Marjorie Baird, speaking for herself and as a representative of the Council on Aging, advised that the Council on Aging had held a meeting this date, and after discussing the zoning problems delegated a few members to attend this hearing to express approval of the Board's Zoning Strategy as it now stands, particularly with the five acre minimum in order to maintain the type of life they came to the County to enjoy, and are happy that the Board made it impossible for anyone else to build a mobile home park outside the city limits of Oak Harbor.

Dan Beardslee, representing Skagit-Island County Builders Association and the Whidbey Island Board of Realtors and Land Surveyors Association of Washington, recalled that he submitted an eight-page analysis and alternative proposal to the Board last week, and at this time, reviewed that proposal and amplified some of the suggestions made therein. Mr. Beardslee commented that fundamentally they too support the concept of a revised land use code for Island County, but on the other hand, as written feel there are some deficiencies and changes which need to be made. They are trying to come up with workable guidelines. He does not support the "down-zone" to five acres. He told the Board that if he and those he represents could be shown by qualitative analysis that it is advantageous to do so, then maybe "they could swallow that". He does not believe that five acres is more rural than 2½ acres. He feels that such is not even simply just a rezone from 2½ acres to 5 acres, as in many instances the overlay zones come in. Although the 2½ acre option is still available, Mr. Beardslee stated that there is a whole list of qualifications attached, i.e., compatible with surrounding land, approved by the Planning Commission, and through a long approval process, etc., so while that option may be available, it is not a straight-forward option.

Mr. Beardslee stated he and those he represents support some of the suggestions which the Planning Commission made relating to the PRD size. He noted that the PRD size as proposed is unworkable -- to work it must be financially feasible, and the density must be increased in PRD's. He suggests specifically that for parcels greater than 20 acres, a basic PRD density of one dwelling unit per acre average, and with TDR's, two dwelling units per 2½ acres average; for parcels 10-20 acres in size, one dwelling unit per 2½ acres average and 1.5 dwelling units per acre average with TDR's. It is his opinion that the more they can do the clustering, the more the rural character and open space will be preserved. As relates to a Planning Commission meeting recently where Mr. Dearborn brought up a proposal to allow very high densities on large parcels with PRD's, Mr. Dearborn stated he supports that concept which may encourage very high density development on large parcels, but noted it would almost require universal construction of sewer treatment facilities. One of the major items Mr. Beardslee believes should be changed in the Rural Residential Zone is the setback requirements, seeming to make the ordinance more and more rigid instead of more flexible in allowing creastive uses of property he does not see a need for that 100' setback. He feels there should be an ability to consider a rezone from rural residential to residential. Existing non-conforming parcels must be ensured (if held by a common owner) that the owner has the ability to sell, and noted his belief that because of the difference in opinion between the Planning Staff and Mr. Dearborn, that something should be included within the Legislative Intent Statement to make it clear. The recreation/open space requirements for PRD's should have some modification, particularly the recreational facility requirement, Mr. Beardslee pointing out that 10% of gross site being set aside for recreational use would mean that on a 20 acre parcel that 2 acres must be set aside, and suggests that that be made more flexible, i.e., adding some general language to the effect that, "recreational facilities should be required if the project warrants it". With regard to open space, Mr. Beardslee stated that the requirements are reasonable, but asked if it were true that the intent of the legislation is that open space will be dedicated to the County. Mr. Dearborn stated that there would have to be at least an easement granted to the County (such as a conservation easement) but the maintenance management of the open space would rest with the homeowners, unless the County chose to assume management responsibilities for some particular reason, and these parcels would probably not be taxed, or if so, at some nominal rate as open space and not having any development potential. Mr. Beardslee referenced the PRD ordinance and the relationship of the TDR program in Montgomery County, Maryland, as further outlined in his letter of analysis, he felt that the important point is with the TDR program structuring, and discussed the

demand side versus the supply side, and the receiving PRD property. He feels that the TDR concept is excellent and believes it can work, but must find a place to spend the development rights. He noted that the program works in Montgomery County because there is a demand, but in Island County, no provisions have been made for any demand. He brought up for consideration and thought a provision to work out through an interlocal agreement where development rights could be spent in the incorporated cities to serve to provide a market for development rights which do not exist under the proposal as structured. He suggests also that development rights be spent on an expedited review procedure. With respect to the change to the Interim Zoning Ordinance as referenced by Tom Roehl earlier limiting parcel size to 12,500 sq. ft., Mr. Beardslee stated that the implications of that should be considered.

Steve Erickson, South Whidbey, expressed his view as to why five acres is preferable to smaller sized areas for people to live on, is for a basic economic reason related to the resources available to support those people who are going to be living here are at some point in the future going to have to provide for a fair amount of their own food and provide for their own fuel -- the obvious fuel in this area being wood. It will take a certain amount of area to grow that wood for each household, with the need for a buffer area. Mr. Erickson stated that if increasing the density, there would be a lot more people in a lot smaller area.

Warren Faust, Coupeville, representing the Council on Aging and the American Association of Retired Persons, stated that they are very much opposed to the developing organization and very much in favor of the Commissioners program. Mr. Faust noted that if desired, he could fill the room with senior citizens from both organizations to voice the same opinion as he stated.

Tom Roehl, indicated his question as to how much those senior citizen groups had educated themselves on the possible impacts to senior citizens of the County pertaining to some of the economic ramifications, and if so, they may look at it more deeply. Mr. Roehl pointed out his difficulty to see how the Assessor would be able to handle the tax situation related to the open space areas. Assuming these areas were not taxed at all, he pointed out that of every PRD done, 30% of the land would not be taxed at all; that taken into account in addition to the some 30,000 + acres in the Open Space Taxation program now (assessed at an extremely low rate) Mr. Roehl pointed out that the people who own small lots need to start looking at what it will cost them tax-wise -- the County having a "constant" from what it takes from the property ownership in the County, a limit as to how much that can be increased each year, but the total amount taken a constant, so that the rate is what fluctuates at which the assessed values are taxed, and generally goes up every time some other property's assessed value goes down, and every time a piece of property goes off the tax rolls, the rate at which everyone else is taxed goes up a little higher.

Mrs. Baird spoke in response to Tom Roehl and Dan Beardslee and anyone else who desired to make Whidbey Island concrete condominiums, what they planned to use for water.

Mr. Dearborn indicated that he believed that Mr. Roehl had unintentionally mis-stated the tax situation. He noted there were two limitations, one the percentage limit as to how much the taxes can grow each year, and on top of that, a millage limit which cannot be exceeded without a vote of the people. When that millage ceiling is reached, taxes cannot be raised but rather government cut, without going back to a vote of the people. It means less revenue to the County, but does not mean more taxes to the people because the County is fixed in terms of its limit on what can be taxed -- a constitutional limit which cannot be altered without a vote.

Chairman Kemp added the fact that in looking at the assessed valuation and county budget, in 1971 the assessed valuation of the county was at one-hundred eleven dollars; today, the assessed valuation of the County is 1.8 billion dollars meaning that during that period of time the County has increased its assessed valuation by 1500%, comparing the budget in 1971 at 2.3 million, and the 1984 budget at 13 million -- having gone up by 300%.

Mr. Roehl indicated that during that period of increased assessed valuation there was a major shift of where that assessed valuation is hitting, which is primarily in the already developed areas. As relates to Mrs. Baird's comment with respect to water, Mr. Roehl agreed that there are many areas of the County where water problems exist, but noted that there are other areas of the County where there is an abundance of water, and noted that basic preliminary results from the USGS Study indicate this to be correct, pointing out that primarily in this County there