



# City of Stevenson

## Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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

**TO:** City Council  
**FROM:** Ben Shumaker, Community Development Director  
**DATE:** August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020  
**SUBJECT:** Zoning Code Amendment – Trade Districts Code Update

---

### Introduction

This memo summarizes the Planning Commission’s recommended changes to the Stevenson Zoning Code. The recommendation involves changes to 8 sections of the Zoning Code and repeal of an existing moratorium.

The City Council is asked to consider the Planning Commission’s recommendation, hear the public’s testimony on the draft ordinance and consider adoption.

### Policy Questions

In the process of making their recommendation, the Planning Commission considered the following policy questions. Their answer to the questions are in **bold**.

- 1) Should Townhomes be allowed in the R2 Two-Family Residential and C1 Commercial District? **Yes.**
- 2) Should *new* Single-Family Detached Dwellings, Manufactured Homes, and Modular Homes be prohibited in the C1 District? **Yes.**
  - a. If *new* Single-Family Detached Dwellings are prohibited, should existing single-family usage of detached dwellings be allowed to continue? **Yes.**
  - b. If *new* Single-Family Detached Dwellings are prohibited, should buildings constructed as single-family detached dwellings—but currently occupied as mixed-use/home-based businesses—be allowed to resume single-family occupancy? **Yes.**
  - c. If *new* Single-Family Detached Dwellings are prohibited, should buildings constructed as single-family detached dwellings—but currently devoted entirely to commercial uses—be allowed to resume single-family occupancy? **Tie vote, defer to City Council.**
- 3) Can certain types of murals be allowed without first being reviewed by the Planning Commission? **Yes.**
- 4) Should the Zoning Interpretations regarding Cultural Attractions in the C1 District and Townhomes in the CR District be implemented in the future? **Yes.**
- 5) Should new buildings in the C1 District be at least 16’ in height? **No.**

### Draft Ordinance

The Planning Commission-recommended draft ordinance is presented tonight as Attachment 1. The ordinance addresses the policies discussed above at the following locations:

#### **1- Allow Townhomes**

For the new allowance of Townhomes in the R2 District, see the final entry in the Use Table of Section 5, page 5 of 8.

For the new allowance of Townhomes in the C1 District, see the Use Table in Section 6, page 6 of 8.

#### **2- Prohibit *New Single-Family Detached Dwellings, Manufactured Homes, and Modular Homes***

For the prohibition see the Use Table in Section 6, page 6 of 8.

**2a- Allow Continued Use of Existing Dwellings**

See "Legacy Home", the new Use Category and last entry in the table of Section 3, page 4 of 8.

Then see the listing for Legacy Home in the Use Table of Section 6, page 6 of 8.

**2b- Allow Home-Based Businesses to Continue Occupancy if Business Closes**

See the inclusion of "Legacy Home" in the description of Home Occupation in the Section 4, page 4 of 8.

Then see the allowance of Home Occupations in the Use Table of Section 6, page 6 of 8.

**2c- Allow/Prohibit Reversion of Single-Family Dwellings once Changed to Commercial Usage**

See the description of "Legacy Home" in the table description Section 3, page 4 of 8, particularly the final statement where the Legacy Home is considered a permitted use and exempt from existing provisions that would compel changes of use under certain scenarios. In the draft the exemptions do not include scenarios where single-family residential use is willfully changed.

**3- Ease Permitting for Certain Murals**

See the addition of a new type of mural drafted at Section 2, page 2 of 8.

Then see the addition of "Type 2 Mural" as permitted in the Table in Section 9, page 7 of 8.

**4- Codify Zoning Interpretations**

See the inclusion of "Cultural Attraction" as a conditional use as the last line in the table in Section 6, page 6 of 8.

See the inclusion of "Townhome" as a conditional use in the CR District in the table in Section 6, page 6 of 8.

Other changes are included in the draft ordinance. These changes either 1) are formatting-based and do not involve a change of policy (for example, see the reorganization occurring in the table of Section 3, pages 2-3 of 8) or 2) eliminate provisions made unnecessary by the policy changes discussed (for example, see the changes to the notes on the table in Section 8, page 7 of 8). (Note: this draft also includes Section 10 to repeal the Council moratorium. If not repealed, the more expansive moratorium would now continue until separately repealed or it expires in May, 2021.)

**Policy Question 2.c—Discussion of Alternatives**

The Planning Commission was unable to come to a recommendation on policy question 2c and forwarded this to the City Council for its own review/decision. If the conversion of single-family detached dwellings back and forth between business uses is something the City Council would like to allow, the following changes to the draft in Attachment 1 would accommodate the change. The text presented below includes optional text based on staff's discussions with active stakeholders.

