



The Enterprise

220 Jewett Blvd, PO Box 218, White Salmon, WA 98672, Phone: 509.493.2112

Glaring problems seen in zoning plan

Your front page article, “Husum rezone hearing planned” (The Enterprise, July 19) quotes the environmental checklist prepared for the Husum/BZ rezone application as saying that 323 additional homes will be need over the next 20 years. This projection is made in the buildable lands inventory.

A draft of this document is included in the plan document proposed by the BZ/Husum Community Council. Although the name of the author of the inventory is not included, it appears to have been used by the council members as the basis for their projections about population growth.

The inventory also states: “By zone, we would anticipate a total of 65 units in the RC Zone, 119 units in the RR2 Zone, and 139 units in the RL zone, using the sample development pattern over the last five years. The RR2 Zone has approximately 604 acres remaining to be developed. It is recognized that all the land may not be developable due to environmental conditions such as flood plains, wetland, wildlife habitat protection, topography, . . .

Based on the information generated, with a two-acre minimum lot size, there would only need to be approximately 130 acres of Rural Residential land available to meet future needs.”

The inventory reaches a similar conclusion about Rural Center and Resource Lands zones – that there is already a sufficient amount of land available in those zones to meet housing development needs over the next 20 years.

Why, then, does the council recommend a total of 1,825 acres of Rural Residential 2 zoning? The Planning Commission’s “findings of fact” (?) state that there are currently 705 existing acres of RR2, nearly 100 acres more than the inventory states. No explanation is given for the discrepancy. The findings of fact also show the final recommended acreage of RR2 as 1,746 acres, an increase of either 1,041 acres or 1,142 acres, depending on whose facts you find.

Remember, the inventory says 65 units (that’s 130 acres) of housing will be developed in RR2 over 20 years. The amount of land zoned into RR2 is clearly excessive and cannot be justified by saying, as the findings of fact does say, that lots of the acres so zoned are not suitable for development. If they aren’t suitable or practical, why are they included?

This is a small sample of the glaring problems posed by the plan. I would need a lot more space to review problems with traffic, ground water, wildlife habitat, rafting and

recreational use, fire protection, and so on These questions should be answered, not brushed off. This is the reason for the meeting, to ask the questions and to try to get answers.

Patricia L. Arnold
Trout Lake