

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Monday, January 8, 2018

6:00 PM

Planning Commission Members Present: Karen Ashley, Chris Ford, Shawn Van Pelt

Staff Present: Ben Shumaker

Community Members Present: Matthew Knudsen, Rick May, Bradlee Seehafer, Mary Repar, Bernard Versari

Guest: Michelle McConnell, Department of Ecology, WA State (DOE)

Call to Order: 6:02 p.m.

Preliminary Matters

1. Annual Selection of Chair and Vice Chair

Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel (absent) previously offered to step up to Chair if no one else was interested. **FORD** made a motion for Hoy-Rhodehamel to be Chair. **VAN PELT** seconded. Motion carries.

ASHLEY offered to step up to Vice Chair. **FORD** made a motion for Ashley to be Vice Chair. **VAN PELT** seconded. Motion carries.

Ashley will run duties as Chair tonight in Hoy-Rhodehamel's absence.

2. Chair Selects Public Comment Option #2

3. **Minutes:** December 11, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

VAN PELT moved to approve minutes. **FORD** sectioned. Motion carries.

4. Public Comment Period

Repar shared hope for a diverse group of people on the commission including those without vested or financial interests and will comment further during review of statements of interest regarding Planning Commission vacancy.

New Business

5. Planning Commission Vacancy:

Candidates were given time to answer interview questions. **VAN PELT** wanted to address how all three candidates are new to the area. **ASHLEY** wanted candidates to consider how being new still helps everything stay as Stevenson and whether there is a vision to change Stevenson to where candidates came from.

May: He ran his own appraisal/consulting business for 32 years. He is familiar with land use and valuation. He just moved to community and is looking for how to make a contribution, given where talents will be most useful. He has attended many Planning Commission meetings in the past. He has

been visiting Stevenson for 20 years as a windsurfer and created more friendships here than where he was living, in Tigard, Ore. He has felt like a part of this community for a long time.

Knudsen: He has worked in multiple analytic departments, operational management, in the private sector management, walking through requests, projects, restrictions, etc. His parents are both members of local planning organizations. He felt the posting played to his strengths and is interested in being a piece of economic growth and steward of environment. He says there's something about the area that keeps us or brought us all here. It is what Stevenson is. He sees aspects of people wanting to be here regardless of how long or how it came to be. He countered the idea that new residents want Stevenson to be more like where they came from but rather to escape where/what they came from. He sees a need to move forward while still reflecting the current vibe of the town. He mentioned the 4 pillars of the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

Seehafer: He has been volunteering with the Eagles where he is a Trustee. He enjoys being in the community and has the ability to give back. The recent politics in the nation has encouraged him to do more than just vote. He has previously been a manager in both healthcare and insurance fields and currently owns a virtual travel agent business. He says being new to the community is an opportunity, outside looking in. He grew up in a small community and is familiar with how small towns are. He has been traveling to Stevenson for many years and is not looking to change Stevenson but make it better while keeping it what it is.

Repar wrote a letter to the Planning Commission. She thinks young blood is needed as well as diversity and she verbalized May has too much personal interest, claimed he has sued the city, and said he is too much of a developer. **Repar** believes May is not appropriate for the Commission because he has so much development interest. Highlighted the importance of quality of life and keeping community. **May** responded that he did not sue the city. **Repar** disagreed. **May** was unaware of the letter **Repar** wrote and has requested to see a copy. **May** stated that he is not a developer and thinks the Planning Commission needs someone who knows something about the law as well as the community and has experience. **Versari** highlighted the importance of having someone with technical experience and knows the implications of decision making. **Versari** seconded importance with quality of life and maintaining community.

ASHLEY asked candidates to leave to continue conversation and candidates voluntarily exited.

FORD asked if information provided on Statement of Interests was verified, **Shumaker** confirmed it was not. **VAN PELT** wants someone with the most experience. **FORD** shared that he will be resigning in 6 months, which will create another vacancy in the near future. **Shumaker** suggested it's best to pick just 1 candidate or to move all 3 to City Council for recommendation. It could be a possibility that they all interview again in front of the Council but this is unsure. **ASHLEY** noted that they have 3 good candidates. Commission is impressed with **Knudsen's** Statement of Interest and previous experience. **ASHLEY** noted that **Knudsen** and wife have bought a home here which shows their stability in the community. **VAN PELT** mentioned that **May** has been to a lot of meetings and he hasn't observed any personal agendas in his previous attendance. Commission agreed that they haven't seen any areas of concern with **May's** interests, as mentioned in **Repar's** letter.

