



City of Stevenson

Phone (509) 427-5970
Fax (509) 427-8202

7121 E Loop Road, PO Box 371
Stevenson, Washington 98648

May 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

Monday, May 10, 2021

6:00 PM

A. Preliminary Matters

1. Public Comment Expectations:

In Person: City Hall will be limited to 20 individuals. Mask Usage is required of all attendees.

Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85637388112> Conference Call: +1 253 215 8782
or +1 346 248 7799 ID #: 856 3738 8112

Please raise hand to comment. Individual comments should be limited to 3 mins.

Tools: *6 to mute/unmute & *9 to raise hand

2. Public Comment Period: (For items not located elsewhere on the agenda)

3. Minutes: March & April, 2021 Meeting Minutes

B. New Business

C. Old Business

4. Zoning Amendment: Increasing Residential Building Capacity: Reestablishing Public Involvement Expectations

D. Discussion

E. Adjournment

5. Staff & Commission Reports: ICMA Fellowship (Parking Intern), Public Tree Preservation Plan, Columbia Realignment Project

6. Thought of the Month: None

MINUTES

Stevenson Planning Commission Meeting Monday, March 08, 2021 at 6:00 PM

Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82001872319>

Conference Call: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799ID #: 820 0187 2319

Attending: Planning Commission Vice-Chair Auguste Zettler, Commissioner Davy Ray, Commissioner Jeff Breckel, Commissioner Mike Beck. Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel was not present.

City Staff: Community Development Director Ben Shumaker

Public Attendees: Mary Repar, Hannah Joy, Jack Clifton, Kelly McKee, Brian McKenzie, Robert Hume, Jeff Holt, Matthew Rivera, Dawn Neilson, Heena D., Annie McHale, Shawn Van Pelt, Rick May.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Zettler at 6:04 p.m. A quorum was established.

A. Preliminary Matters

1. Public Comment Expectations: **Vice Chair Zettler** explained the process and tools available to offer public comments: Please raise hand to comment. Individual comments should be limited to 3 minutes. (Tools: *6 to mute/unmute & *9 to raise hand.)

>Mary Repar asked if the Planning Commission was able to provide a definition of affordable housing, or was it the City Council's responsibility. She referred to Washington Gorge Action Program's editorial on affordable housing in the Pioneer the week of March 3rd, 2021. In response to a question by **Commissioner Ray, Community Development Director Ben Shumaker** reported there is a definition (based on percentage of income spent on housing) provided to inform developers of incentives available to encourage inclusion of affordable housing stock. **Commissioner Zettler** pointed out there is no good definition of affordable housing contained within the Comprehensive Plan and suggested it was something to review. He observed ADU's were recently approved in order to help increase affordable housing stock inventory. Lowering the cost of utility hook-ups was also briefly discussed. **Commissioner Breckel** noted policy makers, developers, financial institutions, real estate professionals, and advocates for the homeless needed to come together to problem solve. Further discussion resulted in all Commissioners agreeing it was a complex issue. They requested to have the topic revisited later.

2. Minutes: January 11th, 2021 Meeting Minutes

MOTION to approve January Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as presented was provided by **Commissioner Breckel** with a second provided by **Commissioner Beck**.

- Voting aye: **Commissioner Breckel, Beck, Ray and Zettler**

B. New Business

No new business was presented.

C. Old Business

3. Zoning Amendment: Increasing Residential Building Capacity: C1 Parking Text Amendment: Draft Ordinance & Public Engagement Efforts

Community Development Director Shumaker briefly explained the packet materials for Commission members. He noted there were 8 decision points for guidance. Two written comments were received regarding the proposed changes to parking. The draft ordinance included could be sent on to the City Council for final approval with any additional recommendations made by the Planning Commission during the meeting.

Shumaker highlighted the second staff report that summarized the outreach efforts made by city staff to engage the public in the parking issue.

He pointed to the matrix on page 9 as a way to help understand the parking programs and described a number of the recent changes made as requested by the Planning Commission. One remaining question had to do with allowances made for outdoor seating during COVID-19 restrictions, and if the changes should be permanent or temporary.

Vice-Chair Zettler then asked for public comments. He provided information on how to use the tools to join the remote meeting, and requested any comments be brief. No comments were received at that time.

Commissioner Beck shared his appreciation for having Planning Commission comments included, and **Commissioner Zettler** welcomed the graphics.

Shumaker responded to a comment regarding the new hotel in Stevenson on Russell Street. He explained it was not 'shoehorned in' under current parking exemptions, as there was no change of use.

Commissioners engaged in an extensive discussion regarding the proposed parking changes. All agreed fewer restrictions were preferred in order to help create a more vital and vibrant downtown area. Without parking, visitors are likely to drive on through and not stop.

Commissioner Breckel spoke of balancing the need for commercial development and visitor parking while being more 'resident friendly', and backed a possible fee-in-lieu system. Changes of use were considered in determining parking needs. **Commissioner Zettler** noted offsetting congestion was important, but without a city owned lot it is difficult to get buy in from businesses and residents. Having every business owner provide onsite parking was deemed impractical. Several Commissioners agreed time limits on parking was another way to help address the situation, but acknowledged parking time limits were currently unenforceable. Questions regarding the use of Columbia Street for additional parking after the realignment project were raised. **Commissioner Ray** recalled White Salmon had tried back-in diagonal parking without much success.

>Rick May provided comments to the Planning Commission. He thanked them for their work, and suggested the City purchase a lot to use for parking.

An additional discussion on COVID-19 safeguards and their affect on outdoor seating and subsequent parking needs for restaurants ensued. That discussion and the prior one resulted in the Planning Commission opting to submit several recommendations to the City Council, with a preface indicating they were interim steps as they anticipated further work on the issue. Points agreed to included:

- Have the City Council initiate flexible provisions for businesses and expanding the options to include all emergencies.
- If outdoor service areas put in during emergencies remain in place after the emergency is passed, ensure parking requirements in place prior to the situation will remain.
- Reduce parking requirements by removing administrative offices in professional buildings/clinics to lower net square footage of active usage used to calculate parking spaces (from 150' sq. to 200' sq).

Motion to approve the parking plan with the proposed changes was made by **Commissioner Beck** with a second by **Commissioner Breckel**. Prior to the vote **Commissioner Zettler** reiterated the Planning Commission was sending the proposed changes to the City Council as a draft, and the Council would be the ones to formally adopt.

- Voting aye: **Commissioner Breckel, Beck and Zettler**. **Commissioner Ray** did not vote, stating he preferred to remain neutral.

