



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY  
WASHINGTON

## COMMUNITY PLANNING SUMMARY MINUTES

### Rural Lands Task Force Meeting #9 – September 22, 2009

Members Present: Ginger Burr, Sharon Bussler, Ingrid Dankmeyer, Dan Dupuis, Russ Grattan, David Halme, Rocque Merritt, Mike Posey, Bob Zumstein and Bill Zimmerman

Staff Present: Jose Alvarez , Oliver Orjiako, Chris Cook

The meeting began at 6:05 pm.

The task force continued its discussion of the agricultural policies. Task force members questioned the need for the policies given the lack of implementation thus far. Staff responded that the language is aspirational and provides a framework to implement the policies. Ingrid Dankmeyer was concerned that the policies would only apply to agriculturally designated property as opposed to all land where agriculture occurs. Mike Posey provided the example of his ability to grow food on his land but is not allowed to have a road side stand to sell the food. The task force directed staff to look into where road side stands are allowed and explore how to amend the code in the future to encourage agriculture production and sales. **Note: Road side stands up to 200 sq. ft. are allowed in the rural areas, rural centers and urban reserve (zoned R-5, R-10, R-20, RC-1, RC-2.5, UR-10, UR-20 and UR-40); up to 300 sq. ft. in the FR-40, FR-80, AG-20 and AG/WL zones. Road side stands are not allowed in the urban zones.**

The task force recommended adding the following policies as bullet points under 3.4.1.

Recommendation:

Encourage cluster development where the zoning allows the division of property in or near Agriculture areas.

Recommendation:

Encourage small scale agriculture wherever it occurs by providing regulatory framework and public resources to facilitate the production and sale of agriculture products.

The task force recommended the following modifications:

Recommendation:

3.4.2 Minimum parcel size should be adequate to allow reasonable ~~and economic~~ agricultural use.

Recommendation:

3.4.5 Commercial agricultural land considered desirable for acquisition for public recreational, scenic and park purposes shall first be evaluated for its agricultural potential ~~impact on a viable industry~~.

Recommendation:

3.4.6 The county should establish or expand special purpose taxing districts and local improvement districts in lands designated in the plan for agricultural use only when the services or facilities provided by the special purpose district or local improvement district, through taxes, assessments, rates or charges, directly benefit agriculture ~~these lands~~.

Recommendation:

3.4.9 Public services and utilities within and adjacent to designated agricultural areas ~~should be designed to prevent~~ shall not result in negative impacts on agriculture and allow for continued resource activity.

The task force recommended deleting the following policies because they felt the language was too specific for a policy and would fit better in the development code.

Recommendation:

~~3.4.12 Within the Agriculture land designation, one principal dwelling unit per 20 acres shall be allowed with the provision for an additional temporary dwelling.~~

Recommendation:

~~3.4.13 Within the Agriculture/Wildlife category, one principal dwelling unit per 160 acres shall be allowed.~~

\* \* \* \* \*

Public comment time was after the break. Stuart Nelson was concerned that the County was going to change zoning from rural to Ag as has recently been done to his property in Lewis County.

Gretchen Starkey was concerned about the task force's recommendation to delete a policy that referenced the AG/WL and wanted to insure that the AG/WL would still be in the code. The task force directed staff to see if the language was codified. **Note: The language relating to the acreage requirements in the AG/WL are codified in Table 40.210.010-2 Lot Requirements.**

Brad Scott was concerned about continued funding for the Rural Lands Task Force project based on an article in the Columbian. Oliver Orjiako explained the BOCC will be looking at a new methodology for establishing budget priorities but that he has not aware of any decision to discontinue with the task force's work.

Mr. Scott also wanted to know if the task force was considering an AG -5 zoning designation.

Bill Doty expressed some concern with cluster lots and encouraged the group to preserve larger lots.

After public comment the task force reviewed and discussed the policies in the Comprehensive plan related to forestry. The task force decided to retain policies 3.3.1 through 3.3.15 and made the following recommendations:

Recommendation:

~~GOAL: To maintain and enhance the conservation of productive forestlands and discourage incompatible uses associated with forestry activities.~~

Recommendation:

3.3.6 Commercial forestland, considered desirable for acquisition for public recreational, scenic and park purposes, shall consider the viability of the land for timber production ~~its impact on a viable forest industry~~ including but not limited to forest management practices on adjacent lands, buffering and transportation of forestry products.

The task force recommended deletion of the following policies because they felt the language was too specific to be in the policy section and should be in the implementation code.

Recommendation:

3.3.16 ~~Within the Forest Tier I category, only one principal dwelling unit per 80 acres shall be allowed with the provision for an additional temporary dwelling.~~

Recommendation:

3.3.17 ~~Within the Forest Tier II category, one principal dwelling unit per 40 acres shall be allowed with the provision for an additional temporary dwelling.~~

The task force directed staff to look into characteristics of buffers between residential and resource lands and add the topic as an agenda item for the next meeting. The task force also expressed interest in discussing the open space act with a representative from the assessor's office. There was also a concern about a rumored increase in Forest Practice Application fees.

**Note: The fee increase took effect in July as part of the Community Development fee increase. See the table below.**

Forest Practice Applications	2008 Fees	2009 Fees	% change
Conversion Option Harvest Plan (COHP) w/approved current use timber mgmt. plan	649	648	-0.15%
Conversion Option Harvest Plan (COHP) w/o approved current use timber mgmt. plan	1118	1228	9.84%
Class IV G:			
Including SEPA	1243	3166	154.71%
without SEPA	832	1638	96.88%
Type 1 Single Family dwelling moratorium or parcel hold waiver, field reviews of non-exempt Class I forest practice	429	2067	381.82%
Open Space/Current Use taxation applications	429	1953	355.24%
Type III, all other moratorium waivers	10599	2838	-73.22%
Hazard tree removal determination, stand alone	400	544	36.00%

Staff suggested holding an Open House on November 10<sup>th</sup> focusing on Rural Centers. The task force affirmed. The task force decided to not meet on Tuesday November 24<sup>th</sup> due to the Thanksgiving holiday.

Next on the agenda will be Open Space taxation and buffers between residential and resource lands.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

**NOTE: The next meeting will be Tuesday, October 13, 2009 at the Dollars Corner Fire Station, 21609 NE 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in Battle Ground, beginning at 6 p.m.** Subsequent meetings are scheduled for October 27 and November 10<sup>th</sup> will be an open house.