**A. Expand the Time Period providing Protections for a "Legacy Home".** Instead of freezing consideration of existing buildings to their use on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, consider the following range of options:

1. Any building ~~existing on, and continually~~ occupied as a single-family detached dwelling since it was constructed January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020... [No limitation]
2. Any building ~~existing on, and continually~~ occupied as a single-family detached dwelling at any time between September 15<sup>th</sup>, 1994 and [the effective date of this ordinance], 2020 since ~~January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020~~... [Some limitation, based on original adoption date of current Zoning Code]
3. A building existing on, and continually occupied as a single-family detached dwelling since January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020... [Current Draft]

**B. Include More Exemptions in the Draft Description of "Legacy Home".** Consider adding the ability to willfully change use of Legacy Homes to/from commercial uses.

1. ...a Legacy Home shall not be considered a nonconforming use and may be renovated, rebuilt, ~~and/or~~ expanded, and/or reestablished after a change of use without consideration of SMC 17.44 –

Nonconforming Uses, ~~provided, however, that SMC 17.44.030—Effect of Nonconforming Use Abandonment shall apply.~~ [No limitation]

2. ...a Legacy Home shall not be considered a nonconforming use and may be renovated, rebuilt, and/or expanded without consideration of SMC 17.44 – Nonconforming Uses, provided, however, that SMC 17.44.030 – Effect of Nonconforming Use Abandonment shall apply. [Current Draft]

In the absence of a Planning Commission recommendation, staff is recommending inclusion of some time-based limitation of what qualifies as a Legacy Homes (A.2) and no limitation of Legacy Homes’ future usage (B.1).

**Policy Question 5—Discussion of Recommendation**

The Planning Commission considered the City Council request to add a minimum building height for new buildings in the C1 District. This policy had been recommended to the Planning Commission by the City Council as a deterrent to shipping container construction. The Planning Commission’s reasons for excluding this limitation from their recommendation involved:

- Reluctance to rely on a band-aid approach to effectively address a larger issue.
- Concern that band-aid approaches become long-term solutions.
- Minimal faith the deterrent would work to prohibit shipping container construction (i.e., inclusion of a 16’ tall false front on a shipping container would be permissible)

The 16’ proposed limitation was based on a staff analysis of existing buildings downtown. This height would allow single-story buildings such as El Rio (16.75), Granny’s Dedunk (16.75’), and NAPA (17.5’). It would prohibit new buildings that are the same height as the former Little Viking (12.25’) or the Post Office (14’).

- C. **Add Minimum Height.** If the City Council chooses to include a minimum height in spite of the Planning Commission’s recommendation, the following red underlined column could be added to the draft ordinance:

**Table 17.25.060-1: Trade Dimensional Standards**

District	<u>Minimum Height of Building</u>	Maximum Height of Building	Minimum Setbacks				Maximum Setbacks		
			Front	Side, Interior	Side, Street	Rear, Interior Lot	Rear, Through Lot	Front	Side, Street
CR	<u>n/a</u>	35 ft <sup>1</sup>	25 ft	0 ft <sup>2,3</sup>	20 ft	0 ft <sup>2,3</sup>	20 ft	-	-
C1	<u>16 ft</u>	50 ft <sup>4</sup>	0 ft <sup>5</sup>	0 ft <sup>2,6</sup>	-	0 ft <sup>2</sup>	-	10 ft <sup>7,8</sup>	10 ft <sup>9</sup>
M1	<u>n/a</u>	35 ft	15 ft	5 ft	-	0 ft <sup>2</sup>	-	-	-

**Next Steps**

After tonight’s public hearing, the City Council may adopt the ordinance or consider other action.

**Attachments**

1. Planning Commission-Recommended Draft Ordinance 2020-1157 (8 pages)
2. Written Comments submitted to the Planning Commission & City Council (28 pages)

**CITY OF STEVENSON  
ORDINANCE 2020-1157**

**AMENDING THE STEVENSON ZONING CODE (SMC TITLE 17); MODIFYING WHERE SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS AND TOWNHOMES ARE ALLOWED; CLARIFYING USE CATEGORIES WITHIN SMC 17.13.010; INCORPORATING ZONING INTERPRETATIONS CONDUCTED UNER SMC 17.12.020; AND REPEALING ORDINANCE 2019-1158.**

**WHEREAS**, on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020 the City Council adopted Ordinance 2020-1158 related to a 1 year moratorium of new single –family residences in the C1 Commercial District; and

**WHEREAS**, the City has completed the planning effort identified in Exhibit “A” of said ordinance, and the plan recommends prohibiting construction of new single-family detached dwellings and similar uses in the C1 District; and

**WHEREAS**, the following use interpretations conducted under SMC 17.12.020 have been reviewed for inclusion in the periodic amendment included in this ordinance:

- ZON2019-03 related to Cultural Attractions in in the C1 Commercial District,
- ZON2019-04 related to Townhomes in the CR Commercial Recreation District; and

