From: Jeffrey Delapena
To: "Heidi Pozzo"
Cc: Oliver Orjiako; Jose Alvarez; Rebecca Messinger
Subject: RE: Comp Plan: Parcel 182138000
Date: Monday, September 21, 2026 10:24:00 AM

Hello Heidi,

Thank you for providing these comments related to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update. Confirming receipt, this will be added to the Comprehensive Plan Index of Record.

Best,

Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2026 5:18 PM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Comp Plan: Parcel 182138000

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.

Correction required before final adoption — parcel 182138000

The Planning Commission/Council Decision Table identifies parcel 182138000 for a change from MX to UM R-24. However, the proposed zoning-map exhibit depicts the parcel as R-50. These are not equivalent designations and the discrepancy cannot be resolved adequately through an informal statement that the “grid prevails.”

The Council is being asked to adopt a legislative package that includes both zoning maps and a decision table. A property owner, future purchaser, development applicant, County permit reviewer, or court reviewing the adoption record should not have to determine which of two conflicting County documents expresses Council's actual decision.

I request that, before final adoption, Council direct staff to:

Correct the zoning-map exhibit to show parcel 182138000 as UM R-24, if that is Council's intended designation;

Correct the associated authoritative GIS/source data and any derivative map products;

Include a written statement in the staff report, ordinance, findings, or exhibit list confirming that the correction is conforming and does not alter Council's substantive decision; and

If R-50 is instead intended, identify the public action, record evidence, and supporting analysis authorizing that change and continue the matter for a properly noticed decision.

Retaining an R-50 designation on the map while asserting that R-24 prevails in a table creates avoidable uncertainty and risks a future claim that R-50 was the adopted designation. The correction should be made in the legislative record now, before the final ordinance is adopted.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Chapter updates
Date: September 16, 2026 at 3:09:38 PM PDT
To: Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>

Hi Jose,

I was just looking at the map that is going to Council for the hearing on Oct. 1. It still has the R-50. Would you advise when it will be corrected?

Thank you,

Heidi

On Sep 1, 2026, at 5:02 PM, Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Heidi,

No, there is a conflict between the map and the table, the table shows the zoning at R-24 and the map at R-50. We are proposing to make the map R-24 so it is consistent with the table as it moves to the Council.

Jose Alvarez he/him/his
Program Manager II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4898

-----Original Message-----
From: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2026 4:40 PM
To: Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: Chapter updates

Hi Jose,

Just to clarify, previously you advised that the parcel was approved at R-24 on the decision table. The map is showing R-50. You indicated below that the map would be aligned to the decision table. Are you now saying that the recommendation is to align to the map at R-50? If you could please clarify.

Thank you,

Heidi

> On Sep 1, 2026, at 4:15 PM, Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov> wrote:
>
> Heidi,
>
> The map is reflecting the preferred alternative. I will point that out to the PC when they get to that line item in their deliberation.
>
> Jose Alvarez he/him/his
> Program Manager II
> COMMUNITY PLANNING
>
> 564.397.4898
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
> Sent: Friday, August 28, 2026 11:09 AM
> To: Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
> Cc: Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>
> Subject: Re: Chapter updates
>
> Hi Jose,
>
> Just wanted to follow up on this. I was just looking at the Planning Commission materials for next week and see that the map still has the parcel at R-50. Would you advise when it will be corrected?
>
> Thank you,

Heidi

> On Aug 23, 2026, at 4:25 PM, Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> Hi Jose,
>
> I was just looking at the maps that were included in the hearing on Thursday with the Planning Commission and saw that this parcel had not yet been adjusted. Would you advise when it will be corrected?
>
> Thank you,
>
> Heidi
>
> > On Aug 12, 2026, at 3:23 PM, Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov> wrote:
> >
> > Heidi,
> >
> > It was initially included as R-50 in Alternative 3 to preserve the higher end of density that could be allowed in the MX zone. When staff recommended scaling back the upzoning in the 179th corridor that was left as R-50 on the map but was still included in the Decision Table as R-24, creating an

inconsistency.

The change from MX to R-24 is in the Decision Table going to the Planning Commission and staff supports making the change on the map to reconcile the inconsistency between the map and the table.

Jose Alvarez he/him/his
Program Manager II
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4898

-----Original Message-----
From: Heidi Pozzo <hcpheidi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 8:34 AM
To: Susan Ellinger <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: Chapter updates

Thank you Susan!

I do have a question on a parcel on 164th that was changed from MX to R-50. There was a request from Ginn/Weber to go from MX to

R-22. Do you know why it was changed to R-50?

Thank you.

Heidi