4. Zoning Amendment: Increasing Residential Building Capacity: Potential Map Change Expanding R3 Area

Community Development Director Shumaker provided background information on the items contained in the meeting packet, and described sections in the draft map. The purpose of the discussion is to begin assessing possible expansion of the R3 zone. No final decisions will be made during tonight's meeting.

He briefly described the 7 points the Planning Commission would be considering, and noted there was not a lot of support from property owners as indicated through survey responses. Their concerns centered on potential negative changes in neighborhood characteristics due to increased housing density.

Commissioners reviewed the proposed revisions within the residential zones. Questions were asked if and/or how increasing density by zoning changes would impact affordable housing. Being responsive to the concerns of existing property owners was seen as essential. Having a logical progression of zoning regulations rather than the mismatches highlighted was also discussed.

Commissioners agreed the recent approval of Accessory Dwelling Units had increased the capacity of Stevenson to add new dwellings. **Commissioner Beck** pointed out even with the expanded capacity few new secondary units were being constructed. He supported removing the need for an owner to occupy one of the homes in the R1 area. He stated he was in favor of simpler zoning rather than adding a new residential zone. **Commissioner Breckel** advised caution in opening up growth in areas that don't have the services, utilities and infrastructure to support, and noted the Planning Commission needed to be careful in offering flexibility.

>Mary Repar asked for more information from the community prior to any decisions. She asked about ADU's and what they were being used for-additional housing or additional income? She stated the rural nature of the community is important.

> Rick May offered comments as well on housing. He suggested additional affordable housing could be encouraged by lowering the cost of development and not by zoning changes. He also addressed the fears of property owners regarding changing the nature of neighborhoods.

>Annie McHale, a Stevenson City Councilor, shared her concerns about affordable housing, and advised the Planning Commission to be extra cautious in zoning changes, as it was misleading to have people think affordable housing will be a result.

Commissioner Beck provided a quick clarification, noting he possibly misspoke about affordable housing and zoning changes. He explained the flexibility would allow more opportunity for property owners. He noted in the R2 zone 58% of the properties have one structure, even though two are permitted. **Shumaker** provided information on the costs of utility connections. Water hook-ups cost ~\$7,000, with multi-family connections reduced to 57% of the initial cost. No reduction is available for sewer installations.

Commissioner Breckel again called for a broader discussion on affordable housing, with all players included. Use the opportunity to learn what is holding development back. He stated he liked the idea of exploring a new zoning definition that may lead to a replacement or modification of R2. **Commissioner Zettler** suggested further exploring the addition of flexible options to R2 similar to those provided in R1, noting criteria was already established.

Shumaker asked for and received permission from the Commissioners to draft possible changes to the R2 zone with their suggestions, and to work on 'rounding out' the odd-shaped boundary lines with input from **Commissioner Breckel**.

All commissioners supported the public outreach methods currently being used by city staff. They agreed using a similar approach and strategy for the Potential Map Change (Expanding R3) could help to maximize public participation and community input. **Commissioner Beck** asked to have any discussion on affordable housing not be included as it is a separate issue.

A brief review of the Iman Cemetery Road and No Name Road vacation petitions was held.

Commissioner Ray asked for and received clarification on the petitions. It was decided to hold further discussion at the March 15th, 2021 Planning Commission meeting, as time would still allow PC recommendations to the City Council for their March 18th, 2021 meeting.

D. Discussion

5. Staff & Commission Reports: Transportation Planning, Hood River Bridge, Dog Mountain Shuttle

Community Development Director Shumaker reported the City is seeking an RFQ for a transportation study and plan. He is hoping the study will be able to cost out off-site/off-street parking areas.

6. Thought of the Month:"Zoom Towns"<https://apautah.org/3730-2/>"The Great Real Estate Reset"<https://www.brookings.edu/essay/the-great-real-estate-reset-a-data-driven-initiative-to-remake-how-and-what-we-build/>

Shumaker explained the essay explores ‘Aspenization’, and the explosive growth of Jackson Hole, Wyoming, expanding on information provided by Mary Repar at a previous meeting. **Commissioner Beck** shared he was working with Kelly O’Malley-O’Keefe on a downtown parking inventory.

E. Adjournment Vice-Chair Zettler adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

DRAFT

Stevenson Planning Commission
Special Meeting Minutes
Held Remotely
Monday, March 15, 2021 6:00 PM

- Attending: Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel; Planning Commissioners Auguste Zettler, Mike Beck, Davy Ray, Jeff Breckel
- City Staff: Ben Shumaker, Community Development Director, Leana Kinley, Stevenson City Administrator
- Public attendees: Patricia Doblle, Jeff Van Camp, Eric Eisemann, Jack Wallis, Annie McHale, Brian MacNamara, several unknown callers.

Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

A. Preliminary Matters

1. Public Comment Expectations:

Public attendees were instructed by **Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel** on the tools in place to allow them to be recognized in order to provide comments. Please raise hand to comment. Individual comments should be limited to 3 minutes. Tools: Phone: *6 to mute/unmute & *9 to raise hand, or use reactions in Zoom website.

2. Public Comment Period:(For items not located elsewhere on the agenda)
No comments were received.

B. New Business

3. Public Hearing: SHOR2021-01 Rock Creek Pump Station: Reviewing a proposal within Shoreline Jurisdiction from the Stevenson Public Works Department.

Community Development Director Shumaker provided information on the items in the meeting packet. He noted there were eleven conditions of approval, with most procedural, and that city staff was recommending passage. He explained the application was subject to review under the Shoreline Management Plan approved and submitted to the Department of Ecology by the City Council, but not yet approved by DOE, which he noted was unusual. The SMP has not yet been officially adopted. The proposed has gone through a high level of scrutiny because of the federal funds involved.

Shumaker presented questions under an Appearance of Fairness Disclosure to Commission members. He explained the process was to ensure fair and impartial decision making. He asked each Commissioner to disclose any personal or financial interest in the proposal and if they would lose or gain anything financially through the project; if they had had any ex-parte communication about the project with anyone outside the Planning Commission meeting, and if there was anything else that would affect their ability to be fair and impartial.

All Commissioners responded no to each of the questions.
No challenges were raised by the applicants.

Commissioners reviewed the application documents and plans. A number of questions from Commissioners focused on the project's design and ability to withstand potential flood damage from Rock Creek. Project consultant Eric Eisemann from Ecological Land Services and lead engineer Jack Wallis from Wallis Engineering described construction details designed to protect the project against flooding. Other questions clarified map designations of riparian areas. **City Administrator Leana Kinley** advised the Planning Commission that recent heavy rainstorms had created significant problems related to the storm system where improvements are proposed, and the project could not be started soon enough. In response to a question from **Commissioner Beck** about SEPA responses, **Community Development Director Shumaker** noted only one response from a tribal entity.