**WHEREAS**, the provisions herein are intended to advance toward Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Stevenson Comprehensive Plan by implementing the following specific objectives and tactics of the plan: 1.12, 1.12-3, 1.17, 2.13, 2.13-1, 2.14, 3.1, 3.2-2, 4.1-1, 4.1-2, 4.3, 4.3-1, 4.3-3, and 5.1; and

**WHEREAS**, the amendment process related to the changes to single-family development in the downtown area was guided by and conducted with knowledge of Tactic 4.3-4 of the Stevenson Comprehensive Plan, and the City Council is satisfied this ordinance does not conflict with the suggestive text (e.g., “consider” and “such as”) of that Tactic; and

**WHEREAS**, the City has determined these regulations to be Categorically Exempt (WAC 197-11-800(19)(b)) from the threshold determination requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on 7/13/2020 as part of its review and has recommended City Council approval of these amendments; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council conducted a public hearing on 8/20/2020 prior to adoption of these amendments;

**AND WHEREAS**, the Stevenson City Council finds that the best interests of the public health, safety and welfare would be served by the amendments herein,

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF STEVENSON, STATE OF WASHINGTON DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1** – The following definition shall be added as SMC 17.10.275 – Dwelling Unit:

“Dwelling Unit” means a single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.

**Section 2** – The definition of Mural at SMC 17.10.738(5), originally adopted through Section 1.D.1.5 of Ordinance 2017-1103 shall be amended by adding the underlined text as follows:

5. a. “Mural” or “Type 1 Mural” means any sign depicting a decorative design or scene intended to provide visual enjoyment that is painted or placed on an exterior building wall and contains no commercial message, logo, symbol, or graphic, provided that, when placed on a residential structure, such depiction is not considered a mural or intended to be regulated under this code.

b. “Type 2 Mural” means any Mural as defined above which is 1) located in a Trade District and 2) proposed and maintained by the City of Stevenson, the Stevenson Downtown Association, or a non-profit representing the interests of the Stevenson business community.

**Section 3** – Use 1. of SMC Table 17.13.010-1 Residence or Accommodation Uses, originally adopted through Section 3.B.2 of Ordinance 2017-1103 and amended by Section 2.A of Ordinance 2017-04 and Section 1 of Ordinance 2019-1141, shall be amended by deleting the ~~struck through~~ text and adding the underlined text as follows. All other use descriptions shall remain in effect without amendment:

1.	Dwelling <del>Unit</del>	<u>Any building that contains one or more dwelling units [SMC 17.10.275] used, intended, or designed to be built, used, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied, or that are occupied for living purposes.</u> <del>An independent living unit within a building, designed and intended for occupancy by not more than one family and having its own housekeeping, kitchen, sleeping and bathroom facilities.</del>	<u>SMC 17.10.275</u>
a.	Single-Family <u>Detached</u> Dwelling	<u>A single detached building containing one dwelling unit. Single-family detached dwellings exclude Mobile Home and include stick-built homes as well as the following types:</u> <u>1. “Manufactured Home”. A single-family detached dwelling built according to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Act, which is a national preemptive building code. A manufactured home: (i) includes plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems; (ii) is built on a permanent chassis; (iii) can be transported in one or more sections with each section at least 8 feet wide and 40 feet long when transported, or when installed on the site is 320 square feet or greater, and (iv) when sited, is designed to be permanently connected to required utilities.</u> <u>2. “Modular Home”. A factory assembled structure designed primarily for use as a dwelling when connected to the required utilities. A Modular Home (i) includes plumbing, heating and electrical systems contained</u>	<u>RCW 35A.21.312, RCW 35A.63.146, RCW 43.22A, RCW 59.20.030, WAC 296-150M, SMC 17.40.120</u> <u>RCW 43.22, RCW 46.04.303, WAC 296-150F</u>

therein, (ii) does not contain its own running gear, (iii) must be mounted on a permanent foundation, and (iv) shall conform to the structural design requirements of the local jurisdiction. A modular home does not include a travel trailer, mobile home or manufactured home.

Single-family dwellings are distinguished by the following types:

1. "Single-Family Detached Dwelling" is a single detached building, which term shall include manufactured home and modular home, containing one dwelling unit.

2. "Townhome" is a dwelling unit within a building containing 2 or more attached dwelling units in which the dwelling units 1) share one or more common walls at the lot line, 2) are on separate lots, and 3) have separate entrances. Other common terms for this use include townhouse, brownstone, row house, etc.

SMC 17.38.085

b. **Manufactured Home**

A single-family detached dwelling built according to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Act, which is a national preemptive building code. A manufactured home: (1) includes plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems; (2) is built on a permanent chassis; (3) can be transported in one or more sections with each section at least 8 feet wide and 40 feet long when transported, or when installed on the site is 320 square feet or greater, and (4) when sited, is designed to be permanently connected to required utilities.

