

**PROPOSED 2011 SKAGIT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS  
Public Comment Matrix**

This document is intended to identify and summarize written and spoken public comments received by Skagit County during the publicly-noticed comment period and public hearing on the proposed 2011 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. Below is a brief comment summary table. The Department has responded where it can add factual information to the record. **This table should not replace the use of the actual comments in their entirety.**

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
RITCHIE MAP AMENDMENT PROPOSAL		
Lucinda Arnold	Opposes proposed up-zone. More homes in the area not needed. Proposal would negatively affect neighbor's views, property value and quality of life.	Comments noted.
Maria DeGoede	Opposes proposed up-zone. Proposal would negatively affect neighbor's views, property value and quality of life.	Comments noted.
Monte & Cindy Hughes	Opposes proposed up-zone. Proposal would negatively affect neighbor's views, property value and quality of life. Purchased their neighboring home based on the expectation of Ag-NRL zoning on subject parcel. Ritchie property floods in winter. Would require extensive fill to build.	Comments noted.
June Kite, Friends of Skagit County	Supports proposal based on PDS staff assessment of a mapping error.	Comments noted.
John Ravnik, Ravnik & Associates, Inc.	Consultant to the applicant. Supports proposal. No prime farmland soils or history of agricultural uses on the property. Parcel is historically a part of the Skagit Beach platted community. Historical mapping error that should be corrected.	Comments noted.
James Ritchie	Applicant and owner of subject property. Supports proposal. Parcel does not contain prime agricultural soils and has never been used for agricultural purposes. Part of Skagit Beach Plat. Intended for and	Comments noted.

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	restricted to single family use by plat covenant. Should have been re-designated Rural Reserve at the same time as the rest of the Skagit Beach Plat. Historical mapping error that should corrected.	
Jim & Linda Ryan	Opposes proposed up-zone. Ritchie property floods in winter. Would require extensive fill to build and may adversely affect wetlands and drainage on neighboring properties.	Comments noted.
<b>JENSEN/PECK MAP AMENDMENT PROPOSAL</b>		
Ayla Holboy	Opposed to proposed up-zone. If approved, proposal would allow for three (and possibly four) new homes on the two parcels—not the “two additional homes” stated by the applicant. Bay View Elementary School is already overcrowded and using multiple portable classrooms, more homes would only add to school overcrowding. Proposal would allow further sprawl and eliminate another small farm that is important to Bay View’s rural character.	Currently there is one primary residence on the western-most of the two parcels (Jensen). Current zoning would allow one primary residence on the other parcel (Peck). Changing the zoning to Rural Intermediate would provide each property owner with one additional development right following the subdivision of each parcel into two lots. Jensens could place one additional primary residence on their property; Pecks could place two primary residences on their property (as none are there now). The maximum number of new primary residences with the rezone would be three, compared to one under current zoning.
LeAnne Holboy	Opposed to proposed up-zone. Supports maintaining existing Skagit County Comprehensive Plan (SCCP) Rural Intermediate (RI) boundary—it correctly defines the logical outer boundary of the Bay View RI LAMIRD, prevents sprawl along Bay View Road and protects the rural character of the community. More 2.5 acre lots in Bay View are not consistent or compatible with the rural character of the area. Proposal violates the SCCP requirements to contain sprawl and protect existing rural character and lifestyle.	Comments noted.

