

## Adam Zack

---

**From:** Timothy Blanchard <tim@blanchardmanning.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 17, 2019 6:00 PM  
**To:** Comp Plan Update  
**Subject:** Land Capacity Analysis Report

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Comments on the Second Draft (November 4, 2019): Very briefly, in order of appearance in the Draft:

Pages 23-27, 37, 39: Please include the full Land Use Designation names in the tables. It is so much easier to use that way.

Page 23: Should “FO” in Table 8 be “FOR” for Forest Resource?

Page 65: I recommend adding a footnote to the first bullet point under County-wide Residential Capacity to make clear to readers that the maps do not reflect reductions in actual development capacity as a result of conservation easements, open space agreements and other parcel-specific agreements to limit development. This should also be addressed in the related Definitions at Pages 83-84.

Page 66: I recommend some notation addressing the apparent disconnect (discussed in a prior Planning Commission meeting) between the recognition that some of the second homes are planned future/retirement homes and the failure to take this into account in estimating the number of new homes required to accommodate the projected population growth. In other words, because part of the projected new population has already built their homes (and these existing homes are not being used to house current population, so no replacement will be necessary to house current population or future population) fewer new homes than projected should be necessary to accommodate the population projections.

Page 67: Please provide additional explanation regarding footnotes 1 and 2 to Table 34.

Page 69: The Decatur Rural General Use anomaly should be discussed further since it is derived entirely as a result of the generality of uses permitted that land use designation. The County has not created a bunch of superfluous commercial zones on Decatur, but has allowed great flexibility in the use of that land.

Page 71, Line 36: It looks like either “increasing” OR “including” should be selected.

Page 79, Line 16: I would replace “cadre” with another word so as not to personify “issues.”

I also recommend including an explanation in an appropriate place regarding how members of the public can interpret the information provided in the analysis to understand geographically the maximum buildout or additional development between now and the maximums allowed by the current mapped densities.

Thanks for all of the hard work on this.

Timothy P. Blanchard  
259 Mount Woolard Road  
Easesound, WA  
O: 360.376.2292  
C: 310.925.9646