Dan Beardslee, representing Roger and Jan Shaffer, felt the entire concept of PRD's discussed rather than the specific parcel and stated his feeling that the real issue was whether or not the neighbors in this area should have 9 or 4 more neighbors as they would have with a short plat, since other issues such as traffic have been addressed. The modified proposal as described by staff helps ameliorate some concerns from neighboring citizens, principally the issue of open space. The compromise from the owners standpoint is that the tracts are much smaller and does not accomplish what they set out to be accomplished. The proposal includes 90' buffer on the south side, the side closest to the Eagle habitat area; at least 50' buffers all around the property; large open space in front; interior open space as illustrated. He discussed why a short plat is less in the public interest than a PRD as proposed. Attributes cited for the proposed PRD: 55% permanent open space; adding a 9th tract preserves 2 acres of resource land somewhere else; buffering from adjacent lands; covenants placed to protect the open space and provide for perpetual maintenance; preservation of rural character. Mr. Beardslee referenced the Findings of Fact dated June 22, 1988, regarding Amendments to the Code, item #8 specifically, dealing with dispersion of residential development throughout the County through standard short plat and subdivision is an inefficient consumption of a limited resource and that the County should encourage infilling of residential and urban areas and clustering of development in residential, rural and resource areas. He referenced an article in Landscape Architecture on the Connecticut Valley with regard to impacts of conventional subdivision versus cluster housing insofar as song birds are concerned showing clearly there is a great advantage to preserve some perpetual open space in terms of wildlife habitat, suggesting even in residential areas if there is some clustered open space or any open space left it becomes very valuable as region develops and another reason for revisiting the idea of PRD's. With that in mind, Mr. Beardslee showed the Board some pictures taken last week as an example of short plat versus PRD. In reply to a question from the Chair, Mr. Beardslee stated that the width of the buffer on the east (right side of the drawing) from Wilkinson Road into access road is about 400'.

Roger Shaffer, Applicant, expressed intent to by no means create a travesty in the neighborhood, first having come up and talked to the Planning Department about short plat versus other opportunities, and were encouraged to go the route taken; followed ordinances, tried to follow advice of each and every department.

Dorothy Bartholomew, 5321 S. Wilkinson Road, Langley, expressed concern about the buffer being only a small row of trees; concern here is not Songbirds but Eagles and that the clear cut was disturbing the Eagles. Since the Eagle Management Plan calls for no construction from July to December, she whether the Department of Wildlife was contacted about the new plan and 90' buffer. Agreed a good PRD is preferred to a short plat, but disagreed this was a good PRD. Expressed concern about the "possible" barn noting such would be seen from the road, dimensions enormous; questioned renumbering parcels. With regard to the size of the property, contention is the property is less than 20 acres; all maps entered as exhibits for preliminary approval show figures for only three sides of the property; the new general site plan shows the total area 19.94 acres and exact figures on all sides. Questioned rights of the property owners have to the County Road and/or County Road right of way, and legal authority for same. The property is less than 20 acres and should follow the Code for property less than 20 acres and not be approved (page 24.2.b.1).

Russell Ramsey, 5680 S. Wilkinson Road, objected to the PRD on the basis of increased traffic flow, adverse effect on the wildlife, inadequate open space, and precedent the PRD would set for all of Whidbey Island.

Bob Harris, 5570 S. Wilkinson Road, also representing his wife Mary, referred to his letter dated March 29, 1990 (Exhibit 1) and reiterated his feeling the real issue is whether existing guidelines were

followed for PRD's and in this case he does the proposal is consistent with the Policy and appropriately should be denied. PRD's should be encouraged in appropriate rural areas, which to him is adjacent to existing cluster houses or existing housing developments of greater than one on five acres. He maintained that there is not a single plot of land on Whidbey Island and if approved will set a precedent with far reaching repercussion.

Mary Lowe, also representing her son Dr.Fred Johnson, owning property directly north of the proposed PRD, approximately 18 acres, noted intention to build a home and studio next to her son; most land is in Forest Reserve. Concern is for wildlife and the number of houses proposed with children, dogs and horses that will encroach on their land. They feel the developer at least should fence it off so domestic animals cannot intermingle with the wild animals.

Thomas Campbell, 5538 S. Wilkinson Road, asked that "if Wilkinson's Road rural nature is not protected what portion of Island County will be", and cited the fundamental issue that the as he sees it: the residents of the rural area do not like the proposal and do not want it approved, seeing it as a threat to their way of life.

Will Dickinson, Executive Director, Economic Development Council, expressed his hope that the Board would look at the matter with the view of whether or not it meets the technical demands of the ordinance and approve it if it does.

Towers Corbley, property owner to the east side almost to the corner touching where the PRD is proposed, and her mother who owns property closest to the proposal (with beach road) was happy to have a PRD go in, and like the idea of 9 lots (as long as the land will support); but is unhappy about the idea of more horses, and mentioned problems with horses now trespassing. She stated that for Woodard Beach and the Woodard Development having this kind of livestock hurts the residential property--their covenants do not allow livestock. She disagreed that the Applicant receive TDR rights from somewhere else, feeling the property should stand on its own.

Rufus Rose, Planning Commission member, South Whidbey resident and real estate broker, stated that the revision proposed seemed to be an effort on the part of the applicant to more closely fit into what he perceived was the Board's interests. Mr. Rose feels that zone boundaries in the middle of a road is a problem since public monies are spent to maintain roads and public utilities running down them; he questions the wisdom of having public property (road) used to its efficient limits only on one side of a road. He agreed that there needed to be a clarification of the aliquot section issue. He sees 8 or 9 home sites that average at or slightly below one acre in size with current real estate practices on South Whidbey indicating the houses would be at least $200,000 price range when sold and which would add to the tax base, add more people in an area in a focussed way. It is his understanding that is what this County said it wants. With regard to concern expressed about an Eagles nest being located close to residences, Mr. Rose stated his understanding that was resolved and that in fact the Eagles now sitting on eggs. His understanding of "presently developing area" as stated in the Zoning Ordinance is that in fact the entire County is regarded as a developing area. He shares concern about definitions in the Comprehensive Plan, Planning Policy Phase II. He also noted that on the east side of

Wilkinson Road the numerous types of development including old plats with lots significantly less than 1 acre, and south of the Corbley property and north of Bartholomew, waterfront parcels 70'to 90'wide.

Pete Sandvigen, Greenbank, felt the fault was not with the developer or the people in the area but the laws and regulations left open to personal definition.

Larry Kwarsick responded to questions posed: Size of Parcel. Property is an aliquot division of land; the Zoning Ordinance