RCW 35A.21.312,  
RCW 35A.63.146,  
RCW 43.22A, RCW  
59.20.030, WAC  
296-150M, SMC  
17.40.120

c. **Modular Home**

A factory assembled structure designed primarily for use as a dwelling when connected to the required utilities. A Modular Home (1) includes plumbing, heating and electrical systems contained therein, (2) does not contain its own running gear, (3) must be mounted on a permanent foundation, and (4) shall conform to the structural design requirements of the local jurisdiction. A modular home does not include a travel trailer, mobile home or manufactured home.

RCW 43.22, RCW  
46.04.303, WAC  
296-150F

d. **Mobile Home**

A factory-built dwelling built prior to June 15, 1976, to standards other than the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development code, and acceptable under applicable state codes in effect at the time of construction or introduction of the home into the state. Mobile homes have not been built since the introduction of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Act. Mobile home does not include recreational vehicles, travel trailers, modular homes, or manufactured homes.

RCW 43.22A, RCW  
59.20.030

e. **Travel Trailer**

A trailer built on a single chassis transportable upon the public streets and highways that is designed to be used as a temporary dwelling without a permanent foundation and may be used without being connected to utilities.

f. **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)**

An ancillary (i.e., secondary) dwelling unit located on the same legal lot as a primary dwelling unit. An ADU is distinguishable from a duplex in that, unlike a duplex unit, it is clearly subordinate to the primary dwelling in terms of size, use and appearance, and may be located in zoning districts which do not otherwise allow Multi-Family Dwellings.

RCW 35A.63.230,  
RCW 43.63A.215,  
SMC 17.40.040

g. **Two-Family Dwelling**

A building containing 2 dwelling units in which the dwelling units share a common wall, floor/ceiling or roof (including without limitation the wall of an attached garage or porch) and which have separate entrances.

h. Multi-Family Dwelling	A building containing <u>23</u> or more dwelling units in which the dwelling units share a common wall, floor/ceiling or roof (including without limitation the wall of an attached garage or porch) and which have separate entrances. Multi-family dwelling also includes apartments, cluster-type housing, condominiums, <u>duplexes</u> , and multiple dwellings or groups of structures on a single lot.
i. Temporary Emergency, Construction or Repair Residence	A residence (which may be a mobile home or travel trailer) that is: (1) located on the same lot as a residence made uninhabitable by fire, flood or other natural disaster and occupied by the persons displaced by such disaster; or (2) located on the same lot as a residence that is under construction or undergoing substantial repairs or reconstruction and occupied by the persons intending to live in such permanent residence when the work is completed; or (3) located on a nonresidential construction site and occupied by persons having construction or security responsibilities over such construction site. However, no such temporary emergency, construction or repair residence shall be inhabited for more than 6 months, unless authorized by the Planning Commission.
j. <u>Townhome</u>	<u>A dwelling unit within a building containing 2 or more attached dwelling units in which the dwelling units (1) share one or more common walls at the lot line, (2) are on separate lots, and (3) have separate entrances. Other common terms for this use include townhouse, brownstone, row house, etc.</u>
k. <u>Legacy Home.</u>	<u>A building existing on, and continually occupied as a single-family detached dwelling since January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020 and located in a district which has prohibited development of new single-family detached dwellings. When allowed as a permitted use, a Legacy Home shall not be considered a nonconforming use and may be renovated, rebuilt, and/or expanded without consideration of SMC 17.44 – Nonconforming Uses, provided, however, that SMC 17.44.030 – Effect of Nonconforming Use Abandonment shall apply.</u>

**Section 4** – Use 10. of SMC Table 17.13.020-1 General Sales or Service Uses, originally adopted through Section 3.C.2 of Ordinance 2017-1103 and amended by Section 2 of Ordinance 2019-1141, shall be amended by deleting the ~~struck-through~~ text and adding the underlined text as follows. All other use descriptions shall remain in effect without amendment:

10 Home Occupation	<p>A commercial activity that: (a) is conducted by a person on the same residential district <u>or legacy home</u> lot where such person resides; (b) provides each outside employee with a legal off-street parking space; and (d) is not so insubstantial or incidental or is not so commonly associated with the residential use as to be regarded as an accessory use (see SMC 17.10.020), but that can be conducted without any significantly adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.</p> <p>Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, a use may be regarded as having a significantly adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood if: (a) goods, stock in trade, or other commodities are displayed; (b) more than 2 nonresidents on the premises are employed in connection with the purported home occupation; (c) it creates objectionable noise, fumes, odor, dust or electrical interference; (d) there is any exterior</p>	SMC 17.10.020, <u>SMC 17.13.010</u>
--------------------	---	--



manifestation of the home occupation, except for an allowed sign no larger than 2 square feet pertaining to the home occupation; or (e) more than 25% of the total gross floor area of residential buildings plus other buildings housing the purported home occupation, or more than 500 square feet of gross floor area (whichever is less), is used for home occupation purposes.

