

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:39 PM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan, Stewart, Jeanne, Olson, Julie (Councilor), Mielke, Tom, Madore, David, Boldt, Marc  
**Subject:** FW: Concerns that "major" changes proposed in the updates have been falsely described as "minor" by county staff

**For the public record of the Clark County 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update**

Please reconsider the language as proposed in the plan update, especially concerning new policies and goals. Is this what the citizens really want? Have the citizens had ample opportunities to review these proposals and weigh in during a public process? There appears to be massive changes that impact the entire document. However, the proposals have been inappropriately described as "minor changes" by staff.

Respectfully submitted,  
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU, Inc

Listed in the Comprehensive Plan Draft Documents, Book #1, May 2016, BOCC work session

1 Background, Issue Paper 6

Discussed the role of the Countywide Planning Policies under RCW 36 70A 130 and introduced a proposed amendment procedure for updating countywide planning policies. **The BOCC elected to continue the current practice.**

Summary On March 1, 2016 the Board of County Councilors adopted Resolution 2016-03-01 and established a Preferred Alternative for study under SEPA. **The foundation of the Preferred Alternative is the adopted 2014 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps (Res. 2014-12-08). In addition, the following actions modify the adopted 2014 Comprehensive Plan and establish the Preferred Alternative.**

2 Page 3, Issue Paper 8 – Preferred Alternative  
Comprehensive Plan Text (Binder 1, Tab 3)

GMA requires that Clark County have a comprehensive plan, which consists of map or maps, and descriptive text covering objectives, principles, and standards used to develop the comprehensive plan. RCW 36 70A 070

The Comprehensive Plan serves as a complete policy document that guides county decisions and services on a wide range of topics that include land use, transportation, parks, housing, capital facilities, and more. With the 2016 update, staff has been reviewing the comprehensive plan document in an effort to be more concise and user friendly. **In addition, the Preferred Alternative requires some policy additions and/or revisions. The following are the new proposed goals and policies.**

3. Page 4, Issue Paper 8 – Preferred Alternative: Chapter 4 Environmental Element:

**Rationale: Inclusion of a goal, policy and strategy on sustainability reflecting the Clark County Sustainability Policy adopted in 2007 and the Growing Healthier Report adopted in 2012.**

Goal Promote the advancement of energy efficiency, green building, waste reduction, composting and recycling, solar and renewable energy use, and local sustainable food production, as well as actions to mitigate and adapt to climate change

**Policy 4.11.1: Clark County is committed to fostering a safe, secure future that conserves natural resources while meeting basic human needs, including clean water, air and food, along with shelter, education, and employment. This commitment to a sustainable future will be a key consideration in making public policy, developing public programs, operating public facilities, and delivering public services.**

Strategies The county will do the following to implement its sustainability policy

- 1 Lead by example
- 2 Encourage innovation in both public and private pursuits
- 3 Promote and demonstrate efficient and effective use of renewable and consumable resources,
- 4 Collaborate with public and private partners on projects aimed at sustainability,
- 5 Continuously enhance our perspective and expertise in making sustainable choices on behalf of the citizens and communities of Clark County, and
- 6 Identify and pursue new opportunities that promote sustainable practices

Page 5 Chapter 5, Transportation Element,

**Rationale: This is a key policy in the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the Growing Healthier Report and meets the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(vii).**

5 2 11 Promote bicycle and pedestrian safety and increased bicycling and walking through encouragement and safety activities

Page 5, Chapter 6 Housing

**Rationale: Include policies that were recommended from the Aging Readiness Plan (2/7/2012), and Growing Healthier Report (6/5/2012) The Board approved the documents** to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan Policy New Strategies from Aging Readiness Plan (items 1-12)

New Strategies from Growing Healthier Report

- 1 Change zoning to allow more areas to support diverse housing types, including small-lot single-family, multifamily, duplexes, Accessory dwelling units, cottages and co-housing

Chapter 11 Community Design Element

Policies Rationale This new policy for the Community Design Element incorporates the Community Framework vision to create a sense of community that supports the human scale and pedestrian connections that work to achieve the following goal Development in urban areas and rural centers should incorporate diverse uses designed in a manner that provides for a sense of community, supports the human scale and allows for multi-modal transportation options

**Rationale: Update language of goals and policies and add new policies that reflect recommendations from community plans/reports adopted since 2007 update (Growing Healthier Report (2012) and Aging Readiness Plan (2012).**

11 2 8 Promote improved public health by encouraging integrated land use and street patterns with sidewalk and recreational facilities that support walking or biking and provide easy access to healthy food