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
<p>Phil Holboy (4 separate comment letters)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposed to proposed up-zone. None of the 2.5 acre parcels in the Bay View RI zone support livestock. None of these homes “preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities”. Instead they have eroded the rural character of the Bay View Road community. Maintaining the RI logical outer boundary at Starvation Ridge Lane avoids a precarious boundary on Bay View Road that would encourage further low density sprawl and decay of the rural and historical character of the area.</li> <li>2. Recommends the Planning Commission review the “No Name Slough Feasibility Study Report” on drainage issues related to development activities in the watershed.</li> <li>3. The SCCP requires that in determining the logical outer boundary of a LAMIRD, the county consider the “need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities.” There is a distinct contrast between the properties north of the Peck-Jensen parcels and those to the south. The current zoning and boundary location provides an effective transition from the 1-acre parcels in Bridgeview to the historical farmsteads on the south side of Bay View Road.  The Peck-Jensen parcels do not resemble any of the 2.5 acre parcels within the Rural Intermediate (RI) zone and therefore should not receive that designation. The subject parcels are more similar to the other parcels along Bay View Road that support livestock and maintain the rural and historic character of the community.</li> <li>4. The current RI logical outer boundary was defined by separating several small 2.5 acre parcels from the much larger 10.9 acre parcel owned by the Pecks at the time the boundary was determined. It was and still is an appropriate logical outer boundary. The existing boundary is not an error. If the boundary is moved to include the Peck-Jensen parcels, then property owners to the east will use this</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Public Works Department will have representatives from its Surface Water Section available during the August 7 deliberations to answer questions about area drainage issues and the referenced report: <i>Feasibility Study of Proposed Water Quality, Drainage, and Habitat Improvement Activities in the No Name Slough Watershed</i>.</p> <p>Drainage issues in the No Name Slough watershed are also addressed in the <i>Bay View Watershed Stormwater Management Plan</i> available on the Public Works website at: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/c5vtlhe">http://tinyurl.com/c5vtlhe</a></p> <p>Planning Commissioners who would like to review or ask questions about the No Name Slough feasibility study in advance should contact Kirk Johnson in Planning or Jan Flagan in Public Works. Otherwise, County staff will be prepared to address the issues during Planning Commission deliberations.</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>map change as precedent for their own up-zone requests (similar to the Pecks and Jensens referencing the Zimmerman parcel to the northeast of their parcels as justification for their proposed up-zone).</p>	
<p>Art &amp; Vickie Jensen</p>	<p>Applicant who supports proposed up-zone. Concerned about some neighbors who have expressed concern about losing their views if new homes are built and loss of rural character. Applicant states that they intend to continue managing some livestock on the property to maintain its rural character and it is their understanding that there is a view easement filed on the parcel requiring any new houses built to be staggered to minimize blocking views of properties to the east. Also includes map indicating adjacent neighbors who do not oppose the proposed rezone (including family members who live on adjacent parcels).</p>	<p>Comments noted. There is a recorded view easement on the Jensen parcel (P35204) which prohibits the building of any structures (other than a split rail or wire fence, a mound septic system, or a well pump house that does not exceed 6 feet in height) in the lower right-hand corner of the parcel. The view easement area is a rectangle with dimensions of 190 feet running south to north and 270 feet running east to west from the south-east corner of the lot. <b>See Attachment 1, Skagit County Auditor file number 200506240128.</b></p>
<p>June Kite, Friends of Skagit County</p>	<p>This proposal should be delayed until Skagit County completes its Transfer of Development Rights program and should be referred to a Bay View Village community subarea planning process for further review.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Marianne Manville-Ailles, Skagit Surveyors &amp; Engineers</p>	<p>Consultant to the applicants. Supports the proposed up-zone. Asserts that the current Rural Intermediate (RI) and Rural Reserve (RRv) logical outer boundary at what is now Starvation Ridge Lane was drawn in error in 1996. Starvation Ridge Lane was not constructed until 2005 in conjunction with a short plat north of the Jensen/Peck parcels. Therefore, Bay View Road is a more logical outer boundary for the RI zone and was so designated in an earlier preliminary draft of the comprehensive plan map before the County changed the boundary to Starvation Ridge Lane in the final adopted 1996 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The applicants' parcels are suitable for additional density because they are not agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance, not</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>located in the floodplain, lack critical areas, have county road access, suitable soils for septic systems and are served by PUD water.</p> <p>The reduction in potential developable rural lots countywide, due to regulatory restrictions, far outweighs the two new lots that would be created by approving this proposal.</p>	
Peter Mullen	<p>Owner of 20 acres in the Bay View Road area who is opposed to the proposed up-zone. If approved, the up-zone on the Jensen-Peck parcels would lead to further requests for similar up-zones along Bay View Road leading to loss of rural character, wildlife habitat and more drainage and school crowding impacts.</p>	Comments noted.
Dan & Rebecca Peck	<p>Applicants who support the proposed up-zone. Intend to build a smaller home and graze some livestock on the property to maintain its rural character. Sold their parcel to the Jensen's with a view easement so that a home can only be built in specified areas on the lot to protect the neighbor's views. They have walked the property with neighbors to ensure that their views are taken into account in siting a new home.</p> <p>Applicants do not believe approval of their rezone request will lead to more redesignation requests along Bay View Road due to lack of significant amount of such requests in last ten years.</p> <p>County-Initiated CPA C-1 that would limit requests for RI zone changes in the future to periodic GMA Updates or a community subarea planning process should not affect consideration of this proposal.</p> <p>The small lot (1 and 2.5 acre) pattern in existence today in the adjacent RI zone did not exist in 1990. Parcels immediately north of the Jensen/Peck parcels in 1990 were mostly 3, 5 and 10 acre parcels. Bay View Road is the logical outer boundary of the RI zone (and was identified as a draft proposed RI outer boundary in 1996 before the County approved the final current boundary at the Peck's northern</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See above staff response to Art and Vicki Jensen comment regarding view easement on Jensen parcel.</p> <p>County-initiated CPA C-1 would not affect consideration of this proposal.</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	parcel edge just prior to adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1996).	
Peter Rasco	<p>Opposes proposed up-zone. Suggests that changing the zoning from Rural Reserve to Rural Intermediate constitutes outward expansion rather than infill of the existing RI LAMIRD at Bay View. The existing physical boundaries (Starvation Ridge Lane and Frans Ridge Lane) are logical boundaries for defining the Rural Intermediate and Rural Reserve zones. If approved, this proposal would add 3-4 more homes to the area and change the Bay View Road area character from “rural” (gardens, livestock, poultry, pasture) to “suburban” (manicured landscaping, no livestock or poultry).</p> <p>Concerned about stormwater runoff impacts on No Name Slough from new development. Cumulative water quality impacts of existing and potential new development need to be evaluated. Cites the No Name Slough watershed study that recommends Skagit County improve comprehensive review of development activities in the watershed through coordination with other local agencies.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>If approved, the proposal would create two more development rights than currently exist. This would create the potential for up to three new primary residences (compared to the one new primary residence that could be built under current zoning).</p> <p>See above staff response to Holboy comment regarding No Name Slough watershed study.</p>
Stephanie Rasco	<p>The County’s decision in 1996, and again in 1997, to maintain the Rural Intermediate (RI) boundary at the northern edge of the Peck-Jensen parcels (what is now Starvation Ridge Lane) was not an error. It follows and implements the goals of the SCCP to retain open spaces and historic structures and correctly applies the definitions of the Rural Intermediate and Rural Reserve zones.</p> <p>Approving the proposed designation change from Rural Reserve (RRv) to Rural Intermediate (RI) would only further low density sprawl, erode the community’s rural character and lead to further rezone requests and subdivision proposals along Bay View Road.</p> <p>Questions why the applicants were allowed to install a second access road and a second septic system before requesting a zoning</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Skagit County regulations do not limit the number of access roads and septic systems on a property to the number of residential structures or development rights. Other reasons for additional access roads or septic systems may include agricultural access or a shop.</p> <p>The Department provided general public notice (Skagit Valley Herald legal notice, website posting, and Department list serve message) in early April, for the May 1 hearing. The Department mailed notice to surrounding property owners in mid-April, as early as possible given available staff. General public notice</p>