**Section 5** – The use category for “Dwelling Units”, in SMC Table 17.15.040-1 Residential Districts Use Table, originally adopted through Section 5.D.2.1 of Ordinance 2017-1103 and amended by Section 3.A.1 of Ordinance 2017-04, shall be amended by deleting the ~~struck-through~~ text, adding the underlined text, and moving text which is doubly struck-through/underlined, as follows. All other use categories, classifications and table notes shall remain in effect without amendment:

**Table 17.15.040-1 Residential Districts Use Table**

Use	R1	R2	R3	MHR	SR
<b>Residence or Accommodation Uses</b>					
Dwelling <del>Unit</del>					
Single-Family Detached Dwelling	P	P	P	P	P
<del>Townhome (SMC 17.38.085)</del>	=	=	<del>P</del>	=	=
- <del>Manufactured Home</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>
- <del>Modular Home</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>
Mobile Home	X	X	X	P	X
Travel Trailer	-	-	-	-	X
Accessory Dwelling Unit (SMC 17.40.040)	A	-	-	-	A
- <del>Two-Family Dwelling</del>	<del>C<sup>1</sup></del>	<del>P</del>	<del>P</del>	<del>C<sup>1</sup></del>	<del>C<sup>1</sup></del>
Multi-Family Dwelling	C <sup>1</sup>	<u>P/C<sup>1</sup></u>	P	C <sup>1</sup>	C <sup>1</sup>
Temporary Emergency, Construction or Repair Residence	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	C <sup>2</sup>	-	C <sup>2</sup>
<u>Townhome (SMC 17.38.085)</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>=C<sup>8</sup></u>	<u>P</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>=</u>

1-Conditional Use Permits for Multi-Family Dwellings which exceed the maximum number of dwelling units allowed in SMC Table 17.15.050-1 ~~these uses~~ are only considered when submitted as part of an R-PUD proposal under SMC 17.17-Residential Planned Unit Developments.

8-Townhomes in the R2 District are subject to review according to the density and parking requirements of the R3 Multi-Family Residential District and shall connect to the municipal sewer system.

**Section 6** – The use categories for “Dwelling Units”, “Professional Office” and Cultural Attraction” in SMC Table 17.25.040-1 Trade Districts Use Table, originally adopted through Section 9.D.2.1 of Ordinance 2017-1103 and amended by Section 5 of Ordinance 219-1141, shall be amended by deleting the ~~struck-through~~ text and adding the underlined text as follows. All other use categories, classifications and table notes shall remain in effect without amendment:

**Table 17.25.040-1 Trade Districts Use Table**

Use	CR	C1	M1
-----	----	----	----



<b>Residence or Accommodation Uses</b>			
<u>Dwelling-Units</u>			
Single-Family Detached Dwelling	<del>-X</del>	<u>PX</u>	<del>-X</del>
<del>- Manufactured Home</del>	-	<u>P</u>	-
<del>- Modular Home</del>	-	<u>P</u>	-
Multi-Family Dwelling	C <sup>1</sup>	P	-
Temporary Emergency, Construction or Repair Residence	-	C <sup>2</sup>	-
<u>Townhome</u>	<u>C<sup>14</sup></u>	<u>P<sup>14</sup></u>	
<u>Legacy Home</u>	-	<u>P</u>	-
<b>General Sales or Service Uses</b>			
Professional Office	-	<del>-P</del>	A/C <sup>13</sup>
<u>Home Occupation</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	
<b>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation Uses</b>			
Cultural Attraction	P	<del>-C</del>	-

14-Townhomes in the CR and C1 District must comply with SMC 17.38.085.

**Section 7** – The standards in SMC Table 17.25.050-1 Trade Density Standards, originally adopted through Section 7.E.1.1 of Ordinance 2017-1103, shall be amended by deleting the ~~struck through~~ text as follows.

**Table 17.25.050-1: Trade Density Standards**

District	Use	Minimum Lot Area	Minimum Lot Width	Minimum Lot Depth	Maximum Lot Coverage
CR	All	10,000 sf	-	-	35%
C1	<del>General</del> <u>All</u>	0 sf <sup>1</sup>	0 ft	0 ft	100% <sup>2</sup>
-	<del>Single-Family Dwelling</del>	<del>6,000 sf</del>	<del>60 ft</del>	<del>100 ft</del>	<del>50%</del>
M1	All	0 sf	-	-	60%

1- Except for multi-family dwellings which require 1,200 sf per unit.

2- Except for residential uses on the first floor above grade, which are limited to 50% of lot area.

**Section 8** – The standards in SMC Table 17.25.060-1 Trade Dimensional Standards, originally adopted through Section 7.F.1.3 of Ordinance 2017-1103, shall be amended by deleting the ~~struck through~~ and adding the underlined text as follows.

