

From: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
To: [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#); [Chuck Houghten](#)
Cc: [Jose Alvarez](#); [Oliver Oriako](#)
Subject: RE: Comprehensive Plan Update Comments
Date: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 7:34:27 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good day, Charles,

Thank you for submitting this feedback in relation to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

This has been forwarded to additional members of Staff and will be entered into the Index of Record.

Best,



Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



From: Clark County <webteam@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 10:53 PM
To: Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Update Comments

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



Submitted on Mon, 06/30/2025 - 10:52 PM

First Name

Charles

Last Name

Houghten

Email Address

cjhoughten@gmail.com

Phone Number

[3608523470](tel:3608523470)

Address

16909 NE 227th Ave

Brush Prairie, Washington. 98606-8108

Message Subject

Comments on Plan Alternatives and Information

Comments

Charles Houghten

16909 NE 227th Ave

Brush Prairie, WA 98606

Comments on Draft Alternatives for the Clark County Comprehensive Plan

June 30, 2025

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the preliminary alternatives for the County and incorporated cities within Clark County.

I used the on-line Virtual Open House, and I thought it worked very well – with some improvements/enhancements recommended.

I am interested in knowing and learning more about some of the more specific elements of the Plan – including Parks and Recreation, Transportation – including bicycle and pedestrian routes,

Protection of Agricultural Lands and an overall vision for that in the County, Protection of Natural Areas, including forests, grasslands, wetlands, streams and riparian areas.

I would like to see Goal statements for the current situation and in comparison, of Goal statements for each of the Alternatives. I can decipher some – such as the Housing Goals, but not for all the planning elements.

I would like to see more information included such as where roads are going to be upgraded over the next 20 years – versus staying in the same status. Where are the current and future sewer lines proposed with each of the alternatives. Are there other major changes to infrastructure planned? How about energy conservation and energy efficiency?

I would like to see more capability in the mapping tool – 1) to provide access to a complete legend; 2) a hover ability to highlight areas of interest from the text to the map. These maps apparently don't show or convey actual zoning where many parcels have been given exceptions or variances to the map zone. How do we get that level of information and how does that information get used in the planning and rezoning process?

Housing is a very important issue, and it seems like the plan has addressed it to a reasonable extent, except for bringing into question major changes from agriculture designations and uses to housing. In my opinion any productive agricultural lands should first and foremost be considered for staying in that designation and not be rezoned. There may be some exceptions, however, if so, mitigating the loss of agricultural lands should be undertaken – such as incorporating new lands into an agricultural designation; proponents to such zoning changes may contribute to agricultural sustainability funds, etc. In short, I recommend avoiding all zoning changes where lands are removed from agricultural production.

Regarding housing – 1) I am concerned about too much “down-zoning” where single family neighborhoods suddenly become mixed use areas. This should only be done with lots of public input and where reasonable (i.e. closer to high density development already); 2) One of the biggest complaints that I hear from young people in our area looking for a new home or those wishing to move out of an apartment is that all the housing is huge and that they have no yards, especially a small backyard for play, gardening, etc. I agree that much more “Middle Housing” is needed – but it must include single-family homes on small lots (with yards!) as well as apartments, townhouses, etc. I'm tired of hearing developers gripe about “it not penciling out” if much more green space, parking space or public spaces are to be suggested in development plans.

I would like to see more information about Climate Change and how the plan actions will be assessed to effect climate livability here.

A few specific comments:

For Battle Ground: I support their plans for mixed use developments in the Dollars Corner area and the area in the SW addition to the City. Hopefully these areas will be designed and planned to minimize congestion in already busy traffic areas. I do not support Battle Grounds proposed changes to the Airpark Neighborhood. Industrial development should stay on the West side of the railroad tracks. And the areas to the East of the railroad and south of 199th St should be retained as rural character and not increase densities as proposed in their alternatives.. New parks and natural area protection should be considered for the areas around Salmon and Mud Creeks.

For Camas: I can support most of what's proposed in their Alternative 2. I can't support Alternative 3 and the agricultural zoning change proposed in their plan. Although I don't know the extent of agricultural use in the area, and it may be suitable for some conversion, the most important agricultural lands in the County are in the Brush Prairie, Battle Ground, Ridgefield and LaCenter areas.

In Summary: I believe that the Clark County and the Cities therein should be able to accommodate the projected growth of the county over the next 20 years within the current Urban Growth Boundaries. While there may be some exceptions to that – avoiding impacts natural areas and conversion of agricultural lands should be among the highest goals of the County. There will be needs for infrastructure improvements throughout the County – these should be projected and presented. Goals should be clearly articulated for the primary elements of the County Plan – including: Housing, Transportation, Agriculture, Natural Resources Protection, Parks and Recreation, Commerical and Industrial Developments, etc.

Thank You

Charles Houghten

© 2025 Clark County Washington