

**City of Stevenson Planning Commission Minutes
October 10, 2016
6:00 PM**

Planning Commission Members: Present: Scott Anderson, Shawn Van Pelt, Karen Ashley. Excused
Absent: Chris Ford, Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel

Staff: Ben Shumaker

Public: Mary Repar

Call to Order - 6:02 PM

Preliminary Matters

1. PUBLIC COMMENT OPTION: **ANDERSON** selects public comment option #1

2. MINUTES: Minutes from the August 8, 2016 and September 13, 2016 meetings were circulated for review and discussion. **ASHLEY** moved; **VAN PELT** seconded approval of the minutes with the addition of the signature line added to the August 8, 2016. No objections.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

REPAR commented on the importance of preserving wetlands in response to activity on 11 acres owned by Rick May, located at Kanaka/Del Rey. She feels strongly the City should have more control of the local wetlands and provided the definition of wetlands as areas which remain wet throughout a drought. She added, wetlands act as ecological sponges and help control flooding. **REPAR** reported 2 roads have been completed on the property owned by Mr. May. She added she is concerned about the public input process and would like more frequent updates on-line to keep the public informed. She summarized by saying, we need wetlands because they're important to the environment.

ANDERSON asked for an update on the property in question. **SHUMAKER** responded by providing background information regarding the Army Corps of Engineers and Department of Ecology's review of the wet areas on this site which determined they were exempt from the wetland designation. He went on to explain how other cities have procedures to classify and designate activities which would trigger the higher levels of public input **REPAR** suggested, and the City could consider a procedural revision of the Zoning Code after the format update is complete.

ANDERSON asked if Mr. May has applied for any land subdivision and **SHUMAKER** answered, no the land was divided prior to the current ownership and recent proposals have used the less involved boundary line adjustment process, a right of way permit to install a driveway, and critical areas written determination of exemption proposals that avoid critical area impacts.

NEW BUSINESS

4. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEWS: Review of 2014-2015 Conditional Use Permits

SHUMAKER reported 3 permits have been issued in the last 3 years and provided the current status of each. Due to the limited public outreach performed before this review, **SHUMAKER** told Commissioners that more in-depth reviews of any specific permits should be conducted at the next Planning Commission meeting to make sure the applicants were present. **ASHLEY** inquired if there had been any complaints made to any of the Conditional Use projects and **SHUMAKER** responded to say one project had a complaint about accumulation of waste during construction, but the issue was immediately resolved. **ANDERSON** discussed why the scheduled review process is desirable and briefly discussed the status of each of the permits. **SHUMAKER** asked Commissioners for direction on the Bed & Breakfast Conditional Use Permit, which had not yet begun operating. There was general discussion about the active review period. **SHUMAKER** explained the active 2-year review period is standard language when he drafts permits, which provides a feedback mechanism. **ANDERSON** expressed interest in finding language to formalize the 'active review period' for Conditional Use Permits and there was general discussion about review dates. **SHUMAKER** recited the City's Zoning Code 1739.020 as pertained to Conditional Use Permit review. **ANDERSON** was satisfied the current language provides ample opportunity to review the projects. **ANDERSON** expressed his concern, if the review date passes and the conditions of the permit are not met, the Planning Commission loses its right to review. **SHUMAKER** confirmed this is not the case and explained the administrative authorities available to get violators into compliance. The group also discussed whether all permits should be recorded with the Auditor.

SHUMAKER asked the Commissioners for their feedback on review process and **ANDERSON** expressed his desire to continue to review Conditional Use Permit applications and receive updates on the projects but does not feel **SHUMAKER** needs to create extensive presentations for each. **SHUMAKER** asked the Commissioners if they wanted him to follow up with the B&B applicants to get an updated status on the project and Commissioners confirmed their interest in knowing their plans for the project.

OLD BUSINESS

5. ZONING CODE REFORMAT: Use Categories, Residential Districts, Conditional Uses

SHUMAKER presented the next installment of the formatted Zoning Code Reformat document with revised Use Tables and reported the project is coming together. He discussed his research into other cities and counties organization of zoning code and found no consistent format. He discussed the resources he reviewed, the different organizational method and complexity of each source to reach the document before them. Similar to the coloring protocols used in the Zoning Map, the reformat uses the American Planning Association's' Land-Based Classification Standards as the basis for its categories. He then set out to designate each of the City's 230 independent use categories into those 10 functional divisions. There was general discussion of the zoning code reformat process.