11 2 9 Encourage the development of age-friendly communities that have affordable and appropriate housing, supportive community features and services, and adequate mobility options, to facilitate personal independence and the engagement of residents in civic and social life

There is a timeline written from 1935-2016 The 1994 era says nothing about the Superior Court Orders or CCCU "The 1994 plan was remanded by the WWGMHB for inconsistency between population projections and capital facilities planning The plan also faced 67 appellants " There is nothing that says the plan was labeled erroneous, unauthorized formula was used, unlawful to GMA

Introduction, Page 15, Integration with other plans The 2016 Plan serves as an umbrella plan to ensure that the following plans are compatible and advance the goals described in the Community Framework Plan

Aging Readiness Plan, February 12, 2012

Growing Healthier Planning for a Healthier Clark County Report, June 5, 2012

**From:** Carol Levanen

**Sent:** Saturday, April 30, 2016 10 52 AM

**To:** [julie\\_olson2@clark.wa.gov](mailto:julie_olson2@clark.wa.gov)

**Subject:** Fw: Health department employees write regulatory Health Element for the Comprehensive Plan 2016 update - For the Public Record

--- On Sat, 4/30/16, Carol Levanen <[cnldental@yahoo.com](mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com)> wrote

> From Carol Levanen <[cnldental@yahoo.com](mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com)>  
> Subject Health department employees write regulatory Health Element for the Comprehensive Plan 2016 update - For the Public Record  
> To "Jeanne Stewart" <[jeanne\\_stewart@clark.wa.gov](mailto:jeanne_stewart@clark.wa.gov)>, "Julie Olson" <[julie\\_olson@clark.wa.gov](mailto:julie_olson@clark.wa.gov)>, "Marc Boldt" <[marc\\_boldt@clark.wa.gov](mailto:marc_boldt@clark.wa.gov)>, "Tom Mielke" <[tom\\_mielke@clark.wa.gov](mailto:tom_mielke@clark.wa.gov)>, "David Madore" <[david\\_madore@clark.wa.gov](mailto:david_madore@clark.wa.gov)>  
> Date Saturday, April 30, 2016, 12 32 AM  
> Dear  
> Councilors,  
> This article is very disturbing These  
> employees of the Health Department are boasting how they  
> created the Health Element for the Clark County  
> Comprehensive Plan, but when a County Commissioner aids  
> staff in creating a rural and resource alternative in the  
> Plan, that is called illegal There was nothing in  
> Alternative 4 that was illegal, and staff, council and the  
> Board of Councilors are fully aware of that The real  
> reason they are opposed to reasonable zoning in the rural  
> areas is because doing so does not agree with a no-growth  
> agenda The Health title is just another name for what  
> has been happening for the last 22 years in the rural and  
> resource lands of the county It all amounts to a  
> property rights takings Health  
> in Comprehensive Planning "We Did It and You Can  
> Too"  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Health  
> in Comprehensive Planning "We Did It and You Can  
> Too" Brendon  
> Haggerty and Jonnie Hyde explain their process in authoring  
> a health element for the update to Clark Co  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Clark  
> County Citizens United, Inc is adamantly opposed to the

> Cluster Ordinance proposed for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan  
> update  
> The proposed Cluster Ordinance clearly falls into  
> the takings category when all rural and resource zoned  
> land cannot divide unless a cluster is used, with the  
> remainder lot locked up forever The loss of revenue  
> to the landowner is excessive and the Washington  
> Attorney General cautions counties from doing this  
> type of regulation The county staff is tricking the  
> landowners into thinking a Cluster ordinance is a good  
> thing Landowners would like it for an option to consider,  
> beyond the regular land division in a zone But, the  
> proposal in the 2016 Plan is to REQUIRE that to create  
> another parcel, the owner can ONLY CLUSTER This means  
> if a landowner has 20 acres and wants to sell their land to  
> someone who wants to start a farm or forest operation on ten  
> acres, they will not be able to do so Instead, the  
> lots must be broken up into one or two 1 acre lots and the  
> rest preserved forever This places a heavy financial  
> burden on the landowner and does nothing to create a  
> diversity of housing, increase economic opportunity, provide  
> opportunity to live and work in the rural area, and  
> preserve the character in the rural and resource lands of  
> Clark County  
> CCCU,  
> Inc asks the Councilors to reverse the proposed Cluster  
> Ordinance and remove it from the Comprehensive Plan, along  
> with returning Alternative 4 to it's rightful place in  
> the Plan  
> It would be better to not have a  
> cluster ordinance at all, than to have such a restrictive  
> one  
> Sincerely,  
> Carol Levanen, Exec Secretary Clark County Citizens United, Inc P O Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604  
>