FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE CLARK COUNTY 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE,
Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU, Inc

One doesn’t see private property rights of land owners discussed in the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the assumption must be, they don’t need to be referred to in various chapters on other subjects?

However, protection of property rights is one of the GMA’s 14 specifically stated important goals, all of which are supposed to receive equal treatment in the Plan. Property rights receives two sentences in the entire 2 volumes of the county plan, while other goals receive entire chapters on their subjects. This alone is a demonstration on unequal treatment. CCCU has been before this Board every week, nearly 3 years, presenting issues of equity and the need to advance the concerns of rural property owners. According to how this plan was written, you would think that property rights wasn’t an issue of concern in Clark County since any mention of CCCU’s rural issues have been erased.

The GMA calls for control of sprawl. It does not call for or allow the county to intentionally limit growth, or stop it altogether. The GMA says just the opposite. The GMA says to “accommodate” projected growth. How does this plan accommodate any reasonable, affordable rural growth for rural jobs and housing?

The thousands of comments you have heard from CCCU over 3 years should have led the staff to believe that changes to the rural and resource lands are called for. We do not have a county plan that reflects our thousands of testimonies. Please consider our testimonies as “evidence” and require acknowledgment of, or at the very least work some of our concerns into the plan.
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