

Mindy.brooks@lewiscountywa.gov

Lewis County Planning Commission

c/o Mindy Brooks

Re: Zoning change for 146 Roundwood Ln, Packwood, WA

March 14, 2025

Thank you for listening to the property owners regarding changing the zoning.

I'm submitting an **opposition** to this change in the zoning of area properties from the current 2 acre minimum to ¼ acre per house. One of the attractive features of the neighborhood is the sparseness of buildings and vehicles. Though dividing property into ¼ acre parcels for building will not actually happen overnight, with time the whole area will become less of a peaceful retreat and necessitate more road maintenance, electrification, and probably eventually sewer and water services. This will eventually ruin the peacefulness and turn the area into a metropolitan environment, which we can have in moving to any city.

Please keep the current zoning for this area and focus on small plots of land closer to the current center of Packwood where it makes more sense.

I realize the county is always interested in increasing the tax base, but please leave this area "as is" and look to other sources for the increase in the county income.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Carol Colleran

cacolleran@msn.com

From: [David Hansen](#)
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: Proposed Amendments To Lewis County Comprehensive Plan And Associated Zoning Designation Changes
Date: Sunday, March 16, 2025 9:18:41 AM

You don't often get email from dah8486@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom It May Concern:

I wish to state that I am against any of the proposed changes to the Lewis County Comprehensive plan and associated zoning designation changes involving the areas of Tanglewood Drive, Mossyrock and the areas around the Lake Mayfield Resort.

I am against the proposed changes for the following reasons:

1. The local water district provides water from a community well. At this time, the water available is barely satisfactory for the current population. Every year we have numerous days of water restrictions and a few days of water outages. The water quality is substandard. This water system cannot support additional users.
2. The road system involving Tanglewood Dr and its branches are all private roads. They are poorly maintained single lane roads. The current roads are barely adequate for the current population and cannot support additional traffic. In addition, the roads are minimally maintained being serviced only by local residents, often with poor or substandard results. The local road system is in a state of disrepair and cannot handle an increase in users.
3. The Tanglewood Dr area of Mossyrock is a popular place to live because it has larger houses and lots. This is what attracts people here. Your proposed zoning changes will cause a loss in property value and quality of life.

Sincerely,

David A Hansen
224 Tanglewood Dr
Mossyrock, WA 98564

(360) 985-0245 (home)
E-mail: dah8486@gmail.com

External Email - Remember to think before you click!

This message may contain links with malware, viruses, etc. Please ensure the message is legitimate before opening it.

From: [Sherry Anderson](#)
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: Regarding parcel: 017953045002
Date: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 9:03:23 PM

You don't often get email from sherry.dot@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Regarding parcel: 017953045002, 868 Hwy. 603
Hello Mindy,

My property is a 7.88 acre parcel across the road from the proposed zoning changes creating higher density directly across from me along old highway 603. I would like to add a request to add my property to that parcel to allow it to be divided into at least 2 parcels. I already have installed an access road and lane to the back of my conveniently long reectangular 7.88 acres where a perfect building site exists. It would not change the immediate area, as all distances, house to house would remain very much the same providing similar private enjoyment of the rural surroundings. It would be about 3-4 acres, or it could be 5, leaving 2.88 for the older house at the front of the lot. Please let me know what you need from me to make this happen. It does not make sense to build two homes on the same lot. With the need for additional housing everywhere, this seems like a sensible request, and due to desirability of the lot I would create at the back half of my property, it would be additional tax base for Lewis County.

Thank you,
Sherry Anderson
sherry.dot@gmail.com
719-339-3745

External Email - Remember to think before you click!

This message may contain links with malware, viruses, etc. Please ensure the message is legitimate before opening it.

Patrick and Gloria Duncan

114 Roundwood Lane

Packwood, WA 98361

206-963-3261

Parcel 035064075002

High Valley Park/Hinkle Tinkle Road/Roundwood Lane

My letter is regarding the Packwood Subarea Plan phase 2. Our property was bought approximately 30 years ago and developed in 20008 with a 2-acre minimum per home. Everyone knew the zoning when they bought property here and the result has been a peaceful cohesive rural neighborhood. We maintain our narrow gravel roads, plow each other out when it snows and watch each other's homes when they are away.

You can imagine our surprise (outrage) when we learned part of the plan was to eliminate our 2-acre minimum and jump two zoning designations from RRC-R2 zoning to RRC zoning. This would allow for development of 4 units per acre. This is extreme. This would only benefit people that do not live here and want to make a buck sub-dividing or selling their land. A housing development would be totally out of character with our existing rural area.

