

Schroader, Kathy



From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 6:39 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: FW: Testimony 3/29/2016 Missing a critical component of the growth plan namely a credible approach

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 1:47 AM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject: RE: Testimony 3/29/2016 Missing a critical component of the growth plan namely a credible approach

April 4, 1997 Judge Poyfair wrote, "The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA

March 12, 1999, The Court of Appeals confirmed that the GMA requires counties and cities to use the 20 year OFM population projection ranges to size their UGA's. Our Court Action held that the GMA does not require counties to OFM's population projections as a cap or ceiling on non-urban growth. "This formulaic view of the GMA requirement is fatally flawed. The Board's requirement to, in essence, require a vacant buildable lands analysis for the rural area was erroneous. This Board decision, however, compelled the County to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board's apparent requirement.

According to the PROCEDURAL HISTORY, before the Hearings Board, August 11, 1997, "That order provided that Clark County was not in compliance with the Act and matter set forth in CCCU's Superior Court appeal was "remanded to Clark County to achieve compliance. We extended the period of time for compliance because of the unusual scope and complexity of the issues. CCCU did not object as that time to use of the compliance process.

June 6, 2006, before the Hearings Board, ORDER DISMISSING CASE, "Although compliance was shown on some issues, compliance for several remaining issues in this case has never been found in a Board order. However, on Sept 7, 2004, Clark County adopted a revised Comprehensive Plan. "

Time and again, staff's actions seem to certainly indicate certain rules don't apply to them, even when written in Superior Court Orders. Judge Poyfair said the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and the resulting land use regulations destroyed the character of rural Clark County. The staff accomplished this by writing an unauthorized formula and then by devising tools that put a cap on rural growth. This cap was accomplished by instituting large lot zoning ordinances that resulted in massive down zoning that created thousands of non-conforming parcels. Rural growth was further curtailed by imposing urban holding and reserve overlays coupled with the large lot zoning regulations. The rural centers have been relegated to what they were

decades ago Any rural growth has been effectively shut down with this tsunami of harsh government intrusion and callous lack of regard for the land owners

The planners have successfully sold their concepts by using an administrative process that still advances the unauthorized formula today This conforms to their old regimen, their old assumptions In reality, it has become a way to ensure that the regimen is biased against the property owners This is an abuse of the rural residents This old regimen needs to be challenged

To grant total discretion to staff and allow them to perpetuate the unauthorized formula is irresponsible This Board has a duty to provide oversight and impose policy and direction to staff on how to conduct the business of county planning There have never been consequences for abusive staff, and the opportunities to abuse the rural landowners is obvious

Ultimately, we live in a Republic where we elect people to protect us from the abuses of local government Councilors Madore and Mielke have indicated they care about rural residents Councilors Boldt, Olson, and Stewart obviously do not

To sprazz@outlook.com

From sprazz@outlook.com

Subject FW: Testimony 3/22/2016 Missing a critical component of the growth plan namely a credible approach

Date Mon, 21 Mar 2016 23:43:15 -0700

The GMA has 14 goals all listed in the law They are supposed to be all weighed equally in the county's comprehensive plan Clark County has an entire chapter on the environment The Goals for private property rights, and affordable housing get a mere glance Inclusivity in the county's public process isn't mentioned

As the lawfully elected Board of Councilors, you are tasked with balancing the 14 goals along with spelling out local policies You are entrusted with handling the overall approach to the growth plan Local jurisdictions are granted much leeway in how they pursue all the goals and policy provisions for all economic development and housing both urban and rural You are entrusted with enhancing all economic prosperity, and quality of life issues as defined by local residents and historical circumstances both for urban and rural communities How will Clark County provide more jobs and accommodate an appropriate ratio of population growth for both segments? Is the intention that people will live and work only within the confines of the UGA? Is that realistic? Does that accurately reflect the desires of the citizens?

Affordable housing is another goal barely given a mention in the county's plan The GMA actually says to encourage availability of affordable housing to all economic sectors of the population The law also says to promote a variety of residential densities and housing types This includes the ability to live a rural lifestyle The Draft SEIS is void of comments on basic affordability, and available land that citizens can afford This is already impacting the housing market for homebuyers in all incomes Housing affordability should be an official concern and needs to be met square on How does enabling a no-growth agenda advance good public policy here and the affordable housing goal of the GMA Law?

Public Participation is another goal. Input from the communities that are most impacted by your planning policies should grab your attentions and have a bearing on your policy directions. Inclusionary practices incorporating the desires of the rural land owners should be required, if nothing else, to be GMA compliant and to appear politically correct. There is general lethargy and no demonstration of respect regarding rural cultural practices in Clark County's development of land use policies. The cities shouldn't be considered the only partners here.

Rural Centers help to protect rural lifestyles, support rural economies, and provide services. Clark County has restricted these areas to what they were decades ago. They haven't been allowed to grow. They are supposed to contain a good deal of variety of densities. Is advancing a no-growth agenda the best public policy way to go? I ask you to examine the difficulties that Daybreak Youth Services experienced in citing their 40-bed facility at Brush Prairie. I also ask you to examine the Summary of Planning Assumptions as defined in Draft SEIS August 2015, Jobs to household ratio is 1 new job for every 1 new dwelling unit. This new facility is proposed to have 60 employees. Where will they live? The GMA says to provide opportunities to both live and work in the rural areas. Without housing for the 60 employees, how is the citing of this much-needed facility GMA compliant?

Without doubt, property rights have been under fire. Nothing in the GMA suggests that concerns for the greater good (environmental) should override property rights. In fact, state law says just the opposite. Property rights must be given the same protections and considerations as the environment. I ask that you incorporate intentional language that states, "Property rights are an important issue in Clark County. People need opportunities to use their land as they wish as long as it doesn't conflict with the rights of others."

CCCU's prevailing court actions and grievances are worthy of attention no matter what your political stance is. We are asking you to make corrections to the comprehensive plan at this time and address the unjust treatment of the rural landowners. Correct the unjust policies promoting exclusiveness. That only demonstrates social injustice and guarantees a discriminatory viewpoint.
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10