

From: [Bart Catching](#)
To: nancyreisor22@gmail.com
Cc: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
Subject: RE: Comprehensive Growth Management Plan
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 1:47:35 PM

Nancy,

Hello, my name is Bart Catching. I am one of the planners in the Clark County Community Planning Department (long-range planning).

Thank you for your thoughtful comments. As my co-worker Jeffrey Delapena stated in his response to you, [your email](#) has been added to the public comment record for the comprehensive plan update. Additionally, you had a couple of specific questions at the end of your message that I have highlighted below. I do not know exactly what you would be looking for using search terms on meeting minutes and it sounds like you have already been using that approach. But below I have provided some additional information here and hopefully that will help you.

1. Re 2001 Thompsen Avenue, that address is in the city limits of Vancouver and so the county does not have any role in the planning or zoning of that property or the surrounding neighborhood. [The City of Vancouver Community Development Department](#) can provide you with information on that site.
2. Regarding the Oak Haven community and 5701 NE St. Johns RD, you asked about proposed land use alternatives that show an upzone from the existing R-18 zone to the proposed R-32 zone. Please be aware that no decisions have been made yet on the rezones of county lands within the Vancouver Urban Growth Area (UGA). This is the process that our department is working on with the County Council and the cities. Additionally, Oak Haven and the other manufactured and mobile home parks in the county's jurisdiction are currently subject to a [redemption moratorium](#) while the county reviews options for these areas. There will likely be another County Council hearing on the work plan for this project next month.

After reviewing this information, please let me know if you have further questions.

Thank you,



Bart Catching
Planner III
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4909

From: Nancy Reisor <nancyreisor22@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 8, 2026 3:41 PM

To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>

Subject: Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

You don't often get email from nancyreisor22@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Dear Jeffrey,

I am writing to submit comments in advance of tonight's meeting.

My name is Nancy Reisor. I live at 5701 NE St John Rd, Unit 13, Vancouver, WA 98661-1770. My phone number is 507-382-0836.

I am opposed to both Alternatives 2 and 3. I live in Oak Haven Senior Community. I am concerned that changes to the current zoning from R-18 to R-32 could cause changes to the property that could cause us to lose our home. The same concerns apply to my daughter's home. She lives at 2001 Thompson Ave, Vancouver, WA. Her neighborhood is currently zoned R-9. Alternatives 2 and 3 would both change that to Heavy Industrial, IH. I think both of these zoning changes would be contrary to the planning goals for housing that include encouraging preservation of existing housing stock. While I understand that there are other goals that must be weighed, I believe that this goal should be at the forefront of the priorities and considerations.

I also believe that the zoning changes would be beneficial to property developers. The land that Oak Haven is on would be more valuable if larger occupancy units could be built here. The owner could sell the property to a developer or redevelop it on their own. It would not benefit them financially to do otherwise. As a result, the property owner and/or developers would experience a large financial gain that would continue to provide benefit to them for years to come. In the meantime, we live in manufactured housing that is attached to the land we rent. If Alternatives 2 or 3 are passed, even if no action is taken for years, we would have a difficult time selling our home if we wanted to. When the property was redeveloped, we would be forced to move. I have no idea what it costs to move a large, double-wide, manufactured home or if there would be any chance we would receive any form of compensation or reimbursement from either the county or the property owners or developers. Even so, nothing would be enough. Oak Haven is also a unique community, with beautiful landscaping and a great location.

I believe the zoning change to my daughter's neighborhood would be only for the benefit of developers, and possibly the county and cities tax base. It is a well-established neighborhood with some homes over 100 years old. It is also on very valuable land, especially to property developers. The passing of alternatives 2 or 3 would displace this established neighborhood for the interest and benefit of developers.

I first became aware of these proposed changes when I received a mailing two to three weeks ago. As a result, I am not as well informed as I would like to be. However, I have started reading Chapter 36.70A of the RCW and the Washington State Department of Commerce website on Growth Management. In addition to those and other resources I can find, I plan to go through both Clark County and the City of Vancouver for meeting minutes that contain discussions related to these issues. I intend to further educate myself, look for any inconsistencies with the goals of the Growth Management Plan, see if there are actions contrary to the recommendations of the Department of Commerce, identify potential conflicts of interest, and anything else relevant to my concerns.

Lastly, regarding searching the minutes on the Clark County website, can you please tell me which terms or phrases I should use to find any information related to the rezoning of 5701 NE St. Johns Rd and 2001 Thomson Ave?

Thank you,

Nancy Reasor