COMMENTS	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>redesignation.</p> <p>Commenter lives immediately north of the Peck property. Clarifies that the applicant Peck testimony that they had spoken with neighbors about protecting their views did not include the Rasco's.</p> <p>Strongly disagrees with the two-week public notification period and three minute public speaking limit at the Planning Commission public hearing. Need more advance notification and time to speak at public hearings.</p>	<p>was also provided in Fall 2011 at docketing phase (Skagit Valley Herald legal notice, Department website and list serve notices).</p> <p>The three-minute spoken public comment limit seeks to give as many people as possible the opportunity to speak and summarize their comments; more detailed comments may be submitted in writing. There is no page limitation to public written correspondence. This is standard County practice for public hearings.</p>
Evan Swanson	<p>Opposed to proposed up-zone. Will change rural character and lead to loss of views to Padilla Bay and the Flats. If approved, it would invite continual and incremental expansion of other rural intermediate areas.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
LAKE ERIE TRUCKING (WOODING) MAP AMENDMENT PROPOSAL		
Joe Barnes, Evergreen Islands	Opposed to proposed up-zone. Rezoning for speculative purposes, in this case, would do more harm than good to the dwindling rural resources and character of Fidalgo Island. This would be a precedent setting up-zone that would encourage more property owners to do the same—to the detriment of the Island’s environment, rural character and scenic beauty.	Comments noted.
Richard Bergner	Opposed to proposed up-zone. Any proposed rezones should only be allowed in conjunction with development and completion of the South Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan. Residents want to keep the rural character and wildlife habitat left on the Island. Wildlife needs large tracts of land to thrive that isn’t broken up into smaller parcels by driveways, buildings and lawns.	<p>In the early 2000s, the Growth Management Hearings Board prohibited upzones and the use of the CaRD Urban Reserve designation on Fidalgo Island until the County completed the Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan. The Hearings Board subsequently found compliance on the County’s CaRD and lot certification ordinances in Case No. 00-2-0046c, eliminating the underlying reasons for its requirement that the County adopt a Fidalgo Island subarea plan before granting any upzones. The Hearings Board made clear that these requirements were no longer in effect on p. 16 of the Order on Reconsideration, Case No. 00-2-0046c, dated March 1, 2007. There is no longer any external requirement that the County approve a Fidalgo Island subarea plan before approving upzones on the island. <b>See Attachment 2, excerpt from Order on Reconsideration, Case No. 00-2-0046c.</b></p> <p>At the same time, the Board of County Commissioners has broad legislative discretion on individual comprehensive plan map amendment proposals, and could determine (or not) that no map amendments</p>



COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
		should be processed until completion of a Fidalgo Island subarea plan. The Planning Commission could also make a recommendation or finding in that regard.
Suzanna Dentel	Opposed to proposed up-zone. The requested increase in density is significant and should only be considered as part of the development and completion of the Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.	See above staff response to Bergner comment regarding Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.
Diane Freethy, Skagit Citizens Alliance for Rural Preservation	Opposed to proposed up-zone. The requested increase in density may cause drainage impacts and should only be considered as part of the development and completion of the Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.	See above staff response to Bergner comment regarding Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan. Public Works staff will be available August 7 to answer drainage questions.
Arlene French	Opposed to proposed up-zone. The requested increase in density is in an inappropriate location that does not have appropriate infrastructure. It also may cause further drainage impacts. Prefers that growth be encouraged in cities and not in rural areas.	Comments noted.
Tom Glade, Evergreen Islands	Member of the Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan Citizen Advisory Committee. Submitted summary background information on the subarea planning process, including survey results indicating vast majority of island residents surveyed were opposed to increasing densities on the island.	Comments noted.
June Kite, Friends of Skagit County	Opposed to proposed up-zone. No density increases should be allowed on Fidalgo island until the subarea planning process is completed.	See above response to Bergner comment regarding Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.
David Pearson	Commenter is a former member of the South Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Strongly objects to commenter Mr. Ravnik's comments that the CAC's recommended plan is a "final draft." An adopted Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan does not exist. Includes attached memo from the TAC to the Board of County Commissioners (April 2006) objecting to the CAC proposed subarea plan.	The latest plan document, dated January 2006, was titled <i>The South Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan Draft</i> . The plan has been suspended pending completion of additional studies, securing additional resources, and a decision by the Board of County Commissioners to place the subarea plan on the Planning & Development Services work program.