People that have purchased property and want to develop it should stick with a 2-acre minimum lot size. If they want to rent it out as a vacation rental, I believe they have property rights that protect them. All we are asking is for our property rights to be protected and for fairness.

All our lots currently have wide forested buffers that support wildlife elk, deer, bear, eagles, hawks, western brown squirrels, coyotes and many more. There must be a rural component to any plan. I can't stress enough how strongly myself and my neighbors oppose this rezone.

Please come visit our neighborhood and see what a development would do to it.

Sincerely,

Patrick F Duncan

Public Testimony on the Onalaska Subarea Plan – Phase 1 Final Draft (November 18, 2024)

Presented to the Lewis County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners

Dear Lewis County Commissioners and Planning Staff, and Planning Commission,

My name is Harry O. Bhagwandin, and I have been a resident of Onalaska since moving here in 1985 where I raised 4 children through the Onalaska School District with my wife Annie of 41 years. Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comments on the *Onalaska Subarea Plan – Phase 1 Final Draft*. This plan outlines a long-term vision for Onalaska. I have been a part of the Subarea Planning process and appreciate the extensive community engagement, staff research, and collaboration that has gone into this important document.

I would like to address several key elements of the plan and provide comments for your consideration:

1. Support for the 20-Year Vision:

The vision articulated in the plan – of Onalaska as a *vibrant small town that preserves its history, supports local businesses, encourages recreation, and provides affordable housing* – is what inspires our family farm and timber community. I fully support this vision, as it recognizes the unique character of Onalaska and balances future growth with the need to maintain the rural charm that we have found that our residents cherish.

2. Housing Affordability and Diversity:

I commend the plan's focus on affordable housing and the encouragement of diverse housing options, including duplexes, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and tiny home villages. However, it will be essential to ensure that zoning updates in Phase 2 truly reflect these priorities and remove any unnecessary barriers to affordable housing development.

3. Local Economic Development:

The plan's goals to strengthen Onalaska's local economy, particularly by attracting businesses that provide essential services like grocery stores, medical facilities, and small-scale manufacturing, are critical. I urge the county and the Economic Alliance of Lewis County to actively pursue partnerships and incentives that will make this vision a reality. A thriving local economy will reduce the need for residents to travel long distances for basic goods and services.

4. Transportation and Pedestrian Safety:

The emphasis on improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, especially along State Route 508, is a welcome addition to the plan. As traffic increases, enhancing walkability

and slowing vehicle speeds will be crucial to ensuring safety and encouraging residents to support local businesses.

5. Environmental Protection and Recreation:

Onalaska's natural resources, including Carlisle Lake and the South Fork Newaukum River, are central to the community's identity. The plan's policies to protect these resources while expanding recreational opportunities, such as trails and parks, strike an appropriate balance. I encourage the county to prioritize any appropriate funding and ongoing implementation of these goals in Phase 2.

6. Public Facilities and Aging in Place:

The plan's recognition of the importance of public services, including water, sewer, and high-speed internet, is critical to supporting future growth. Additionally, the emphasis on services that allow residents to age in place, such as senior housing, adult daycare, and in-home healthcare, will help Onalaska remain a multigenerational community where people can live and thrive throughout their lives.

In closing, I want to express my gratitude to the Lewis County Planning Department staff and the Planning Commission, Community Advisory Committee members, and the volunteers who have contributed their time in the development of this plan. As the process moves forward into Phase 2, I encourage the county to maintain open lines of communication with residents and ensure that the final zoning and development regulations align with the community's vision.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my comments. I look forward to seeing how the *Onalaska Subarea Plan* continues to evolve in the coming months.

With all due respect,

Harry O. Bhagwandin
183 Shady Grove Road
Onalaska, WA 98570

From: [Reed McGraw](#)
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: Onalaska planning commission
Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 11:53:32 AM

You don't often get email from queeks5@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern:

I am the owner of 314 Railroad St (parcel number 032840001000) in Onalaska, WA. I have a few concerns regarding the new zoning proposal.

- 1- I have personally been watching and saving up to do storage units on my property, this new zoning would kill that opportunity for the community.
- 2- This new proposal would impact future growth with sewer and water connections currently available.
- 3- Diminishing property values for current\future occupant(s)

I will be at the meeting tonight and would appreciate consideration on these concerns.