Public Hearing: SHOR2021-01 Rock Creek Pump Station: Reviewing a proposal within Shoreline Jurisdiction from the Stevenson Public Works Department.

The public hearing was opened at 6:30 p.m. by **Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel**. No comments were received. **Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel** closed the public hearing at 6:31.

Following a short discussion, all Commissioners agreed the findings were fair and in line with the Shoreline Management Program and current zoning requirements.

MOTION to approve the **SHOR2021-01 Rock Creek Pump Station** was made by **Commissioner Zettler**, seconded by **Commissioner Ray**.

- Voting aye: Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel, Commissioner Ray, Zettler, Beck, and Breckel

C. Old Business

4. Street Vacation-Potential recommendation to City Council on a petition to vacate a section of Iman Cemetery Road at Rock Creek.

Community Development Director Shumaker asked **Commissioner Beck** to provide information on the road vacation petition for a section of Iman Creek Cemetery Road that has been submitted to the City Council. The Planning Commission has expressed interest in providing a recommendation to the City Council on the matter, and **Commissioner Beck** served on a sub-committee established to address the request. A public hearing on the matter is scheduled for the March 18th, 2021 City Council meeting.

Commissioner Zettler referred to information contained in the meeting packet regarding prior discussions on the issue. Maintaining access to Rock Creek was noted as a concern. **Commissioner Breckel** also highlighted the difficulties adjoining landowners face with trespass,

litter, parking problems, sanitation and property damage. Input from the Skamania County Cemetery District and Public Works was also considered.

Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel invited public comment, but none was received.

Commission Ray shared information on his site visit and discussions with property owners and wants the City's presence in the area to work out for the property owners.

Following an extensive discussion, the Commissioners arrived at a consensus to recommend against vacation, but called upon the Stevenson City Council to recognize the area has become an attractive nuisance and to accept responsibility for maintaining the city owned property and right-of-way.

D. Discussion

5. Staff & Commission Reports:

Commission members received information on new weight restrictions on Hood River Bridge and the potential increase in truck traffic that may occur through Stevenson along SR 14. The Dalles bridge will also undergo repairs beginning in late summer 2021.

The Dog Mountain Shuttle will resume soon with lower passenger capacities dictated by COVID-19 safeguards. Construction along Rock Creek may affect the weekday routes. Columbia Area Transit in Hood River may be able to provide larger vehicles with more seating.

The Stevenson City Council will hold a strategic planning retreat, March 27, 1-4 p.m. at the Hegewald Center. **Commissioner Ray** agreed to attend as a Planning Commission representative, with **Commissioner Beck** considering attendance as well.

E. Adjournment

Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

MINUTES
April 2021 Planning Commission Meeting
Monday, April 12, 2021
6:00 PM

In Person: City Hall was limited to 20 individuals.

Mask Usage was required of all attendees.

Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88265425672>

Attending: Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel, Commissioners Auguste Zettler, Davy Ray, Jeff Breckel, Mike Beck; Community Development Director Ben Shumaker.

Public attendees: Karen Rutledge, Phil Crawford, Mary Repar, Annie McHale, Rick May, Pat Rice, Kim Salveson, Tracy Grotto, Julie Fitzpatrick-May, Art Yeoman, David Wyatt, Caryl McMains, David Cox, Kim Stafford, Dawn Nielsen, Kent Nielsen, Kelly McKee and several unidentified participants.

Planning Commission Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel opened the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

A. Preliminary Matters

1. Public Comment Expectations:

PC Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel explained the public comment process and how to use the online tools to remotely participate. Please raise hand to comment, and limit comments to 3 minutes. Tools: For virtual attendees use *6 to mute/unmute & *9 to raise hand.

2. Public Comment Period: (For items not located elsewhere on the agenda)

>Mary Repar asked how Stevenson wanted to be seen as a community. She spoke about BnB's, summer residences and weekend houses and how much tax was collected from these part-time residences. She noted she has seen increasing numbers of gated housing. She asked the Commission when they were going to address the issue of affordable housing as it relates to the city's work plan. She commented the lack of affordable housing is a concern throughout the U.S.

B. New Business

3. b. Short Plat Review: SP2021-01 McMains Short Plat Planning Commission Optional Review

Community Development Director Ben Shumaker summarized the Short Plat Review. The City of Stevenson Planning Department received a short plat application for a lot along Ryan Allen Road north of Lakeview Street. The tax lot number for the property is 02-07-02-1-0-0300. The property address is 47 SW Ryan Allen Road and is developed with a single-family detached dwelling in the SR Suburban Residential District.

Per the city code, the Planning Commission is to be notified and given the opportunity to review the application. The proposal involves division of one ~1.8 acre property into 2 lots of ~0.81 acres and ~0.95 acres in area.

Shumaker recommended the Planning Commission bypass its review of the short plat and entrust the decision on the application to the Short Plat Administrator. Plans with 4 lots or less can be reviewed through this process.

The Planning Commission agreed through consensus to allow city staff to make the decision on the Short Plat review SP2021-01.

C. Old Business

4. Zoning Amendment: Increasing Residential Building Capacity: Potential Text Change and Map Amendment-New R2 Standards, Expanding R2 & R3 Areas.

Community Development Director Shumaker provided background information on the proposed text amendments and map changes. Changes allowing additional construction on all properties currently zoned R2 and a subset of properties currently zoned R1 are being considered. At its March 2021 regular meeting, the Planning Commission requested modifications to the previous concept of expanding the R3 zone. The draft policy presented in the meeting packet for review was in response to the Commission's and community's concerns. The modifications were presented for the Commission's review. **Shumaker** noted there were no decision points to be reached at the meeting, just more discussion on the proposed text and map amendments.

Shumaker summarized proposed items in the draft which provided greater flexibility for owners of R2 property. These were decreasing the minimum lot size, allowing a greater number of units per acre, eliminating maximum lot coverage limitations, allowing 4-plexes and 3-plexes and decreasing front setbacks. Areas providing greater regulation included prohibiting the use of new septic systems and limitation of structures near driveway.

He described the outreach process used to solicit input. A website (ci.stevenson.wa.us/letsbuild/) provided information and gathered public comments on the proposed amendments; hard copies of letters with maps were mailed to owners of all tax parcels in the R2 District and R1 Core Area; city staff attended a neighborhood meeting to provide background information and hear concerns; and emails related to the April 12th, 2021 Planning Commission meeting were sent to those known by City staff to own property or have an interest in the area.

