizens with as many potential specifics as possible to better scrutinize and argue counterpoints

Citizen testimony is not an election or a straw poll that determines the Board’s decision. Rather, the most valuable testimony will likely include the most compelling arguments. All testimony will be thoughtfully considered before the Board makes final decisions.

We welcome your input and encourage each citizen to offer testimony that may potentially make Clark County’s Comp Plan better. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Alternative and Comp Plan Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Preferred Alternative starts with a foundation of Alternative 1 that is then progressively modified by the following elements with the last element taking priority and proceeding over prior (lower number) elements. Related Comp Plan Update Policy is also specified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Option Description</th>
<th>Planning Commission Recommendation</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTR.1</td>
<td>NO ACTION/ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td>Motion to Approve AYE = 6; NAY = 0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 'No Action Alternative' This option re-accepts the current plan, planning assumptions and moves the planning horizon out to 2035.</td>
<td>Motion Passed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTR.2</td>
<td>COUNTY-INITIATED ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RURAL LANDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul Bardzik, Andy Mickelson, Anna Miller and 3 others like this

Chronological

Kj Hinton Stick to your guns and your vision
Like Reply 9 hrs

Bryan McGillis Stick to your vision? What about the vision of professional planners? Or that of your constituents - pardon me, the governed?
Like Reply 1.8 hrs

David Madore Bryan McGillis, we differ on our understanding of the role of planners and elected representatives. As I see it, the law requires the elected representatives to plan the future of our community, not staff.

If we simply delegated that task to staff, elected representatives would be not needed except to approve staff’s plan. The land belongs to the people, not the staff. The plan must be for the people, not staff.
Some support government of the professionals, by the professionals, for the professionals I prefer government of the people, by the people, for the people.

We need staff and their professional expertise. Without staff, the ship would be dead in the water. But the ship's course is not to be set by staff. That course is to be set by those who own the ship – the citizens. They are the captain, not staff. The peoples' interests are to guide the ship's course through their elected representatives.

Bryan McGillis Using your argument, there seems to be no need for professional planners.

I expect my elected officials to respect the counsel they receive from experts. When there are differing opinions, listen and reflect on all facts. At the very least, I expect.

Kj Hinton Planners provide advice. Nothing more.

And as much as you might want them to, there is zero reason to shut down government until the new guys get there.

Bryan McGillis Advice based on years of experience. Aside from the will of those that would benefit from Alt 4, whose counsel is being heeded?

David Madore Bryan McGillis, as a representative of the people, I am striving to faithfully represent their interests. And the rural citizens have overwhelmingly supported correcting the mismatch that has disadvantaged them for more than two decades. Why would you advocate against them?

Kj Hinton Bryan McGillis Whatever it's based on, it's advice. That's all it is. And if the voters are upset with the decisions made, they can take action next November to do something about it.

Bryan McGillis I'm asking why the rush now? Why not wait until the full council is seated?

Lisa Nichols Henry "The rural citizens have overwhelmingly supported..." I was at the meeting at Hockinson, where I expected to hear about all four plans but was shown The Alternative Four Show, and overwhelming support of urbanization of the rural areas of Clark County was not the tenor of the meeting. I heard a few people excited to make money off subdividing and selling their property afterward. Of course Madore and Mielke will do what they want to do, no matter what the consequences to the county.

David Clark Bryan McGillis --- "What about the vision of professional planners?"

ME --- Simple - professional urban planners generally think know how other people should...
They ignore their stated job of planning for people's future needs and desires in favor of imposing their vision of utopia on them. Namely people should live in tiny, costly high density condos, travel by slow, polluting, expensive mass transit instead of fast, low pollution, low cost cars, and eat only expensive local food if it's in season and shop at expensive, walkable neighborhood stores with limited selection and high prices instead of low cost supermarkets with a wide selection.

According to one former Clark County planner who was also a top Portland planner, planners tend to be Fascists. See http://www.debunkingportland.com/former-member-of

But the worst part is they are too deluded to check the result of their previous work and keep making false claims about their plans. For instance, who would have followed them if they said "our plan for Oregon will double the cost of housing, making many people homeless, it will create intolerable traffic congestion, lay the foundation for crappy schools, waste billions of dollars on light rail that less than 5% of the people use, slow economic growth, and reduce people's income."

But that is exactly what planners gave Oregon. Why do you want to follow such fools?

David Clark: Even Obama is catching on to the harm planners have done to many cities! The WSJ reported that Jason Furman, chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, in a recent speech, presented evidence that zoning increases housing prices, hurts the poor, increases inequality and increases the likelihood of housing bubbles. http://blogs.wsj.com/why-white-house-economists/

Here are a few quotes from his speech: "Basic economic theory predicts—and many empirical studies confirm—that housing markets in which supply cannot keep up with demand will see housing prices rise. Mayer and Somerville (2000) conclude that land use regulation and levels of new housing construction are inversely correlated.

"Restricted supply leads to higher prices and less affordability. They can hit the poorest Americans the hardest."

"Zoning Impacts Labor Markets, Productivity, and Inequality."

from https://www.whitehouse.gov/20151120_barriers_shared

David Clark: Additional reading

Rules add $200,000 to Seattle house price
http://www.seattletimes.com/uw-study-rules-add/

That Hissing Sound
Paul Krugman, Nobel Economist
"So when people become willing to spend more on houses, say because of a fall in mortgage rates, some houses get built, but the prices of existing houses also go up." (Bold added)

The Impact of Building Restrictions on Housing Affordability (182k)
Edward L. Glaeser and Joseph Gyourko
http://www.debunkingportland.com/docs/0306glae.pdf

Regulatory Barriers
BY DAVID ENGEL
Director of the Division of Affordable Housing Research & Technology at HUD

The Causes and Consequences of Land Use Regulation. Evidence from Greater Boston
Edward L. Glaeser and Bryce A. Ward
Harvard Institute of Economic Research
http://www.debunkingportland.com/docs/HIER2124.pdf

Zoning's Steep Price
Edward L. Glaeser and Joseph Gyourko
"Measures of zoning strictness are highly correlated with high prices While all of our
evidence is suggestive, not definitive, it seems to suggest that land-use regulation is
responsible for high housing costs where they exist" (Bold added)
REGULATION FALL 2002

Residential Land Use Regulation and the US Housing Price Cycle
Harfang Huang and Yao Tangy
Department of Economics, University of Alberta, Department of Economics, Bowdoin
College
"Contrary to prior literature, our findings indicate a significant link between supply
inelasticity and price declines during the bust, whereas Glaeser, Gyourko, and Saiz (2008)
found little evidence of such a relationship from an earlier downturn from 1989 to 1996"
http://finance.townhall.com/ /local_governments_also_to

How Urban Planners Caused the Housing Bubble
http://www.cato.org/ /how-urban-planners-caused-housing
Full analysis

All of this indicates that land use regulations are generally harmful when they go beyond
health and safety Such regulations should be reduced to the absolute minimum The current
comprehensive plan review offers an opportunity to end many harmful restrictions on
people's land
Now please explain why you want to follow planners that will make you life worse?
Like Reply 6 hrs