

Adam Zack

From: Fred Klein <freddythek10@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2017 4:36 PM
To: Comp Plan Update
Subject: Fwd: Eastsound UGA boundaries
Attachments: EPRC.12.07.17.pdf

Begin forwarded message:

From: Fred Klein <freddythek10@gmail.com>
Subject: Eastsound UGA boundaries
Date: December 7, 2017 at 4:24:33 PM PST
To: Erika Shook <ErikaS@sanjuanco.com>
Cc: Rick Hughes <Rickh@sanjuanco.com>, Bill Watson <billwatson2016@gmail.com>, Jamie Stephens <jamies@sanjuanco.com>

Erika...FYI...I gave the attached presentation during the public comment period at today's EPRC meeting.

Best,

Fred

DATE: December 7, 2017
TO: Eastsound Planning & Review Committee

Gentlepeople,

Most of you are aware that for the past 28 years, I have stewarded a 30 acre parcel in Eastsound which I've always believed was an ideal site for a neighborhood of clustered, modest homes with ample forested common area...I have been thwarted in my efforts which initially focused on creating a cohousing community of 30 homes.

With the coming of GMA, the EPRC excluded this site from the Urban Growth Area by acting in a gross, conscious, deviation from the GMA criteria for establishing UGA boundaries.

As part of the current CP update, our Planning Director has made me a commitment to revisit the basis upon which the current UGA boundaries were established and make a determination whether or not lands "characterized by urban growth" were improperly omitted from the UGA.

Given that this parcel abuts the current UGA, is served with sewer which was sized in order to accommodate "urban-level development", and all other essential services including direct access to 4 public roads, has no critical areas, drains away from the East Sound watershed, exists within an area developed in a "low-density urban" pattern, and the dearth of land available within the present UGA which is suitable for moderate-income family and senior housing clusters...this parcel is uniquely situated to contribute to meeting Eastsound's housing goals.

I ask EPRC to answer this question:

Would it best serve the interests of our community as a site for modest homes within the Eastsound UGA...?...or, as a small gated enclave of six, 5 acre homesites as allowed under it's existing designation outside the UGA?

(Under GMA, residential projects within a UGA must be planned for, but not necessarily built out initially, at a minimum residential density of 4 homes/acre.)

Without the strong support of the EPRC to revisit the present boundaries of the UGA in the current update of the Comprehensive Plan, this precious asset will be squandered as a subdivision into six, 5 acre lots.

Naturally, I am available and willing to engage with you, as a committee or individually, in order to provide background and supporting evidence for any assertions I've made.

Cordially,

Fred Klein