PC Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel asked about notes from conversations Shumaker had with property owners along Frank Johns Road. He responded that the property owners kept the notes, and the discussion involved explaining the specifics of the draft and listening to the owners' questions and concerns, including potential traffic increases, changes to city neighborhood characteristics, and difficulty in understanding the amendment language and maps.

>Karen Rutledge asked where is this information coming from and explained difficulty finding own property on maps.

Commissioner Breckel stated it was important to go through the current Zoning Map to identify what would be accomplished. He reflected on anomalies in the maps, with odd shaped bits of land, and zoning districts that don't necessarily reflect the use of the land. He noted access to basic services and neighborhood characteristics was essential to provide for a logical and orderly system of growth outside of the city center. He pointed to the layout of the current sewer system as an example of past haphazard planning.

Commissioner Zettler asked for clarification on the difference between the multiple units for R2 described in page 19 and 21 of the packet. He stated it was unclear whether they were Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) and asked about the 4 units now provided for in the updated draft, noting that would change the neighborhood feel considerably. He commented that more equitable

usage was what he thought the Planning Commission wanted. **Commissioner Ray** agreed with **Commissioner Breckel** regarding the sewer lines, and asked for clarification regarding a comment made in a letter submitted to the Commission.

>Rick May asked how many units could be put on a site. He pointed out there were no changes proposed to the actual number of buildings and density was not increased. He stated the recent Housing Needs Analysis recommended increases in the number of allowable units.

Commissioner Ray asked about plans for connecting Del Ray, and Shumaker advised it was unknown, as the neighborhood itself would have to make decisions.

Commissioner Beck spoke about the updates to the zoning maps, stating they appeared modest in scope and accommodating for future growth and housing affordability. He appreciated the current revisions as a good compromise, and pointed out some changes in R2 were in line with goals in the city's Comprehensive Plan. Section 3.2.2 spoke to 'ensuring adequate land for development of multi-family housing development.'

Middle density is intended to facilitate a range of residential uses. Any actual changes would be driven by the property owners, with expanded density providing potential economic opportunity. He pointed out that changes could occur already, even without the proposed zoning amendments. The City Council should be a part of determining how expansion of the sewer system should be funded.

A further discussion took place on new use of private septic systems and future sewer line expansion. Questions were raised over the prohibition of new septic systems when sewer lines were not available to connect to, and what takes place if an ADU is constructed. **Shumaker** clarified existing septic systems can be used until they fail. Extension of sewer lines in R1 is the issue.

PC Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel expressed reluctance about 'infill' and Shumaker suggested that was possibly a policy discussion for the Planning Commission to consider later.

Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel then opened the meeting up for public comments.

> Annie McHale stated it was good to have voices heard. She was OK with modest changes, agrees with some, but cannot make certain changes won't happen. She asked about controlling design changes in impacted areas.

>6:56 p.m. Phil Crawford spoke about liking the ability to walk to local stores and services.

Extending services without annexation is bad policy.

>Tracy Grotto. ? Stated she helped organize a neighborhood meeting. She asked for less complex language in letters to homeowners to make it easier to understand and clarification on the public involvement process. She volunteered to help with any additional outreach attempts.

>Rick May commented about the underlying effort to make development easier for affordable housing, calling it a noble goal. Proposed changes look to future and what Stevenson will need for housing. He referred to the recent Housing Needs Assessment and asked why the PC was proposing the changes.

Commissioner Breckel spoke about ensuring a logical growth pattern to avoid erratic service coverage, and noted there was no hurry to make changes.

>Pat Rice asked what is driving this revision? He asked about grant funding and how it defined the deliverables.

Shumaker responded there were housing needs identified and recommendations made in the Housing Needs Assessment. He noted further analysis showed additional housing is needed, or affordability will decrease while rent and utilities will increase.

He described the two main deliverables-the first included the staff report introducing the topic, and the second is the ordinance/regulatory change. He pointed out the community conversation needs to take place prior to any ordinance change and the grant deliverables do not drive the outcome.

>Pat Rice reported people on Del Ray do not want the south side of Del Ray to be R3. He asked why the recent RFP for a traffic study included costing out completion of Del Ray extension. He asked about the community involvement process and the Del Ray neighborhood. He has 5 buildable lots he was ready to build on. He claimed city hall was slowing building by being unresponsive, and related his requests for a habitat biologist were not being met. He suggested some city forms could be resigned to reduce the need to repeat information, and asked for rules regarding utility costs for smaller structures.

>Karen Rutledge thanked the Commission for their work. She stated the documents are hard to understand, and encouraged more public forums. She commented property owners get emotional when their property is seen to be affected by something they don't understand. She suggested additional stakeholders need to be included.

>Phil Crawford Reinforce Tracy's point regarding other stakeholders. Agrees with business development, but livability and quality of life is not being addressed. Study did not include other stakeholders or advocates for them. Some are willing to help with outreach.

> Rick May encouraged more flexibility, and spoke about a local homeowner facing extreme costs to connect to sewer. He stated it would cost 3X the value of the lot to extend the sewer line, and asked about the HNA recommendation regarding alternatives to sewer systems. It was pointed out that section referred to places without public systems, most notably the Carson area.

Shumaker responded to the comments about public involvement, noting the first task the Planning Commission does is set the public strategy. He reiterated the process used for the current zoning amendments, pointing out the questionnaire had places for property owners to express opinions.

Commissioner Breckel concurred it was hard for folks to sit in a PC meeting to talk about issues unless it has direct impact. Most people don't know what their property is zoned, so when changes are proposed suddenly questions arise. He stated hard decisions about the future will need to be made, and getting people interested means having more conversations about new ideas.

Commissioner Zettler maintained change was often hard to visualize. He noted the Comprehensive Plan was set up to guide work ten years in the future. It needs to be rewritten periodically to reflect new needs and conditions.

Commissioner Ray, stating 'we are in business to do the bestest for the mostest', agreed with staying aligned with the comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Beck reminded everyone Covid restrictions made it remarkably difficult to hold meetings to gather public input. The Planning Commission is trying to accommodate the public's request to be more involved. He noted the proposed changes have guidance from the comprehensive plan and HNA and show the potential to accommodate future growth. He agreed

more conversations are needed, and asserted no drastic changes were planned for tonight. He appreciated the staff's efforts to get public input.

>Julie Fitzpatrick-May spoke in favor of more public input and more open communication. She suggested there were better ways to communicate, and noted she had neighbors that did not receive information.

She stated Tracy's comments and offers to help with outreach are appreciated. She asked about having more information for owner-specific questions regarding what can be done with property.

