From:	Cnty 2025 Comp Plan
To:	Chuck Houghten; Cnty 2025 Comp Plan
Subject:	RE: Comprehensive Plan Update Comments
Date:	Thursday, October 1, 2026 1:29:53 PM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png image004.png

Good day, Chuck,

Thank you very much for submitting these comments related to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan update.

Confirming this has been received and will be added to the Comprehensive Plan Index of Record. This will also be forwarded to be shared with the council prior to tonight's Hearing.

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: Clark County <webteam@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2026 12:57 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 Thu, 10/01/2026 - 12:57 PM

First Name
Chuck

Last Name
Houghten

Email Address
cjhoughten@gmail.com

Phone Number
3608523470

Address
16909 NE 227th Ave
Brush Prairie, Washington. 98606-8108

Message Subject
Comments On Comprehensive Plan Update

Comments
I would first like to thank the County Planning Staff and their support team for doing an amazing job for a very complex comprehensive planning process. I don't think there should be any shame or penalty for the time it takes to put a product like this together. That said, I still found it a challenge to find some of the details of the plan and EIS, online.
I have participated in the planning process since the Scoping effort began, provided comments during the process including for the Draft EIS. At Scoping, I first recommended development of an alternative that would plan for growth to occur within the existing Urban Growth Boundaries. Commenting on the Draft EIS for the Plan, I recommended support for Alternative 2 with the exception of expanding development into or causing impacts to existing agricultural and important natural resource areas. I primarily supported this alternative due to statements in the Draft EIS that concluded that focusing growth as in Alternative 1 (current UGB) could impact existing natural resources and open space amenities. I find that to be unacceptable. Natural resource areas such as forests, wetlands and open spaces should be expanded and better protected for a quality environment.
While I have been cautiously optimistic about the future of Clark County (including all the cities), I am now growing more concerned that we're in danger of losing too much of the quality of life that

many enjoy in our area. We are primed for more growth – the area is and will continue to be attractive and in high demand for more developments – both residential and commercial. As I see more land being down-zoned and subdivided outside of the existing UGB now, the future of quality agricultural areas, open space and natural areas becomes blurry.

I urge the County to further the study and assessment of the rural residential zones – essentially how much subdividing is too much and more specifically where will future sewer extensions be necessary to maintain water quality in our rivers, lakes and wetlands. I would also urge a separate detailed study to help design the future development along the I-5 corridor. Where will greenways/open spaces be retained; local transportation to the growing commerce and development likely in this area.

I urge the County and all the Cities to focus on the quality of life, the quality of our environment, and to avoid a sprawling approach. Focus on infilling and urban renewals where it makes sense to increase density. Preserve the rural environment and agricultural lands. Expand parks, recreation areas and open space, while improving access for foot and bicycle users.

I recommend that the County and Cities focus development over the next twenty years within the current UGB's. If Alternative 2 is selected, it should be modified to state that existing functioning agricultural and important natural resource areas (e.g. wetland and riparian lands) will be avoided or excluded from new developmental impacts.

Thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

© 2026 Clark County Washington