**Table 17.25.060-1: Trade Dimensional Standards**

District	Minimum Setbacks	Maximum Setbacks
----------	------------------	------------------

	Maximum Height of Building	Front	Side, Interior	Side, Street	Rear, Interior Lot	Rear, Through Lot	Front	Side, Street
CR	35 ft <sup>1</sup>	25 ft	0 ft <sup>2,3</sup>	20 ft	0 ft <sup>2,3</sup>	20 ft	-	-
C1	50 ft <sup>4</sup>	0 ft <sup>5</sup>	0 ft <sup>2,6</sup>	-	0 ft <sup>2</sup>	-	10 ft <sup>7,8</sup>	10 ft <sup>9</sup>
M1	35 ft	15 ft	5 ft	-	0 ft <sup>2</sup>	-	-	-

1 - A greater height may be allowed by the Planning Commission; provided it does not interfere with the views of a substantial number of upland properties which are presently residential or have a potential for residential development and there is an overriding public interest in allowing a greater height. For each 10 ft increase in height that is allowed, there shall be an additional setback or stepback of 15 ft from any property line.

2 - Except in Zone Transition Areas where the minimum setback shall be the same as any adjoining more restrictive district.

3 - Except for multiple residential dwelling units adjoining a nonresidential use where the minimum setback shall be 20 ft.

4 - 35 ft for ~~multi-family dwellings and legacy homes~~ single-family and multi-family dwellings.

5 - 15 ft for ~~legacy homes~~ single-family dwellings.

6 - 5 ft for ~~legacy homes~~ single-family dwellings.

7 - 20 ft for ~~legacy homes~~ single-family dwellings.

8 - Automobile service stations are exempt from the maximum front yard requirement.

9 - ~~Legacy Homes Single-Family residential construction~~ may have a greater setback.

**Section 9** – The section of SMC Table 17.25.145-1 Allowed Signage related to “Sign Type”, originally adopted through Section 7.K.1.1 of Ordinance 2017-1103, shall be amended by adding the underlined text as follows. All other portions of SMC Table 17.25.145-1 shall remain in effect without amendment:

**Table 17.25.145-1: Allowed Signage**

Sign Type	CR	C1	M1
Community Information Sign	P	P	P
Dilapidated Sign	X <sup>2</sup>	X <sup>2</sup>	X <sup>2</sup>
Mural, <u>Type 1</u>	C	C	C
<u>Mural, Type 2</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
Off-Premises Sign	X	X	X
Sign Placed by a Governmental Agency	P	P	P
Sign of Outstanding Design	C	C	X

2 - An existing sign, together with its sign structure, which becomes dilapidated shall be removed after notice to the property owner, unless upon appeal under SMC 17.46, the property owner establishes facts sufficient to rebut the presumption of dilapidation.

**Section 10** – Ordinance 2020-1158 shall be repealed in its entirety.

**Section 11** – If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or other portion of this Ordinance, or its application to any person, is, for any reason, declared invalid, in whole or in part by any court or agency of competent jurisdiction, said decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.

This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force beginning on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020.

Passed by a vote of \_\_\_\_\_ at the City Council meeting of \_\_\_\_\_, 2020.

SIGNED:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Anderson  
Mayor of Stevenson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leana Kinley  
Clerk/Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth B. Woodrich  
City Attorney



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

---

## Letter

Barb Robinson <robinson@gorge.net>  
To: Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Mon, Jul 13, 2020 at 11:54 AM

Ben and Planning commission - I received the letter to downtown property owners and tried to ignore it but I'm going to respond in language that isn't politically correct or "try to be nice and polite". It is ridiculous! Your "False" responses are poor examples of our concerns. Your points were never our concerns - no one said we thought we couldn't stay when someone retires -- or that we'd have to move or change our use! Who said this? I think no one did and the unfriendly, over-planning mentality of the city has caused the general feeling in the community that it does no good to give your input. Having lived here longer than any of you, I have watched the city council give all authority to a planning commission that now seems to be the tail that wags the dog! Your "vision" of what you want a small town to be doesn't reflect what most people think should happen. With a mayor who seems to think his opinion is more important than the "people's", a planning commission that spends hours and money putting out 40 plus page documents we're supposed to keep up with, and a city council that apparently just follows what the planner thinks, I think it's a waste of our time to try to protect our rights as property owners -- and I take offense at your silly example of the city trying to think like a business! That is just plain dumb!! Where to seat a person in a restaurant is a decision made by a business owner who has to determine what income is needed to "stay afloat", NOT what is for the "common good" (socialism at it's best!). I also take offense at your mention of a "generous" grandfathering concerning single family homes. You're being "generous" with what I can do with my own private property that we've worked for over 60 years to improve and pass on to my kids???