>Phil Crawford sees opportunity for communication, not finger wagging. Neighborhood is all in. Agreed there were tremendous challenges this year.

Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel briefly reviewed comments and asked if more flexibility was possible. She asked if it would be possible to have more outreach with interactive maps in view of the concerns expressed.

>Rick May, all we want to know is what is your plan?

Community Development Director Shumaker spoke about the different messages he was hearing. He noted some commenters wanted increased flexibility, while others called for more controls and he was struggling to understand how both can occur.

>Rick May offered to give credit where credit is due. He appreciated recent planning work done in the commercial area and parking. Can't make homeowners in areas with no sewers have sewers. Have to answer and deal with concerns rising from change.

>Pat Rice-questions need to be answered before plans are created, who pays for what, when and where. Discussion still is needed regarding changes.

Commissioner Breckel appreciated the honest feedback. He also thanked **Shumaker** for his attempts to involve the public, especially when it's not easy to meet in person. He pointed to the number of people present as an indication of success in reaching people.

Community Development Director Shumaker shared that at the neighborhood meeting organized by Tracy and Phil Crawford it was brought up that public meetings by the city are viewed with suspicion by some, and that some believe decisions are already made. He asked for direction by the Commission in how to move forward.

>Pat Rice asked why not implement a 2020 goal to have city staff meet with neighborhood residents. His neighborhood has ideas on development, but thinks the city doesn't want to meet as the city has its own plan.

Commissioner Zettler agreed questions about why things are being done by the city is a recurring discussion and needs to be kept in mind when presenting changes. There is an expectation to be informed.

Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel asked **Shumaker** what he needed from the Planning Commission, and he responded that a direction to present a draft public engagement policy would be great.

>Rick May stated the issue is we don't know why.

Commissioner Zettler suggesting going back to basics to explain zones and the changes being proposed, as it is awkward for someone who does not understand the language or the terms.

Commissioner Beck recommended having clarity from the City Council regarding plans to expand or extend the sewer system in the city.

Community Development Director Shumaker summarized the discussion points from the meeting. He and **Commissioner Breckel** will work together on a draft public engagement strategy.

He clarified the use of more laymen's terms would be appropriate. He will get an update from other city staff on sewer plans.

D. Discussion

5. Staff & Commission Reports: ICMA Fellowship (Parking Intern)

Shumaker reported the City has posted a temporary position with the University of Washington in hopes of finding a student to work as an intern. The primary focus will be parking issues, with work done on conducting a gap analysis of existing on and off street parking.

6. Thought of the Month: Community Submission: Zoning Opinion Article

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/04/opinion/affordable-housing-california.html?referringSource=articleShare>

Shumaker explained the article about the City of Berkeley ties zoning to overt racism.

E. Adjournment The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Johanna Roe



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

7121 E Loop Road, PO Box 371
Stevenson, Washington 98648

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: August 10th, 2020
SUBJECT: Increasing Residential Building Capacity – Public Involvement

Introduction

This memo deals with public involvement in the discussion of increasing residential building capacity. It includes a catalogue of the public involvement efforts undertaken by the City so far and summarizes the results of those efforts. Finally, it asks the Planning Commission to broaden those efforts.

The discussion underlying this public involvement involves a suite of potential amendments to the Zoning Code, Zoning Map, and Stevenson Municipal Code's water/sewer utility connection requirements. The amendments come from several sources, including the 2020 *Skamania County Housing Needs Analysis*, the draft 2020 *Downtown Plan for Success!*, the 2013 *Stevenson Comprehensive Plan*, city elected/appointed official concepts, city staff analysis, public input, etc. See Attachment 1 for additional information on the scope of the potential amendments.

Efforts Undertaken To Date

The Planning Commission kicked-off this discussion on August 10th, 2020. The staff memo to that meeting continues to serve as an important source of information in this discussion. That memo, as well as a great deal of additional information is available at <http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/letsbuild/>. At that meeting, the Planning Commission discussed its public involvement expectations, including:

- 1) Satisfying the minimum requirements (A public hearing by the City Council, Advertising the public hearing by Staff, Recommending action by the Planning Commission).
- 2) Exceeding the minimum requirements (Mailings to affected property owners, Iterative Planning Commission Workshops, Community questionnaires, Stakeholder taskforces).
- 3) Providing opportunities for involvement during COVID (Outdoor workshops)

To date, the following efforts have been organized to exceed the minimum requirements. Together, these efforts generated 1,190+ engagements by the public.

- 1) Project Website. The city website was updated to include this project and acts as a repository for all information. No analytics have been performed to understand how many have engaged with this opportunity.
- 2) Community Questionnaires. Four separate questionnaires were circulated using surveymonkey.com and each were available for approximately 1 month. In total, the questionnaires generated 135 responses. The anonymous nature of the questionnaire does not allow reporting of the specific number of individuals.
- 3) Council/Commission Liaisons. Two City Council members and 1 Planning Commissioner were explicitly available to residents of the R1 Single-Family Residential and R2 Two-Family Residential districts where map (and then map and text changes) were considered. These liaisons report a total of 4 community members engaged with this opportunity.

- 4) Direct Mailings. Information about the above opportunities along with discussion draft amendments and upcoming Planning Commission meetings were sent via USPS mail to all property owners in the areas impacted by the amendments and via email to individuals known by staff to own or have interest in the affected areas. In total, owners of 232 properties were sent letters initiating and updating the conversation. The email distribution lists grew overtime as community involvement grew, currently the 4 lists combined have 268 email recipients.
- 5) Stakeholder Interviews. The Community Questionnaires and Direct Mailings offered interested individuals the opportunity to have more in-depth discussions with staff about their views/experiences. In total, 4 community members engaged with this opportunity.
- 6) Social Media Postings. Information about the City website and the community questionnaires (twice for each) were posted on the City's Facebook page. In total, these posts generated 735 views, 110 clicks, 83 reactions (comments/shares/likes/etc.).
- 7) Iterative Planning Commission Workshops. The Planning Commission has met monthly since the project kicked-off in August 2020. Each specific topic has involved at least 2 meetings, with the first introducing a discussion draft of a potential change along with the public involvement steps initiated to initiate the discussion. Subsequent meetings then considered how public contributions to the discussion could be incorporated into subsequent drafts. Until March 2021, all meetings were held remotely via Zoom. The April 2021 saw the return of limited in-person participation along with the remote, Zoom option. The minutes of these meetings reflect participation by 38 named individuals and attendance by an unknown number of unnamed individuals.
- 8) City Council Public Hearings. To date, the City Council has held 2 public hearings on the amendments recommended by the Planning Commission. Public participation occurred at these meetings. The numbers are not reported here because the hearings are part of the minimum requirement Zoning Code amendments.
- 9) Notable Limitations.
 - a. Direct mailings to the public via mail/email focus on property owners. This excludes renters and those unable to afford housing in the area considered. The mailings also rely on the addresses maintained Skamania County and did not reach those who have since-changed addresses.
 - b. Community questionnaires are not statistically valid surveys of the Stevenson community, and no effort has been made to collect statistically valid surveys.