Thank You,
Reed McGraw

External Email - Remember to think before you click!

This message may contain links with malware, viruses, etc. Please ensure the message is legitimate before opening it.

March 29, 2025

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in support of the Packwood Subarea Plan Phase 2.

Packwood is seeing an unprecedented number of people who are coming to the Packwood area to live, recreate, and pass through. The Packwood Visitors Center reported that in 2024 there were 10,350 people who stopped in. They estimate that it is only 1 to 3 percent of the number of people who are actually coming into the Packwood area.

To share their numbers, 2020 = 3979 people, 2021 = 6351 people, 2022 = 8133 people, 2023 = 9809 people, and 2024 = 10350 people. As you can see the number is growing.

Packwood needs protection from the sheer number of people coming to our area. I believe that the Packwood Subarea Plan Phase 2 is doing that. By changing the zoning from STMU (small town mixed use) to other zoning, the implementation of stricter regulations will curb unwanted behavior. This change will also promote economic growth in the correct areas. Instead of a grocery store being implemented in High Valley, it is encouraged along Highway 12.

One point of contention is the implementation of the UGA (urban growth area). I believe that the only way for the plan to move forward is to change Packwood from its various LAMIRD (limited area of more intense rural development) designations to a UGA. While the sewer project has been delayed, I am hopeful that it will come to fruition. By having the UGA in place, the economic growth that will take place with sewer would have limitations in place. Currently the limitations are put in place by the Department of Health instead of Lewis County.

The main reason that I am in favor of the new zoning and regulations will be the potential for multifamily housing. Currently, the zoning does not allow for it. The new zoning promotes it, although it is mostly dependent upon the sewer. However, for landowners with large parcels (like the new millsite owners) they could put in their own private sewer system and build an apartment building or a condo. Under the current zoning, they are not allowed to do that.

Multifamily means more affordable. The businesses in Packwood are already suffering with a lack of workers. The potential employees cannot afford to live in Packwood and therefore have to drive. The extra mileage means more time and money. Minimum wage has not caught up with the cost of living and the choice to find employment towards the west end of the county where there is more housing and employment opportunities is the one being made. Labor day of 2024, Blanton's Market in Packwood only had 12 employees to run the store against the onslaught of people coming into town. When Hal Blanton owned the store, he had somewhere between 25-30 employees.

Thank you for taking the time to consider the needs of Packwood and finding a way to protect the town that, perhaps too many, people love.

Thank you,

Amber S. Brown

12985 US Hwy 12, Packwood, WA 98361

March 24, 2025

Gina Owen
647 Silverbrook Road
Randle, WA 98377
ginaowen321@gmail.com

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to express my support for the Packwood Subarea Plan Phase 2 and to urge you to adopt it.

I am a resident of Randle, having moved here 9 years ago with my husband when we retired. We are very connected to East Lewis County as residents, family business owners, active community participants and recreators.

Our family members own the Packwood Station in Packwood as well as Raintree Nursery in Morton. They have worked very hard to grow these businesses and contribute to a vibrant business community. In addition, we are very active volunteers for the community as Board members for Pinchot Partners, Lewis County Water Conservancy Board, Members of Skate Creek Park, the Gifford Pinchot Trash Force and many other activities. We are committed to this community, and feel very optimistic about its future.

I am in support of the Packwood Subarea Plan Phase 2 for the following reasons. Growth is happening in Packwood, and all of East Lewis County. This is an incredibly beautiful part of the country, with easy access to Mount Rainier National Park, White Pass Ski Resort, endless hiking, fishing, biking and hunting opportunities. Packwood is emerging from the economic malaise of the last 30 years, and rapid expansion is here. How that expansion and growth is managed is the central question, not whether growth should be allowed. Growth is happening, and with the sewer system project soon to begin, it will only accelerate. As I see it, growth can be either ignored, and it occurs in a haphazard and unthoughtful way, or it can be carefully managed and planned, which is what I believe this first phase of the Subarea plan does.

First and foremost, the Plan addresses the Small Town Mixed Use zoning that is resulting in haphazard growth. It calls for more varied zoning that will allow for better housing options, businesses and future planning for planned expansions. It specifically proposes UGA zoning to bring clarity and organization to the subarea section. It will allow for better housing options for locals, and minimize short term rentals in the downtown area.