ASHLEY made a motion to put forth **Knudsen**. **FORD** seconded. Motion carries to put his name forward to the City Council with a majority vote (2 to 1).

Candidates welcomed back in. The announcement is made that **Knudsen** is recommended to the City Council. **Shumaker** mentioned that another vacancy will be opening in the next 6 months and current letters of interest will be rolled over to the next opening.

6. Biennial Comp Plan Amendments: No requests received, however, an out-of-cycle amendment is expected when the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) is finalized.

Old Business

7. Shoreline Advisory Committee: Discuss draft SMP and determine next steps in review process. Review first draft Shoreline Restoration Plan

Shumaker introduced group exercise, involving two rounds of discussion: 1. Identify areas/topics to review 2. Determine where the topic falls within options (preliminary deliberation, public release, final deliberation, recommended adoption).

Versari identified the following sections of the SMP (Nov 2017 draft) to review:

1.3.2 - Annexation plan - **Versari** stated that this is beyond the jurisdiction of Stevenson and says Shumaker made Stevenson look bigger than it is. **FORD** explained that for those who may be building in or out of the city in the future, this gives them the option of preplanning and having full awareness of future plans. Consensus on leaving as is until after public comment and address if it creates confusion.

2.3.1 - Pre-application - **Versari** explained that “activities” and “uses” are not defined and does not indicate when this pre-application process is required. **Shumaker** noted “uses” is defined in Chapter 7, page 82 (as the WAC definition, which includes “development”). **McConnell** suggested rewording this section to be more clear and define “uses”. **Shumaker** explained that most of the document has “use” and “activities” as interchangeable so the SMP could be streamlined to use one or the other as the chosen label. **McConnell** explained that “activities” is the broad term, which includes “use” and “development” under its umbrella. Consensus is to clear up labeling of “use”, “activities” and “development” throughout document for public release.

2.4.1 - Permit regulations - **Versari** noted the same issue as 2.3.1 with the labeling of “activities”. Consensus to change ‘activity’ to ‘modification’ for public release.

2.5.2 - Statement of exemption - **Versari** noted that currently the SMP says a Letter of Exemption is needed for everything and he suggested changing to only requiring this step based on level of exemption. **McConnell** explained that requiring this step, regardless of level, serves as a great tracking tool and safeguard. The current plan takes from what is being suggested from DOE. **Shumaker** explained that, without this step, the DOE doesn’t always see development occurring with the consideration of the SMP. Further input from DOE would be helpful, as there’s exempt and exempt from substantial development project. **McConnell** to discuss further with DOE and get more information back. Consensus to leave it the way it is without change.

2.9 - Nonconforming language - Further discussion/change on Table 5.1 means no need for change to this area.

Figure 3.2.1 - Aquatic Environment - **Versari** suggested replacing aquatic designation. **McConnell** explained that all areas below ordinary high water mark are aquatic which explains why aquatic language has been used within the plan. **McConnell** explained further that the purpose for identifying aquatic is due to development in water, which is very significant. Shoreline of the water and the land immediately adjacent to it are both important to identify and address. There is a Washington Administrative Code (WAC) definition of “aquatic” which has been incorporated into SMP. Consensus to remove 3.2 from the topics to address.