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>Suggests two options for the Wooding proposed CPA:</p> <p>Deny the up-zone pending completion of an approved and adopted Fidalgo island Subarea Plan.</p> <p>Approve the up-zone with the provision that the open space of the CaRD be labeled a “critical area” to be preserved in its natural and undisturbed state.</p>	<p>Skagit County does not have legal authority or code provisions allowing it to condition a comprehensive plan amendment proposal in the manner suggested. The Planning Commission could make findings regarding how it believes the property should be developed if the Board were to approve the comprehensive plan amendment request. These findings would not be binding, however they could be considered by the County if the landowner submits an application for a specific development project in the future.</p>
Howard Pellett	<p>Opposed to proposed up-zone. No density increases should be allowed on Fidalgo island until the subarea planning process is completed.</p>	<p>See staff responses to above Bergner comment regarding Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.</p>
Sheila Pritchett	<p>Opposed to the proposed up-zone for the following reasons:</p> <p>Any up-zoning on the island should be postponed until a South Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan is completed and adopted.</p> <p>No up-zoning on the island should be approved until all planning studies called for in Resolution #R20030276 (August 11, 2003) have been completed to document the need for increased density and its potential impacts on island residents.</p> <p>References Growth Management Hearings Board Order (February 6, 2001) that the Fidalgo island Subarea Plan must be completed before any CaRD development or any other increase in density are allowed to occur.</p> <p>Mr. Wooding was a member of the subarea plan CAC that proposed “an illegal...unnecessary.... and unwanted... plan....that was rejected”. Mr. Wooding should not now be allowed to benefit from a lack of a plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>See above staff response to Bergner comment regarding Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners in office in 2003 approved Resolution No R20030152 “acknowledging a firm commitment to completing the Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan...absent any unforeseen circumstances beyond Skagit County’s control...” <b>(See also Attachment 3, Resolution #R20030276)</b></p> <p>It is the current Board of County Commissioners’ responsibility to determine if that commitment remains, and if it has any bearing on their consideration of the Wooding amendment proposal and other proposals to redesignate and rezone property on Fidalgo Island.</p> <p>The Planning Commission is free to make findings or a</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
		recommendation in that regard.
John Ravnik, Ravnik & Associates	Consultant to the applicant. Submits original 2011 Wooding CPA proposal with supporting materials. Same information already submitted prior to docketing in 2011.	Submittal noted.
John Ravnik, Ravnik & Associates	<p>Consultant to the applicant. Presents responses to public comments made against the proposal during the Board of County Commissioners docketing hearing comment period in November 2011.</p> <p>The 35-acre Wooding parcel is less than the 40 acre minimum for RR-NRL designation.</p> <p>Even though there appears to be even tree growth across the property, only 21 acres of the total 35 acre parcel contain PLFG 3 soils called for in the RR-NRL designation criteria. The remaining 14 acres of the site have PFLG 4 soils that are not considered a forest resource criterion.</p> <p>The Wooding parcel does not meet the RR-NRL criteria that it is a part of a 160 acre or larger contiguous block of resource land. The combined contiguous Wooding RR-NRL parcels only constitute 83 acres.</p> <p>The property is not enrolled in a current-use tax assessment program</p> <p>The property has not been managed for timber production for the past ten years.</p> <p>The CAC-recommended Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan identifies a need for more land that can reasonably be developed under current zoning.</p> <p>The creation of new residential lots from the proposed re-zone will not create any significant impacts on Fidalgo Island.</p>	See Department's recommendations memo, dated March 28, 2012 provided to the Planning Commission previously, also available on the PDS website, for its evaluation of the Wooding proposal relative to the Rural Resource-NRL designation criteria.
John Ravnik, Ravnik & Associates & William Wooding,	Commenters are the applicant and his consultant. Comments are in support of the up-zone. The property's size, soil conditions and wooded conditions do not meet the criteria for Rural Resource-Natural Resource	Comments noted.

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
Applicant	<p>Land (RR-NRL) and the property should be re-zoned to Rural Reserve (RRv).</p> <p>There are known drainage problems on Fidalgo Island. However, this is not a justification for denying the change in designation from the subject property. There is sufficient utility infrastructure in the area to support residential development.</p> <p>Whether the zoning stays or changes, neither dictates whether logging can occur on the property. The owner/applicant has no intention of clear-cutting the property and has been an exceptional steward of the land. He has donated a portion of the site to the local water district for water storage tanks. Only a portion of the property contains a marginal soil quality supportive of forest growth.</p> <p>The ability to create seven (7) new lots on the parcel with the re-zone to Rural Reserve (and using the CaRD process) does not create any significant impacts.</p>	
Arlene Wechezak	<p>Opposed to the proposed up-zone. This parcel is one of the last and rare large undeveloped land tracts left on Fidalgo Island. Aerial photo and ground inspection indicate evident tree growth and natural reforestation occurring on the parcel despite the applicant's assertion that the site suffers from a high tree seedling mortality rate. There is also no demonstrated need for additional housing on the island at this time. There are numerous vacant homes for rent, purchase or lease on the island today.</p>	Comments noted.
Brian Wetcher (at public hearing)	<p>Commenter is an advisory board member for Anacortes Community Forestlands and board member for Evergreen Islands.</p> <p>Subject property contributes to nearby aquifers underlying Lake Erie to the northeast and Trafton Lake to the southeast.</p> <p>The Seaview development in the same area as the subject property has</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Public Works staff will be present on August 7<sup>th</sup> to answer questions about drainage and related issues in the area.</p>

