Friends of Clark County  
PO Box 513  
Vancouver, WA 98666

To Board of Clark County Councilors  
Clark County Planning Commission  
Community Planning  
Kathy Schroader

May 25, 2016

For the record  Amended for electronic extension of May 24 Joint Hearing re the countywide rezoning of the rural and resource lands and processes toward the Comprehensive Plan

Re. Evaluation of the Preferred Plan: Rezoning for rural and resource land and clusters  2016 Comprehensive Plan for BOCC and Planning Commission deliberations

1) Tax Consequences  Many people will not understand that there are potential tax consequences of the proposed countywide rezoning for all landowners who will be subject to the countywide rezoning  On Tuesday 5/17/2016, we asked the Board of County Councilors to ask the County Assessor to produce the answers to the following questions before the Tuesday Joint Hearing. Here we repeat.

What are the consequences of the rezoning proposals to landowners if
They divide their land  
They do not divide their land  
The have current use permits

2) Sprawl and challenge to rural nature  The attached map shows the results of the previous cluster ordinance  You can see the countywide sprawl  If you go to the parcel numbers via GIS or Google Maps, you see that the parcels mostly now contain very large homes with multi-acre lawns. This old cluster ordinance changed the nature of the area from rural to suburban estate and the cluster ordinance was discontinued
Lowering the minimum parcel size and/or increasing housing sites for Resource Lands, Title 40.210

Friends of Clark County (FOCC) wants a Comprehensive plan that is submitted on time, is affordable and is compliant with the State GMA. Therefore we support the 2007 Growth Management Plan (the former Alt 1) as compliant with state statutes, more than adequate for the estimated population, compliant with state law, and affordable. It can be submitted on time and avoid default. The current Preferred Alternative may be noncompliant, unnecessary and unaffordable. There are several problems with the proposed zoning changes for rural and resource lands in the Preferred Plan, Title 40-210. The countywide nature of the rezoning, especially of resource lands, should not pass either the WWGMHB or the courts. Making countywide zoning changes to resource lands without a full EIS should not pass either the WWGMHB or the courts. The Preferred Plan combines of both.

Also, state statute demands that the county enhance, protect, conserve and promote use of resource lands. Lowering the AG-land minimum parcel size to 10 acres and/or increasing dwelling units within them will affect their ability to function as resource lands and can be seen as functional de-designation of the land for some farming functions. A 10-acre parcel is too small for any AG that needs large machines and is too small for commercial berries, orchards, livestock (especially pigs), and other kinds of dry-land farming (e.g., grains, hay).

Further, state statute requires that you show your work, including showing the need to increase the number of parcels in resource lands. There are several issues here. First, Preferred Plan zoning changes for the rural areas are already making it easier/less expensive/less public for landowners to rezone and divide their existing rural parcels, which will increase the number of small rural lots and increase buildable parcels. It is not clear whether these potential new parcels are included in the new parcel count. This is on top of the already large # of buildable parcels in the rural area. Please ask Community Planning how many parcels were added to the rural area when Judge Poyfair threw out AG/Forest category proposed for resource lands and the County returned those parcels to rural lands. It can be argued that there are already a plethora of rural parcels and that there is no need to attack resource lands.

**Reduced parcel minimum size/Clusters/Additional dwelling units: Title 40.210.010**

FOCC holds that housing units taken out of the resource parcels via reduced minimum parcel size and/or clusters with a remainder, set up a conflict situation between residents of the houses and the use of the resource land and, if proposed, should be subject to several conditions.

The County is proposing clusters and/or simple reduced parcel size on resource agricultural (AG) and forest (FR) lands.

**First, we are told by state statute to enhance, protect, conserve and promote use of resource lands.** Putting a cluster of houses into resource land sets up a conflict between the owners of the houses and the farmers on the remainder parcel.

Houses, clustered or not, adjacent to farms do not enhance, protect, conserve and promote agricultural land and its use. The larger the cluster, the more power the house people will have to curtail the use of the AG land for farming.
Further, some resource lands currently have the recommended protective buffers. The proposed clusters are taken out of the resource land itself and inside of the buffer. Clusters are “buffer-busters, which effectively remove the protection of existing buffers.

This conflict between houses and farming activities will remain, even if all of the below protections of the remainder are included in the Preferred Plan.

Second, if you must cluster, FOCC proposes that you require the below.

That following WAC 365 196 815, Section 3 A, the cluster houses be only on land not suitable for farming and the parcels will be only 1 acre.

Clusters will be allowed only where there is public water to prevent de-watering of existing wells on either the remainder or on neighboring parcels.

Clusters will be placed adjacent to each other along a public road, rather than within the remainder. This protects the remainder, increases access for emergency response and decreases school bus stops.

The remainder deed will contain a codicil stating that the parcel is AG resource land and is not further divisible.

Each cluster deed will contain a codicil that states the parcel is a cluster lot taken from AG or forest resource land and that 1) the parcel is not further divisible and 2) residents are in an agricultural zone and will be exposed to noise, smells, dust, lights, large machines and all of these at most hours, as is permitted under the “right to farm” county law.

Thank you for accepting our amended input.

Sincerely,

Sydney Reisbick, President
Friends of Clark County