

Wiser, Sonja

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 8:38 AM
To: 'lauriev12@q.com'
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Alvarez, Jose; Tilton, Rebecca; LaRocque, Linnea; Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Laurie:

Thank you for your email.

Your property was originally zoned R-20 as part of a settlement of an appeal of the 1994 comprehensive plan. R-20 zoning was used to buffer smaller Rural-zoned properties (R-10 and R-5) from properties with the potential for resource uses, in your case the agriculturally-zoned property (AG-20) to the east.

In the 2016 comprehensive plan update, the Board changed the minimum parcel size for agriculturally-zoned properties from 20 acres (AG-20) to ten acres (AG-10). As such, it made no sense to have 10-acre agriculture parcels buffered by 20-acre Rural parcels, so for some parcels (including yours) the zoning was changed from R-20 to R-10. The action of changing AG-20 to AG-10 was appealed, and the ruling was against the county. So, the Board is changing AG-10 back to AG-20. Because the original R-20 zoning stemmed from the settlement of an earlier appeal, we are changing the corresponding R-10 back to R-20 as well.

There will be a public hearing on this (and other compliance issues) before the Board on Tuesday, June 20, at 10:00 a.m. in the sixth floor hearing room at the Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin, in Vancouver. You are welcome to come and testify at that hearing. I am copying the Board's office on this reply so they will have your comment as well as our response.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

-----Original Message-----

From: Laurie Veitenheimer [<mailto:Lauriev12@q.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 7:46 AM
To: Wiser, Sonja
Subject: Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Our property is one of the 283 parcels changed from R-20 to R-10, and we want it kept as R-10. We have waited 20 years for it to be changed, so that now that we are getting ready to retire we can build something smaller on the back of our property to easily live in and then have 2 parcels to leave to our 2 sons when we die.

All the parcels on our street are already 10 acres or less, so this makes no sense why ours cannot stay at R-10. Since there are only 283 parcels affected, it seems like the county could work easily with those property owners and ensure that there are no negative impacts. Once we found out that our property was R-10, we called the county and found out the process to subdivide into another lot, and we were getting things in order when we found out through the

newspaper that things were being held up again. Please work with us to allow R-10 to remain in affect for our property.
Thank you.

From,
Gary and Laurie Veitenheimer
21117 NE 50th Avenue
Ridgefield, WA 98642

Sent from my iPad