COMMENTS	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>created significant drainage problems and hazards particularly for the County roadway and the downstream properties. This includes eutrophication in the shallow bay area along the coastline 9("not Bowman's Bay.... slightly north of there in the 'bite'") from the drain fields of the already very heavily-developed coastal area that all points downhill to the bay.</p> <p>Concerned that redesignation of Wooding property will set a precedent for redesignation of similar holdings directly off of Heart Lake Road and contiguous with forest lands. This would violate at least the spirit, if not the letter, of the original intent of the South Fidalgo Plan. County should have the South Fidalgo Plan in place before it moves forward with Wooding and other similar rezones.</p>	<p>See previous responses regarding Fidalgo Island Subarea Plan.</p>
Rosanne Wubbels	<p>Opposed to proposed up-zone. No density increases should be allowed on Fidalgo island until the subarea planning process is completed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
Ronald Zuber	<p>Opposed to proposed up-zone. Desires to maintain low densities and the rural and natural character of Fidalgo island.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<b>COUNTY-INITIATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY AMENDMENTS</b>		
David Hough	<p>Commenter is opposed to County-initiated CPA C-1 that proposes to allow consideration of Rural Intermediate (RI) rezone applications only during state-mandated periodic GMA comprehensive plan updates or as part of a community subarea planning process. Commenter is concerned that the proposed amendment would significantly reduce the opportunity for reconsideration of RI zoning designations that may have been made in error on Fidalgo Island for which changes have been restricted until recently by the Growth Management Hearings Board.</p> <p>Commenter also questions what the schedule would be for amendment windows under the proposed amendment and requests the County to "correct those areas that did not meet the designation requirements in</p>	<p>In 1997, Skagit County adopted its first comprehensive plan and development regulations pursuant to GMA. Shortly thereafter, and again in 2007 when the state law required Skagit County to update its comprehensive plan and development regulations to assure that both were compliant with GMA, Skagit County allowed for the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning district map to be reviewed and corrected if errors were discovered.</p> <p>GMA and Skagit County recognize that a comprehensive plan is intended to be long-term, is not</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>the initial approval prior to amending the current process.” Commenter notes an approximately 80 acre area of Rural Reserve (RRv) zoning on Fidalgo Island that he asserts should be zoned RI.</p>	<p>to be amended more frequently than once-per-year, is required to be periodically reviewed to assure compliance with state laws and locally adopted land use policies, and is to be in effect for 20 years.</p> <p>It is with this in mind, that Skagit County has contemplated establishing a land use policy which would limit review of Rural Intermediate and Rural Village boundary amendments to ensure concurrent and period review and create a more predictable land use pattern over a longer period of time. This is consistent with GMA.</p>
<p>June Kite, Friends of Skagit County</p>	<p>Commenter is opposed to proposed County-initiated CPA C-1 that proposes to only allow consideration of Rural Intermediate (RI) rezone applications during state-mandated periodic GMA comprehensive plan updates or as part of a community subarea planning process. This proposal is premature and “should be postponed until the Bay View Village and Rural Intermediate Community Plans have been appropriately processed and adopted and boundaries and densities established.”</p>	<p>There currently is no schedule or plan to conduct subarea plans for the Bay View Rural Village or the Rural Intermediate area countywide.</p>
<p>Marianne Manville-Ailes (at public hearing)</p>	<p>How many of these Rural Intermediate and Rural Village changes have happened in the last fifteen years? We have not had an avalanche of these things. They are expensive so this is not something that everybody is going to be able to do or be motivated to do.</p> <p>Every ten-year Comprehensive Plan updates are a big deal. An individual property owner’s amendment can easily become lost in that very large ten-year review.</p> <p>Instead of making RI and Rural Village redesignations more difficult, there needs to be a comprehensive look at what has changed and where we have had reductions in developable lots.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

COMMENTER	PUBLIC COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSE
	<p>Would really encourage the Planning Commission to take all that into consideration before taking some draconian measure that would preclude people from correcting designation errors or having legitimate designation issues addressed.</p>	