As family business owners in Packwood, one of the most difficult issues is affordable housing. The current zoning prevents options for more affordable housing with multifamily housing, ADUs, bunkhouses, etc. that can meet present and future needs for citizens of Packwood and business owners having difficulty hiring due to lack of affordable housing.

Jobs, housing and quality education are in short supply in Packwood. It is nearly impossible to hire

additional staff due to lack of affordable housing and quality education. Few young families can live in, move to or remain in Packwood without good job opportunities, affordable housing and quality education. White Pass school, in the next town over is the only option, and even that school has declining enrollment. A vibrant community cannot exist without meeting young families needs.

Aging in place for long time residents is not an option with the lack of medical and pharmaceutical services. Older people have almost no option but to leave when medical needs increase. The plan supports the addition of amenities that will address this and allow better options for Packwood's senior citizens.

Thank you for your time and I urge you to adopt the Packwood Subarea

Phase 2 plan.

Sincerely,

Gina Owen

From: [Cindy Dolowy](#)
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: TESTIMONY re: proposed zoning designation amendments
Date: Monday, March 31, 2025 9:02:59 AM

I'm writing in regards to the proposal of amendments to the comprehensive plan map affecting zoning designations, in particular the proposal to reduce the size to 1/4 acre that a parcel may be divided into. This is my written testimony:

I am vehemently AGAINST the proposal to reduce parcel size to 1/4 acre.

In general this is simply 'urban sprawl' which most rural folks do not want invading and destroying their peaceful, rural lifestyles. Keep urban sprawl in town and build UPWARD, not outward!!

In my case this would turn my area into a crowded suburban neighborhood rather than the lovely, rural atmosphere we currently enjoy. This proposal would drastically increase the number of single family homes that could be crammed onto ANY land in the affected area. My understanding is the current Boistfort water situation is already at its limit so that alone would be an issue.

My immediate concern is that the clearcut that was recently created on the top of Curtis Hill Road is being considered to become a housing development. The clearcut is bad enough but to turn it into a crowded neighborhood would not only cause more damage to the physical land and affect all the surrounding neighbors with noise and traffic forever, but it'll also permanently destroy a huge chunk of natural habitat for the wildlife in the area which is bountiful. There is a nearby creek which is beneficial to all the wildlife. And the surrounding undeveloped woodland and open fields has provided them safe haven for centuries. It's just heartbreaking to think this natural beauty could be destroyed for the people and the wildlife residing in the area.

If tax revenue is what the bottom line is here then build high rise condos in town - not wipe out precious farmland, woodland and greenbelts.

~Cynthia J. Dolowy

External Email - Remember to think before you click!

From: tracyleigh2@juno.com
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: RE: zoning concerns/ Questions Lewis County
Date: Thursday, April 3, 2025 9:05:38 PM

[You don't often get email from tracyleigh2@juno.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Tracy and Leigh Fassett
116 Hinkle Tinkle Ln/114 Roundwood LN PUMP
Packwood, WA 98361
parcel # 035064075001
High Valley Park/Hinkle Tinkle LN/Roundwood

Dear Mindy, the area of the proposed zoning change that I am mainly speaking about is the proposed change in zoning designations from RRC-R2 to RRC zoning.

I strongly disagree with this type of a change to such a rural neighborhood. That kind of change would allow for people who use their properties as rentals, or bare land to seek making the most money for the land. When our property was purchased it was a 2 acre minimum. All of the existing houses have wide forested buffers that help support the wildlife. That type of zoned building in that area would be out of character for the current rural neighborhood. I am very surprised that that big of a change is even being considered. People bought property in those types of areas for that reason.

Thank you again,
Leigh Fassett

External Email - Remember to think before you click!

This message may contain links with malware, viruses, etc. Please ensure the message is legitimate before opening it.

Commerce Meadows, LLC
PO Box 921
Brush Prairie WA. 98604

Packwood UGA Support Letter

To Whom It May Concern,

To start, this is a letter in support of the Packwood Urban Growth Boundary. My business partner Joel Stirling and I own a 131-acre site in Packwood known as the Old Mill. This site historically employed hundreds and drove the economy in East Lewis County. The mill has been shuttered for nearly over 25 years.

The draw to Packwood is no longer the timber industry, the town currently hosts over 1 million tourists a year because of our proximity to Mt. Rainier National Park, White Pass Ski Resort and Goat Rocks Wilderness. Increasingly, like many tourist towns, the people who work in the area cannot afford to live in town. The cost of a single-family home has gone up 300% since 2012.