Results of Past Public Involvement

To date, the City has adopted 2 ordinances intended to increase residential building capacity. The first deals with the text of the R3 Multi-Family Residential District, the second with the text of the C1 Commercial District and the parking requirements of the Zoning Code. Both ordinances reflect the public's engagement in their topics. In several cases the engagement confirmed broad policies stances underlying the discussion draft regulations mailed in the initial contact. In both ordinances, the public's involvement resulted in changes to the discussion drafts.

Notable changes include:

- Limiting the allowance of larger-scale senior care housing in the R3 District.
- Adding pedestrian protections near driveways in the R3 District.
- Reducing types of building areas triggering parking requirements.
- Reducing the amount of parking required of clinics.
- Expanding incentives for certain construction in the C1 District.

Planning Commission Guidance

The conversations though of the R3 and C1 districts involved allowing more where a lot was already allowed. The conversation involved in the R2 and Core Area R1 involve allowing more where less is currently allowed. A larger

number of current residents/owners are engaging the public involvement opportunities and asking for more, deeper discussion about the topics and it is clear the initial public involvement strategies should be reevaluated. To ensure the proposed changes incorporates public input and occurs within a manageable timeline, the Planning Commission is asked to address the following guidance points:

Guidance Point #1: Should the public involvement strategies be expanded to include an all-community Open House?

Conceptually, the Open House would be held at the Hegewald Center. The format would involve a staff preamble explaining the why, what, how questions underlying the potential changes followed by break-out exercises for the public to provide guidance on specific topics (e.g., location, affordability, transportation corridors/utility services, building design, etc.).

Guidance Point #2: Is a follow-up, all-community Town Hall appropriate to satisfy the public's need for engagement on this topic?

Conceptually, the Town Hall would also be held at the Hegewald Center. The format would involve a staff listing of potential actions gleaned from the Open House, followed by round-robin opportunities for verbal testimony and written comment sheets.

Next Steps

At the conclusion of this meeting, staff will initiate the requested public involvement strategies and prepare materials to assist the public engagement. The Planning Commission should expect to see this topic again on its June meeting agenda.

Prepared by,

Ben Shumaker
Community Development Director

Attachment

- Scope/Status of Potential Amendments

Attachment 1 – Scope/Status of Potential Amendment

Potential Amendment Topic	Status
2020 Skamania County Housing Needs Analysis	
Expand Accessory Dwelling Unit Flexibility Allow Duplexes in R1 Align Zoning with Water/Sewer Plans & Improvements Consolidate R2 & R3 Districts Reduce Minimum Lot Size in R2, R3, & CR Districts Permit Senior Housing Options in R3 Conditionally Permit Senior Housing Options in R2 Permit Live/Work Spaces in C1 District Allow Lot Size Averaging Reduce Setbacks Increase Maximum Lot Coverage Develop Shadow Platting Requirements Rezone Areas near Frank Johns Road, Loop Road, Vancouver Avenue, School Street Allow Utility Extension Beyond City Limits Subject to Annexation Agreements Jointly Plan with Skamania County through an Intergovernmental Agreement Perform City/County Fiscal Analyses of Annexation Jointly Pursue Funding for Utility Extensions Identify Publicly-owned Properties Suitable for Housing Acquire Tax-Delinquent Properties Pursue Community Land Trust Develop Regional [Wetland] Mitigation Banking Lobby Legislature for Homestead Taxation Authority	Not Considered Not Considered Being Discussed Being Discussed Adopted (R3/CR) Being Discussed (R2) Considered, Rejected Not Considered To Be Discussed Adopted Adopted (R3) Being Discussed (R2) Adopted (R3) Being Discussed (R2) To Be Discussed Being Discussed Being Discussed Not Considered Unrelated to Zoning Unrelated to Zoning Unrelated to Zoning Unrelated to Zoning Unrelated to Zoning Unrelated to Zoning Unrelated to Zoning
Draft Downtown Plan for SUCCESS!	
Establish Sub-Zones within Downtown Area to Guide Location of Housing Reduce Residential Parking Requirements Conditionally Approve Parking Reductions for Senior and Affordable Housing Conditionally Approve Other Parking Reductions Develop Fee-in-Lieu of On-Site Parking Requirements Incentivize Mixed-Use via Parking Reductions Reduce Parking for Food Service Uses & Retail Stores Expand Off-Site Parking Options for Hotels Develop Shared Parking Lots Improve Walking/Biking Routes to Shared Parking Lots Expand Options for Joint-Use of Parking Agreements Facilitate Innovation through Bikeshares, Employee Cash-out Programs, etc. Establish Minimum Densities for new Housing Development	To Be Discussed Adopted Adopted Adopted Adopted Adopted Adopted Adopted Future Discussion Future Discussion Adopted Not Considered To Be Discussed
Others (Incomplete List of Planning Commission-,Public- & Staff-Led Topics)	
Expand R2 & R3 Near Schools Protect Pedestrians Near Driveways Align Loop Road & Frank Johns Road Zoning with Comprehensive Plan Rezone Split-Zoned Parcels	Being Discussed Adopted (R3) Being Discussed (R2) Being Discussed Being Discussed



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Planning Commission meeting ~ Tonight? Not on the calendar online

Julie May <julie@bowlesmarketplace.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 11:06 AM

To: planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Cc: Julie May <julie@bowlesmarketplace.com>, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hello Ben & Planning Commission~

I just got the agenda this very second as writing to find out if indeed a meeting.

I am on the road the rest of today, and would have liked to have seen the agenda with more time than just a few hours before the meeting.

Biggest question on my mind: I am very curious about the community outreach going on for the zoning proposals.

