



**Schroader, Kathy**

---

**From:** Wisner, Sonja  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 19, 2016 1:37 PM  
**To:** Albrecht, Gary, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colette, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy, Wisner, Sonja, Bill Wright, Eileen Quiring, John Blom-Hasson, Karl Johnson, Richard Bender, Ron Barca-Boeing, Ron Barca-MSN, Steve Morasch (stevem@landerholm.com)  
**Cc:** Tilton, Rebecca  
**Subject:** FW: COMP PLAN COMMENTS FOR COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION HEARINGS IN MAY 2016

Fyi and for the record

**From:** [jmzeider@aol.com](mailto:jmzeider@aol.com) [<mailto:jmzeider@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 18, 2016 1:58 PM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** COMP PLAN COMMENTS FOR COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION HEARINGS IN MAY 2016

May 18, 2016

To: The Clark County Council and Clark County Planning Commission

I am writing as a long-time rural resident (3<sup>th</sup> generation in Clark County) to oppose reducing the minimum lot sizes for Agricultural, Forest and Rural Residential lands

If the County does continue to move towards reduced lot sizes, then in regard to Options 1 and 2 for allowing more homes in farm and forest lands, then I prefer Option 1 because it would require homesites to be clustered along property lines and adjacent to existing roads to minimize new roads or driveways. This at least helps mitigate the impacts of additional homes.

Fundamentally, however, I believe that minimum lot size reductions and allowing additional residential development in what is left of rural Clark County as part of the current Comprehensive Plan Update is going to lead to poor development outcomes on the ground, an overall loss of productive farm and forest land in Clark County as more "mini-mansions" pop up, higher property taxes for those who cannot or do not want to subdivide, and higher overall costs for all County taxpayers in paying for the services for additional development in rural Clark County (The County is already projecting a \$158.1 million shortfall for transportation costs alone under the current preferred alternative.)

It would be far better to make no changes to current ag, forest, and rural planning, and then to promptly convene a task force comprised of a wide range of rural, ag, forestry, and other representatives to look carefully at development outside the Urban Growth Boundaries and offer recommendations for sensible development that would preserve ag, forest, rural open space and other resources and offer property owners in those areas stability and predictability for the future. Ag and forestry in particular rely on long timelines for productivity. Being whip-sawed every so many years by the political process only undermines efforts for rural economic viability.

I am unable to attend the public hearings in May and hope you will consider my input anyway.

Sincerely,

---

Judy Zeider  
PO Box 261  
Battle Ground  
WA 98604-0261  
360-608-5899

<sup>1</sup> I know that the County Assessor has stated in the past there is no direct relationship between zoning and property tax assessments, and changes in zoning will not increase taxes. I am skeptical of that assertion. Property tax valuation is based on sales of comparable properties. It seems logical to me that if development of housing in rural areas increases due to availability of more lots, prices of land will increase and inevitably the sales comparables for all rural properties will go up in value. A rural land rush will “lift all boats” – even those boats whose owners would rather not see their property values go up, which would likely result in an increase in their taxes as well.