

FW: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Environmental Impact Statement, Franklin County Planning Commission Meeting, January 19, 2020

Rebeca Gilley <rgilley@co.franklin.wa.us>

Tue 1/19/2021 5:28 PM

To: Aaron Gunderson <agunderson@co.franklin.wa.us>;

Cc: Derrick Braaten <dbraaten@co.franklin.wa.us>; Nicole Stickney <planning@co.franklin.wa.us>; Donna Crisp <dcrisp@co.franklin.wa.us>; Julie A. Michel <jamichel@co.franklin.wa.us>;

I will forward your request to our Planners, Aaron and Derrick

From: Steven Schlegel [mailto:scschlegel@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 3:45 PM

To: planninginquiry <planninginquiry@co.franklin.wa.us>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Environmental Impact Statement, Franklin County Planning Commission Meeting, January 19, 2020

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

Dear Sirs,

I would like to register my dislike of the preferred Alternative 3 in the Environmental Impact Statement dated September 2020. The plan proposes to change the zoning in large areas of the city and expand the Urban Growth Area Boundary. I dislike Alternative 3 for a couple of reasons:

1. The expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries will affect large areas of county land and will limit or restrict what the land owners can do with their land even though it may be 20 years before the city envelopes that land, if ever. The effects on the land owners may be large, but they are also small effecting even building a gardening shed or animal shelter that is too large. Many land owners do not realize this will be a problem until they are told they are violating code or try to sell their property.
2. The proposed changes in zoning, especially in the Broadmore Planning Area will place industrial, medium, medium-high, and high-density residential zones among built-up areas currently zoned low-density residential. This will have several derogatory effects on the area including increased traffic, increased crime, and decreased property values besides changing the "culture" of the area. As a homeowner in the vicinity with a large lot and expansive home, I don't want to see apartments, condominiums, track houses, and inexpensive homes built in the area that will reduce my and my neighbors' property values.

While I understand contractor's desire to maximize profits by building higher-density housing and commercial buildings on the limited remaining land within the boundaries of the city and urban growth area boundary; and the City of Pasco's desire to maximize tax revenues from the undeveloped areas, changing the zoning as proposed in Alternative 3 is disastrous for current residents. Until the undeveloped land in Pasco is developed under current plans, Alternative 1 should be pursued. If that is impossible, Alternative 2 is as far as the City should plan. Alternative 3 should not be considered viable.

Thank you,
Steven Schlegel
9304 W. Richardson Rd.
Pasco, WA

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10