Thank you~

~Julie

Julie May;
Marketing & Public Relations Manager for Bowles Marketplace
julie@bowlesmarketplace.com
(cell) 503-201-9460

www.BowlesMarketplace.com
"Your Littleton Community Marketplace"



Plans

Susan Krug <lvkrug30@yahoo.com>
To: Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Thu, Apr 15, 2021 at 9:26 AM

Ben,
Thanks for the information. I was not thinking that the city would be responsible for a cemetery as we do have the cemetery district within the county, however I wanted to find out if any plans are in place for the future of the cemetery district to purchase property that the city planners would plan for our community. The two entities should be working together as we are all headed in the same direction and death is part of that so plans should be made as our city is growing in leaps and bounds and places to bury our loved ones should be included in those plans.
Thanks again for your help and would ask that the planning board do more about finding out what or if any thing could be included in future plans for the city.
Susan

On Wednesday, April 14, 2021, 04:57:46 PM PDT, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Susan-

To my knowledge, the City has never considered establishing a city-run cemetery. As a result, I don't believe any specific site selection process has ever occurred.

The extent of the future cemetery planning I am aware of is limited to:

a) The Zoning Code's listing of "Cemetery or Mausoleum" as a contemplated use.

https://library.municode.com/wa/stevenson/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO_CH17.13USCLDE_17.13.060EDPUADHECAOTINUS

This use is then listed as Condition Use in the SR Suburban

Residential.

https://library.municode.com/wa/stevenson/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO_CH17.15REDI_17.15.040US

http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Zoning_Stevenson_MapUpdate20161012.pdf

b) Similarly, our draft Shoreline Management Program, considered appropriate areas and suggests their prohibition in Aquatic and Natural areas, as Shoreline Conditional Uses in the Shoreline Residential, and as Permitted in the Urban Conservancy areas. See page 42 of this link for the draft use table and page 93 for the draft map.

http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Resolution2018_322_Exhibit_D_SMP.pdf

Based on these restrictions, proponents seeking to create a cemetery would have some indication of where that would and would not be possible.

Please let me know if you have other questions,

BEN SHUMAKER

-----Original Message-----

From: 'Susan Krug' via planning [mailto:planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us]

Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 11:27 AM

To: planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Subject: Plans

Question: Does the city have another cemetery site in the plans for the Stevenson area's future use? If not why not? Thank you.

Susan Krug, Stevenson



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Housing memo for PC


Mary Repar <repar2014@gmail.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 10:54 AM

To: ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us, planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Hi, Ben,
I've been thinking about housing in our community. For tonight's planning commission meeting.. Please see attached. Thank you.

Mary Repar

 **Housing_29April2021.docx**
16K

There but for the Grace of God... We will never build enough affordable housing for a rising population until we address the wealth disparity that prevents working people from owning their own home. We will never have equitable, affordable housing for working people until we de-commodify housing. For too long we have treated housing like a commodity that is not a human right. Especially when there is so much money to be made! Oh, my! The house that was built in the 1970's or '80's for under a hundred thousand dollars now sells for three or four hundred thousand or more! What's not to like.

One solution is that for every three housing units built, we should build one affordable home. No matter what type of development, a subdivision, townhomes, condos, apartments, etc., a similar type of affordable unit should be built in that development. Building low income and subsidized housing in separate developments only works to set these folks apart from their neighbors, making them appear separated from the wider society.

These affordable homes also need to be designated as such for 40 or 50 years so that they are not sold for profit.

The tax laws pertaining to housing need to change. Why should a homeowner be forced to buy a bigger or more expensive home after selling their own? Why not save that money for retirement or other investments? Why not get some tax credit for downsizing? Yes, a sales tax should be paid on the profit made from selling that home and that money used to build more affordable housing stock.

We have gotten used to making money from housing and this has to stop. Housing and/or shelter, like food, water, and safety are a human right and should not be treated as a commodity that only those with more money, or luck, should have access to. To de-commodify is to make equitable.

In 2008, we saw the effect of greed and commodification of housing blast through our society with a vengeance. Hundreds of thousands of homeowners found their loans under water and lost their homes. Then what happened? Greed happened. Those homes were purchased at firehouse sales by limited liability corporations and other entities and became pricey rentals that are making huge amounts of money for these guys but also serve to highlight a major problem of commodifying housing: commodified, overpriced housing is no longer available to working people in our country.

Working people, the labor that is the grease for our entire economy and society, deserve better. They deserve a living wage, they deserve to live and work in a society that honors and values their labor and promotes equitable housing for all people. Working people are not here to serve society, to make sure that we are fed and watered while they struggle making minimum wage. Working people are us and deserve respect.

All this will require changes in legislative policies that now favor commodifying housing instead of fostering a more equitable housing situation. Rent control, proposition 13-like tax policy, higher taxation policy on second and third and fifth homes, etc., and much more should be on the table.

Do we want to foster a nation of home owners as was done after WW II, or do we want to continue to make housing stock a gambling chip where those who are lucky enough or rich enough continue to make money off housing disparities and inequities? We have to decide what kind of society we want. Do we want people living, working, vesting in our communities? Do we want to be a society that views home ownership a privilege and not a human right? Or, will we face reality and choose equity and equality over temporary monetary gain? Will we work toward more haves than have nots?

There, but for the Grace of God go we all...



Housing Need Figures

Robert Muth <rcmuth88@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 29, 2021 at 8:17 AM

To: Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

Cc: Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Robert Muth <robert.muth@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Amy Weissfeld <amy.weissfeld@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Paul Hendricks <paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Annie McHale <annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Dave Cox <dave.cox@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Scott Anderson <scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, David Ray <david.ray@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Valerie Hoy <valerie.hoy@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Auguste Zettler <auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Rick - Thank you. Look forward to a deeper dive into the information and informed decisions.

Thanks.

On Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 2:49 PM Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net> wrote:

Robert,

Great idea Robert. I believe it would be useful for the Council and Public to see the full range of possibilities, from lowest to highest, focusing on the most likely scenario. I have seen no public document from the City or been privy to any Council conversations that have done this with the Johnson Economics Stevenson Report. Only the highest number in the range has been published in any memo. I believe well thought out decisions are built on good information. Thank you for your response.

Rick May

On Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 2:31 PM Robert Muth <rcmuth88@gmail.com> wrote:

Rick - As a council member, I certainly appreciate public input especially input from qualified citizens as yourself.

My only question in this email chain, is should Council and Planning not have both numbers - most reliable and highest? Seems we should have all the information available to make any well informed decision.

Again, thank you for your input and associated comments, very much appreciated.

Robert C. Muth

On Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 2:20 PM Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net> wrote:

Good afternoon Ben

First, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. That likely took significant time and it is appreciated. However, may I suggest you might be over analyzing my request. John Spikkelan, the Author of The Johnson Economics Report for Stevenson noted the baseline number is the *most reliable figure of projected future housing demand for Stevenson*. As I stated before, I believe it is appropriate to provide City Council and the Public with the *most reliable* demand figures, not the highest possible figure in the range. This was my only request, most reliable not highest please. Thank you.

