

#080865
4/2/09

Summary of Statement of Dian Deevey to City Commission, April 2, 2009

1. Comprehensive plan policies are stated in very general terms. Similarities and differences between City and County comprehensive plan language do not provide a guide to the real differences between what the City would allow to happen on the annexed land and what the County would allow on the property if it were not annexed. Consequently, the comparisons presented by staff tonight have little bearing on the concerns of many in the audience.
2. Understanding the differences between existing County protections and possible future City protections requires examining the land development regulations. At present, there are vast and critical differences between the two sets of regulations at present.
3. If the City Commissioners really want to continue the protections the county now offers to this parcel, ^{they} it must make wholesale changes in its regulations, and make them far more restrictive than most city regulations governing land development are.
4. Implementing stronger regulations would require a very large amount of staff time, and may require additional staff with new skills.
5. The City should review its annexation policies. Can you staff really handle the many annexations of the last few years? Should the land really be urbanized? What about the tax penalties for your constituents?
6. I strongly recommend that City Commissioners reconsider the role of rich and beneficial ecosystems near its borders, and also consider whether the citizens really want to destroy these systems in order to expand urbanization. I believe that if given the opportunity, many citizens would very strongly oppose the destructions that urbanization of these precious places entails. I know that many people in this community feel this way ^{and} including many past and current members of the Sierra Club Executive Board.