3.2.3 - Shoreline Residential - **Versari** suggested changing Shoreline Residential from 1 designation to 2. **Shumaker** explained that “aquatic”, “natural” and “shoreline residential” were all taken from the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) definitions and “urban” definition was our own. **McConnell** explained use of the WAC definition creates ease and clarity for any entity picking up the plan in the future. **McConnell** stated that it sounds like **Versari** is suggesting a lot of effort and detail for a small area and the commission should be wary of anything that looks or feels like spot zoning. **McConnell** suggested basing a change around parcel size instead. **Shumaker** questioned changing the proposal for a

small quantity of lots. **May** confirmed 7 lots are not the only multi residential. **Versari** suggested changing designations to align with ICR, where high and low density were identified. It was explained that the comprehension plan is meant to be larger and broader, whereas the SMP is meant to go into more detail. **Versari** supplied the commission with tables compiling information from other Columbia Gorge area SMPs to compare and contrast differences in designations. **McConnell** mentioned some plans will create subset for subdivision of small lots. **McConnell** suggested careful consideration when comparing plans with other areas without considering differences in shoreline and designations. **McConnell** confirmed 3 designations in the city limits and 1 outside. **Shumaker** helped identify that the area of most concern connects to the change in the residential setback. Further discussion/change on Table 5.1 means no need for change to this area - Consensus to remove 3.2 from topics to address.

4.4 - Critical areas; 4.4.4 - Fish and wildlife habitat - **Versari** wondered whether a critical area report is required along Columbia River and whether the SMP needs this information. **Versari** asked whether there is a way to minimize the cost of a report when we already know what's in the river. **Shumaker** clarified that the purpose of this section isn't to go find new fish in the area but the purpose is to determine appropriate planting, storm water control, and additional aspects of the development project. Consensus to leave it the way it is without change.

5.3, Table 5.1- Residential setbacks, Multi-family - **Versari** reported that this removes two residential plots with a 50 foot setback. **Versari** explained that what was important to note is whether the shoreline is deteriorated or pristine and the shoreline here has been identified as very poor, which would mean a shorter setback. Fifty feet from high water mark is the current setback (since 1971). The current plan proposes to change setback of 100 feet so it would take from his and others' properties. Lots in this area are narrow which means they are prevented from single family. **May** stated that because they're preexisting the new zone would not apply. Current SMP states that zones do not apply if they meet requirement, which these plots do. **Shumaker** suggested adding language such as "on existing lots" to be clear. **McConnell** noted that zoning and shoreline designations are not mutually exclusive. **May** explained that overlay overrides zoning. Zoning code allows for replacement after 75% damage, which is concerning to **Versari** that damage would mean limited replacement. **ASHLEY** suggested that there isn't a want for multi residential on the shoreline. **Shumaker** confirmed that the area of concern is in the difference between 50 and 100 feet/50 and 60 feet setback. **Shumaker** suggested changing Table 5.1 multi-family and residential to 50 foot setback and shoreline variance first for property replacement. Consensus to change back to previous setback of 50 feet for public release.

Table 6.1 - Shoreline use - More information and discussion with designations (3.2.1, 3.2.3) confirms with consensus to leave it the way it is without change.

6.4.1 - Vegetation removal - **Versari** asked for clarification on emergency situations. **Shumaker** explained that it is possible, when issues arise, that a Statement of Exemption can be granted retroactively. Consensus to address and clarify language - for public release.

Versari identified additional words to define - "activity", "use", "parallel environment" - Consensus to define "use" with WAC definition - for public release. Consensus to add definition for "parallel environment" - both for public release.

Consensus - Preliminary deliberation for all topics addressed. All topics to be presented to Commission before going to public comment period.

Shumaker brought attention to Chapter 3 - Restoration - Table 3.2 identifies projects and **Shumaker** would love to add more. The Restoration plan is available on the website.

Staff Reports

8. Staff & Commission Reports:

Shumaker explained the new sewer downspout charge. For anyone connected to the sewer, there will be a \$10 fee on sewer bills starting this month. If residents should know that they do not have to pay if they do not contribute to stormwater. Call the city and someone will come out to inspect.

Department of Commerce provided updated population projections statewide. State is expecting the age group 25-29 to increase. As that group ages up, age group of 25-29 will increase again. Age group 0-5 will also increase.

Discussion

9. **Thought of the Month:** None

Adjournment: 8:46 (2hr 44min)

Minutes by Claire Baylor

Planning Commissioner Attendance 2018

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Ashley	+											
Hoy-Rhodehamel	0											
Ford	+											
Van Pelt	+											

+ = Present; 0 = Excused Absence; -- = Unexcused Absence; X = Meeting Cancelled