Rick May

On Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 12:40 PM Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Rick-

Do I have this correct? You are ascribing a greater value to the 2019 report than the 2020 report based on your conversation with the author of the 2019 report.

I'm curious to know whether you believe I am ascribing a greater value to anything that has been presented. If you do believe that, then I would like to correct you.

My stance: The City has collected a great deal of information about likely future growth, including 2 stand-alone reports which were prepared using different methodologies based on 2 overlapping market areas with 2 overlapping time horizons. The role I have taken in this is to provide that information for the public and the decision makers to interpret, to assign value to, and determine whether actions should be taken. The email conversation you've initiated here is evidence of my success in this role.

In this role, I also synthesized the information of the reports to provide an apples-to-apples comparison. Nowhere in that synthesis did I intend to undermine either report or to elevate one over the other. You are requesting that I do so now, and I don't see how I can honor that request without undermining the professional agnosticism required of me. That said, you remain free to value whatever information you find most useful, and I encourage you and all others to do so.

I'm also curious to understand what direction you believe the City should be taking when considering changes to the Zoning Code. It appears, and please correct me if this is not true, you want the City's regulations to:

- Consider a 10-year planning horizon, and no longer,
- Limit housing growth to 129 units within that horizon.

The current discussion has not been tailored to achieve any certain number of homes within any certain timeline. As a result, the conversation hasn't grappled with which consultants' methodologies result in more worthy limitations. As the conversation evolves though, it certainly can, and if that is what you are suggesting here, this will provide a way to do so.

Thank you,

BEN SHUMAKER

From: Rick May [mailto:rick@mayandassociates.net]

Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 10:14 AM

To: Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Cc: Robert Muth <robert.muth@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Amy Weissfeld <amy.weissfeld@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Paul Hendricks <paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Annie McHale <annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Dave Cox <dave.cox@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Scott Anderson <scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; David Ray <david.ray@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Valerie Hoy <valerie.hoy@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Auguste Zettler <auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Subject: Re: Housing Need Figures

Good Morning Ben,

Thank you for your quick response. Maybe there was some misunderstanding with my request. If so, my apology. Let me be clear now. John Spikkelan, the Author of The Johnson Economics Report for Stevenson noted the baseline number is the *most reliable figure of projected future housing demand for Stevenson*. I believe it is appropriate to provide City Council and the Public with the *most likely* demand figures, not the highest possible figure. Thank you.

Rick May / 503-341-2932

On Mon, Apr 26, 2021 at 9:20 AM Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us> wrote:

Hello-

The discrepancy noted by Mr. May is explained in the memo he references. See attached in the second bullet point on the first page and the table note on the second page. The memo uses the high estimate out of necessity. The 2020 Housing Needs Analysis only reports the high growth forecasts. The 2019 Residential Market Analysis reports low, baseline, and high. As a result, the high growth estimate is the only apples-to-apples that can possibly be offered.

In either case, a) growth is expected, b) growth is expected at a faster rate than that seen in the preceding 10 years, and c) the type of housing necessary for this growth differs from that being provided by the market.

The policies currently being evaluated contain varied methods to a) enable the growth anticipated, b) ensure the anticipated growth occurs in appropriate areas/forms, and c) institute market controls to balance the growth with the type of housing needed.

The full text of both reports, and a great deal more, is available on the City website: <http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/letsbuild/>

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

BEN SHUMAKER

From: Rick May [mailto:rick@mayandassociates.net]

Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 7:11 PM

To: robert.muth@ci.stevenson.wa.us; amy.weissfeld@ci.stevenson.wa.us; Paul Hendricks <paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us; dave.cox@ci.stevenson.wa.us; scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us; david.ray@ci.stevenson.wa.us; mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us; jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us; valerie.hoy@ci.stevenson.wa.us; auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us; Ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Subject: Housing Need Figures

City Council and Planning Commission Members,

Well thought out decisions need accurate information. On October 12th, 2020, Stevenson Planning sent out a Housing Needs Analysis memo. This memo noted a projected housing need of 228 units for Stevenson over the next 10 years, stating it was based in the Johnson Economics Stevenson Report. It appears this 228-unit figure is being relied upon by Planning to support higher density residential zoning changes currently proposed.

However, the Johnson Economics Report's baseline projected need for Stevenson was 129 not 228 units. The Johnson Report also noted a likely pent up demand for 50 additional mainly low-income housing units. On April 16th, I discussed the Johnson Report with Jerry Johnson and John Spikkelan, the Author. Both John and Jerry noted the baseline number is the most reliable figure of projected future housing demand in Stevenson. Jerry noted the baseline figure is what the model kicks out if given expected parameters. John also noted a majority of the 50-unit excess demand would best be filled by walk-up apartments in Stevenson's core area. John felt this is the best way to create small apartments, both affordable to build and affordable for lower income folks to rent.

In conclusion, as per the Johnson Report and discussions with the Author, the likely demand for housing in Stevenson over the next 10 years is the baseline figure of 129 units. Another 50 predominantly small inexpensive apartment units are likely needed, mainly to the downtown core area, if economically feasible. The 228 units in the October 12th Planning memo is the highest end of the range. City Council and the public should be provided and rely upon the *most likely* demand figures, not the highest possible figures. This data would help the Council and public make well informed decisions. I suggest Planning sends out a memo on projection demand that accurately represents the Johnson Report's baseline conclusions. Thank you.

Rick May / 503-341-2932

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932

--

Robert C. Muth

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932

--

Robert C. Muth



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

zoning proposals

Barb Robinson <robinson@gorge.net>

Sat, May 1, 2021 at 5:02 PM

To: "citycouncil@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <citycouncil@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, "planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

As several letters in the paper recently have expressed so well the concerns of residents regarding the proposed zoning changes, I join them in objecting to changes that will negatively affect our town. If you have been to Troutdale and Gresham recently, seeing the huge apartment buildings crammed in to open spaces certainly changed the "feeling" of those communities and it isn't what we want in Stevenson. Zoning changes are necessary certainly, but not to fit a small groups' "vision" of what they want when they make no sense from a business or personal standpoint. A pressing issue right now is parking for the post office and for businesses and with the lot that is for sale now, it would be awesome if someone could find some grant money to purchase that and provide city parking. I would guess there would be little opposition to that!

Would it be possible to have a meeting for more public input on the zoning proposal now that things are open enough that it could be a live meeting? I think it would be helpful.

Thank you.

Barbara Robinson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10