Today, the Old Mill site sits ready to serve this area in a different way. Over 100 years of industrial use left a large site of pavement and old buildings. This property will have a major impact in solving housing affordability issues in this part of Lewis County as well as bring in millions in economic development. And as a bonus, the environmental impact of repurposing this site greatly is negated compared to most raw land developments.

Due to the lack of sewer, housing options remain severely constrained. The onsite septic systems, pose a threat to drinking water and the upper Cowlitz River due to our unique geography.

The people who love and enjoy Packwood have been the groundswell for the rezone and proposed growth management area. The County has worked closely with the Citizens Advisory Council for years and have made great progress. This is not the work of outside developers or foreign industry. They wish to be stewards of this area and manage growth before growth cannot be contained- which will happen. This UGA approval is a very important first step to bring sewer and missing middle housing to the Packwood area.

Currently, there are no multifamily housing options in town and the nearest incorporated city is 30 miles away. Businesses in town have closed because they can't find employees who can afford to live in Packwood. The Old Mill site has nearly 10 acres of multifamily housing availability. We also have 65 acres of cottage and attached product proposed. Joel and I stand committed to help provide housing stock to support the 'missing middle' of housing in the area. These changes will create more affordable housing for people living and working in Packwood.

Demand for housing cannot be ignored in the area, the opportunities for growth in tourism related industries stands to make Packwood another national destination in Washington-with such, the benefits will be felt state and county wide. The town was named in a March 2022 Wall Street Journal article identifying 5 undiscovered mountain towns in the West. Packwood was first on the list and the only named town in Washinton State. The increase in tourism, related jobs and commerce and immediate need for major civil construction projects and housing stock will stoke consumer spending to levels far past what this town has experienced and provide a strong return the investment of taxpayer dollars into this area.

Please support local housing, jobs, tourism and water quality by supporting the Packwood UGA and Zoning Proposals.

Sincerely,

David Campos
Commerce Meadows, LLC.

From: [Mindy and Steve Fohn](#)
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: Packwood Subarea Plan Comments from Mindy Fohn April 7, 2025
Date: Monday, April 7, 2025 9:13:34 AM

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Packwood Subarea Plan. My connection to the Packwood area began in 1970 skiing at White Pass traveling from Spanaway. After that, I visited Timberline Community beginning in 1980 with my in-laws. They've owned a small vacation home since 1970, which is still in the family, and my family built a home in Timberline completed in 2010. Yes, we are part-time vacation home owners in the Packwood area.

I want to acknowledge the speedy and thorough responses to my emailed questions from Mindy Brooks of the Lewis County Planning Department.

I am generally supportive of the Packwood Subarea Plan. The plan has sideboards and rules for accommodating affordable housing. The challenge will be enforcing the rules including the designated rent cost and short-term rentals. In regards to short-term rentals, I encourage Lewis County to review codes and methods used by other counties for code language and enforcement. Requiring a permit and relying upon complaints to code enforcement may suffice. However, the County should be aware of how unit owners can circumnavigate the guidelines by limiting the stays to just under the specified threshold of nightly or weekly rentals.

The plan is highly dependent on upgrading utility infrastructure. Infrastructure improvements should include roads, stormwater, sewer, lighting, sidewalks and drinking water.

The sewer plan has been completed, selecting the MBR plant site and drainfield, along with the initial collection system. Funding this system will be challenging in light of the Washington State budget shortfall and cuts to Federal grants. This system is likely too expensive to be funding solely by those that connect to the system. It appears this plan is contingent upon building the sewer system.

The existing water purveyor, Lewis District 3, does not have existing capacity for water service in the case of full build out. A new source and expanded distribution system, possibly additional reservoir and pump station may be needed. The County is encouraged to consider how to phase the growth in light of this limitation, possibly prioritizing the existing water service capacity first for the multi-family housing in order to move forward the goal of affordable housing. The County and or Washington State Department of Health should require Lewis District 3 revise or amend their water system plan to address this growth.

There is little mention of stormwater, roads, lighting, and sidewalks improvements in the plan. The County could consider a "complete streets" planning effort to specify the look, feel and function of the side road areas with the vision of how Packwood should look (mountain village community). Integrating these utilities may open the County to funding each portion – stormwater from Centennial Clean Water Funds, roads from Public Works Trust Fund, and lighting and sidewalks from other sources. This integrated approach may provide cost savings and benefits to the goal of a walkable and lively village.