Your letter is typical government double-speak and because people move in from somewhere, get on the council or planning commission and want to change the town to their "vision" doesn't make their ideas better than mine. With many empty lots, businesses struggling to even survive, and not many people waiting to open a business, it's not the time to be so restrictive. The downtown area can't provide sufficient parking for current businesses now. Your efforts need to be directed at helping current business owners -- listen their input instead of telling us what's best for us.

I would appreciate this being provided to the other members of the planning commission as well as city council as I don't do the Zoom meetings.

Thank you.

Barbara Robinson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

July 8, 2020

City of Stevenson  
Planning Department  
Ben Shumaker  
RE: Planning Commission Meeting- Single-Family Dwellings Downtown

I'd like for you to submit this letter to the Planning Commission for input during the July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. I won't be available to read it during the Zoom meeting. I hope it can be read for the record during the meeting.

In response to your letter of July 7 to Downtown Property Owners regarding "intent and effect" of zoning discussions I'd like to respond to possible effects. I'm not entirely clear as to the intent of the zoning and maybe you can elaborate?

Small business owners who take the chance to follow a dream and invest in it inherently take on a risk a salaried employee can't appreciate. There are no 8-5 hours with holiday, vacation and sick pay. There's no Monday through Friday work schedule, no medical benefits or retirement to speak of. They risk their savings and the possibility they won't be able to pay their bills if sales don't meet expenses. In a town like Stevenson, business owners count on local support to help them through the lean months and hope the tourist season is a good one. With purchases of property in downtown Stevenson, there is a benefit of determining what is the "highest and best use" of one's property. In many cases an owner can use the property for business or a dwelling. This is an enviable position that may help to weather any economic conditions that can change. Property owners purchase with this in mind as part of their business plan and it's a great selling point in their future. This type of zoning partly reflects the unique character and charm of our small town.

If the city is trying "think like a business" I can suggest from decades of owning various companies, the first place to start is "cutting the fat" out of the budget. If the city is suggesting they can increase revenue on the backs of property owners by a zoning change, I would suggest you rethink what it means to perform your duties as a humble public servant. The city employees garner their salaries from the public at large and their best practices would be to run the city as efficiently as possible and help its citizens prosper. Free enterprise will determine the type of commerce that ensues in our town, not bureaucratic dictate.

Your idea of forcing property owners to build a certain type of dwelling is not conducive to good commerce. Instead of increased revenue you'll be "shooting yourself in the foot". I priced the single-family dwelling plan and the multi-family plan for the McClosky's and can tell you the cost increase was around 30% for them to build what they were required to build. The number of people able to buy land and build a more expensive structure as required will be diminished. The costs of building will increase rents and the progress of new building will slow, not to mention the community will suffer from less entrepreneurship coming to our town. The success rate of a venture will have an increased potential of failure because of these added costs.

Most people understand zoning is important and certain types of business is limited to certain zones. In this case "listening to concerns" must evolve into a longer-term approach. Limiting property owners' options is not a sensible move at this time. Even before COVID-19 there was a global economic

slowdown. Now with business barely holding on because of shutdowns and restrictions coupled with war zone riot areas as close to Stevenson as 50 miles, and future supply chain issues involving major world events, our lives are changing fast. We need to wait this thing out to see what happens to our community. I'd like to propose a moratorium on all zoning changes for the remainder of 2020 if not through 2021 and to lift the current moratorium on single-family dwellings downtown until a future date. At that time, a viable benefit to the community must be shown for this change to zoning. If this idea is so good, won't it still be as viable in a year or two?

Respectfully Submitted,

Pat Price



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Public Comment for City Council Meeting 6/18/2020

---

**Monica Masco** <arrowhead.monica@gmail.com>  
To: Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Thu, Jun 18, 2020 at 9:52 AM

Hello Leana

I will also read during the Public Hearing 6:30pm regarding Resolution 2020-364.

I take pride in my property (mixed use residence and accounting office) located at 235 First Street. I oppose the city's resolution 2020-364 – moratorium on new single family residences in the C1 zone. If my structure was destroyed due to a catastrophic event this city resolution/moratorium would prohibit me from replacing a similar dwelling. This is unsettling and seems an unfair interference/taking of property rights. Punishment for being a good neighbor.

The City's Comprehensive Plan states on page 1

*"Stevenson is a friendly, welcoming community that values excellent schools and a small town atmosphere."*

Page 28 Goal 4 Tactic 4.3-3 states *"Ensure the viability, salability, and re-buildability of existing single-family homes in the downtown area by including zoning provisions such as designating all home built prior to January 31, 2013 as permitted uses or incorporating generous continuation policies for nonconforming single-family uses."*

As well Tactic 4.3-4 states *"Consider allowing new single family development in the downtown area as conditional uses according to specific criteria such as the presence of lot sizes too small to support new commercial uses."*

It's one thing to dream about the future of Stevenson and it's another to be sensible and respect current residents' property uses. Development should create community not push residents out.