SHUMAKER introduced the Residential Zone Use Tables (Attachment #1, pg. 2-4) and explained each category. He then highlighted some inconsistencies that are made clear when this format is used. There was general discussion about the future policy-level discussion/review (tiny homes, accessory dwelling units, etc.),

but the focus of this effort remained on establishing the new format. The Commissioners gave positive feedback on the format and readability of the revised document.

SHUMAKER introduced some policy changes which bring consistency with state laws on ‘adult family homes’, ‘nursing homes,’ and similar uses. **ASHLEY** asked if any action by Commissioners is needed. **SHUMAKER** explained the changes being made will ultimately be changing Ordinance and will need City Council approval and, and he’s bringing up these small changes as they occur to make the final review and recommendation easier. He continued, if Commissioners want to make changes, or have objections to the proposed changes, now is the time to express them so they can be resolved in future drafts. **ANDERSON** confirmed his understanding, the proposed changes are based on changes made to state laws over the years and he has no objections to the proposed definition changes.

SHUMAKER introduced Utility and Communication Facilities (UCF) as a use category which helps clear up conflicts in existing use categories. The proposed new language provides more clarity between small and common uses such as overhead and underground cables and larger less common uses like a treatment plant, booster pump station, reservoir, etc. **ANDERSON** asked for examples of Communication facilities and **SHUMAKER** noted ‘switchboard’ is currently listed. **ANDERSON** commented NoaNet has a presence on Maple Drive where communication fiber is coming into/out of the building and clearly fits the definition of a communication facility. **SHUMAKER** made note to include such facilities in the next draft. There was general discussion about vaults and cisterns. **SHUMAKER** explained he would most likely view a cistern as an allowable accessory use.

SHUMAKER discussed the small suggested changes to include outdoor recreation areas and emergency service facilities as part of other general use categories.

SHUMAKER continued to walk through the Use Tables of the residential districts and highlighted how the format compliments the City’s Comp Plan. There was continued general discussion about dimensional standards, conditional use, accessory, sign standards and other use tables.

SHUMAKER asked if any Commissioners had any concerns about the readability and functionality of the reformatted code. No Commissioners expressed concern and praised **SHUMAKER** again for the work he’s invested in this project. **SHUMAKER** briefly discussed the remaining tasks to be completed before the final ordinance can be presented to the Commissioners but they will see the full use table reformat at the next meeting. He commented he hopes for a final presentation and adoption by the November meeting.

6. Staff Reports

SHUMAKER reported the city submitted a grant request for technical assistance from Smart Growth America, funded through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the funds would be used to perform a parking audit.

He reported Portland State University has an open application period now for assistance with residential growth study.

He updated Commission members on the Remi Short Plat (intersection of Lasher St./Jefferson St.) and reported the applicant is appealing four of the conditions of the short plat. He added the City Council or Hearing Examiner will hear the appeal.

He reported he is still working with Planning Commission and City Council to find a working date for the Joint Meeting on Growth. **ANDERSON** repeated his urgency to meet in time to have the opportunity to designate funds for related growth activities before the City budget is adopted. He asked if a Capital Improvement Plan line-item on budget. **SHUMAKER** added the Planning Commission has not previously been a part of Capital Improvement Planning and it would be up to the City Council, to decide if and how they would take input from the Planning Commission on Capital Improvements.

SHUMAKER said he is currently working on developing breakout sessions for the joint meeting to identify friction points and potential solutions to those friction points. There was general discussion about purpose of the joint meeting. **ANDERSON** expressed concern about the hijacking of the meeting agenda and getting off topic but **SHUMAKER** explained how he will work to mitigate that possibility and explained the joint meeting will not be set up as a Town Hall meeting and discussion will be limited to the agenda.

REPAR mentioned the recent discovery of lead in the pipes of the Carson schools and asked about lead pipes in the City. **SHUMAKER** commented he didn't have good knowledge on the topic said Karl Russell is the City's Water Manager and would be the proper person to address the question. **SHUMAKER** did explain the testing site locations around the water system.

ASHLEY commented she receives a request for water samples annually at her home. **REPAE** asked how her parking lot at the veterinary clinic is progressing. **ASHLEY** reported she has received the Critical Areas Permit and progress is halted due to the start of the rain season. She anticipates it being fixed sometime in 2017.

ANDERSON gave an update on the Stevenson Downtown Association. They had their first public meeting, with another steering committee meeting coming next week. They hope to have a board in place and to have their first meeting by December 2016.

Meeting adjourned at 7:18 pm.

Approved _____; Approved as amended _____

Scott Anderson, Chair
Minutes by: Jennifer Anderson

Date