It would be proactive to work with WSDOT to encourage frontage improvements on Highway 12. Highway 12 frontage is a prominent feature when entering or exiting the Packwood subarea. It seems this plan basically is waiting on WSDOT to improve that section and tack on the frontage improvements (curb/gutter/sidewalk/landscaping) at that time. That "time" may be far into the future.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Packwood Subarea Plan.

Sincerely,

Mindy Fohn

msfohn@comcast.net

External Email - Remember to think before you click!

This message may contain links with malware, viruses, etc. Please ensure the message is legitimate before opening it.

From: [Mindy and Steve Fohn](#)
To: [Mindy Brooks](#)
Subject: Packwood Urban Growth Area Rezone
Date: Monday, April 7, 2025 9:42:47 AM

Hi Mindy,

There's a chance I can testify in person. However, below are my second set of comments.

Thanks!

Mindy Fohn

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the proposed rezoning of RRC area including Goat Rocks, High Valley and Timberline. My connection to the Packwood area began in 1970 skiing at White Pass traveling from Spanaway. After that, I visited Timberline Community beginning in 1980 with my in-laws. They've owned a small vacation home since 1970, which is still in the family, and my family built a home in Timberline completed in 2010. Yes, we are part-time vacation home owners in the Packwood area.

I have several reservations about the rezoning of RRC to ¼ acre lots, where septic/water/critical areas can support the lot size.

Lack of Consideration for Rural Characteristic Preservation

This rezone will codify and uneven pattern of development and not in line with the rural characteristic of the area. The current boundary includes large lots that can be subdivided to ¼ acre lots adjacent to other large lots. For some areas, islands of dense development will be in-between areas of 2 acre lots that the landowners purchased in order to live in a rural area. The boundary was drawn in the 1990's at the time of the Growth Management Act for this LAMIRD Type 1 area. From the WAC

WAC 365-196-425 (Emphasis added)

(D) The fundamental purpose of the logical outer boundary is to minimize and contain the LAMIRD. Counties should favor the configuration that best minimizes and contains the LAMIRD to the area of existing development as of the date the county became subject to the planning requirements of the act.

When evaluating alternative configurations of the logical outer boundary, counties should determine how much new growth will occur at build out and determine if this level of new growth is consistent with rural character and can be accommodated with the appropriate level of public facilities and public services. Counties should use the following criteria to evaluate various configurations when establishing the logical outer boundary:

- (I) The need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities;
 - (II) Physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways, and land forms and contours;
 - (III) The prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries; and
 - (IV) The ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl.
- (E) Once a logical outer boundary has been adopted, counties may consider changes to the boundary in subsequent amendments. When doing so, the county must use the same criteria used when originally designating the boundary. Counties should avoid adding new undeveloped parcels as infill, especially if doing so would add to the capacity of the LAMIRD.

Recommendations:

1. The County has the option to change the boundary. It is encouraged to review the boundary and remove large lots where rural character will be compromised.
2. Additionally the County should consider the criteria in the WAC and provide more details for this Urban Growth Area.

Drinking Water Infrastructure

The County has neglected to consider the problems with drinking water capacity in this Urban Growth Area. It is well known the drinking water systems are struggling to meet capacity and will need to develop new sources, distribution system, reservoirs and pump stations. The growth will be biased towards developers in line waiting for connections, and then those that are late to the game.

Recommendation:

1. The County and Washington State Health Departments should require updated water system plans that address full build out.

Affordable Housing Goals

The Plan is hiding behind “Affordable Housing” goals and does not address the high probability of the majority of the new development to become vacation homes and/or short-term rentals. With the limitation of water systems and lack of any short-term rental codes, affordable housing will not be enhanced with this rezone.

Recommendation:

1. The County should adopt short-term rental codes developed from the Packwood Subarea Plan in this Urban Growth Area.

Stormwater Management

Stormwater Management is limited on ¼ acre lots. Any residential lot under 0.77 acres requires and “Abbreviated Drainage Plan”. When multiple ¼ acre lots are developed, there may not be an understanding of cumulative effects of conversion of larger areas from forest to impervious surfaces.

Recommendation:

1. The County should address multiple/clustered ¼ acre lots and the cumulative impacts of stormwater to critical areas such as groundwater recharge, streams, and wetlands.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Packwood Subarea Plan.

Sincerely,

Mindy Fohn

msfohn@comcast.net