When it comes time to revisit the C1 zoning issues I hope the city will be creative and use suitable mechanisms such as grandfather clauses (a clause in prohibitive legislation that makes exceptions for those already engaged in the activity that it bans or regulates) to keep the uses consistent with property owners intentions. Allow the back and forth of residential and business use in existing single family dwelling structures. Strict zoning uses in the C1 are not justified. Please be a good neighbor.

Thank you,

Monica Masco



Hello Leana,

Please include these comments in the packet for tonight's meeting. I intend to make these comments during the meeting as well.

Thank you,

Brian McNamara

After attending the video conference of the Stevenson City Council Meeting on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020 it is painfully clear that the City Council has a foregone conclusion that Stevenson desperately needs a moratorium against "new" Single Family Detached Dwellings (SFDD) in the C1 downtown area. There was no justification provided that this was somehow necessary to ensure new "affordable" downtown residential opportunities or would somehow increase construction of new businesses. Even after acknowledging that the original emergency moratorium was initiated without due public comment, and to the detriment of property owners, the Council went ahead and approved a new moratorium. The Council flat out said "We have already decided this and it should have already been done". This after a poignant *mia-culpa* provided by Councilman Paul Hendricks. As noted in last week's Skamania County Pioneer at least 20 constituents submitted comments against renewing the Emergency Moratorium. 11 of those comments were from affected property owners. Stakeholder feedback and public opinion are falling on deaf ears. Many current residents and property owners are still unaware of the moratorium(s).

I highlighted some farcical jargon in the new moratorium below.

WHEREAS, the Stevenson City Council finds that the City's ability to preserve the look and feel of the city as outlined in the adopted Comprehensive Plan will be jeopardized unless this moratorium is authorized; and

The "look and feel" of Stevenson remains the same as it has for over 30 years, including the SFDD. The look of Stevenson will not be enhanced by empty businesses with apartments above them.

WHEREAS, the Stevenson City Council finds that the authorization of this moratorium is necessary to protect the health, welfare, safety and future economic viability of the City;

SFDD actually protect the health, welfare and safety of the City. As for the economic vitality of the City we have a hardware store, grocery store and a few viable restaurants. The rest of the marketplace are basically "dreamer" businesses which rarely survive even in good economic times. The 1991 Comprehensive Plan identifies the fact of "retail drain", which means that residents are spending their retail money elsewhere due to multiple market factors. Walmart, Costco, Home Depot, Safeway etc. offer better selection and prices. Our population will not make a quantum leap to change this.

WHEREAS, the City has not completed the downtown plan to address this issue; and

The City Council and Planning Commission are moving ahead with the Plan for SUCCESS to the detriment of current property owners' rights. In fact, the Ten Year Build Out in the Plan for Success states;

“» Includes concepts for private parcels, with owner knowledge. Does not infer that property owners agree or disagree with each concept. » Existing uses are NOT displaced. Any future change would require owner consent, additional planning, design, and public review”.

WHEREAS, RCW 35A.63.220 requires a City to conduct a public hearing and adopt Findings of Fact supporting the moratorium; and

This is not a true “public meeting” but yet another virtual meeting. And the Council has not shown that the moratorium is an emergency or pressing issue. In fact, it is highly unpopular with affected property owners and the general public. The overwhelming negative stakeholder and public comments addressed to the Council were ignored by the Council when they reinstated the moratorium on May 21st. There were no advocates other than Council members. Unfortunately, the Council does not feel responsible to their constituents. Therefore, the Council will once again approve the Findings of Fact to ensure the continuation of the moratorium until the Planning Commission provides them with their recommendation to make the Council desired Zoning changes permanent.)

The City Council of the City of Stevenson adopts the following findings of fact:

1. The City has listed in the 2013 Comprehensive Plan to, “consider allowing new single family development in the downtown area as conditional uses according to specific criteria such as the presence of lot sizes too small to support new commercial uses.”

What the 2013 Comprehensive Plan actually says is “4.3-1– Protect commercial space from incompatible uses, such as industrial. 4.3-2– Encourage adaptive reuse in the design of new downtown buildings. 4.3-3– Ensure the viability, salability, and re-buildability of existing single-family homes in the downtown area by including zoning provisions such as designating all homes built prior to January 1st, 2013 as permitted uses or incorporating generous continuation policies for nonconforming single-family uses. 4.3-4– Consider allowing new single-family development in the downtown area as conditional uses according to specific criteria such as (inherent property rights granted at the time of purchase) the presence of lot sizes too small to support new commercial uses”.

The City Council needs to grandfather the rights of single family detached dwelling property owners as granted at the time of purchase.

Brian McNamara



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Public Comment for June 18 Meeting

---

Pat <pat@aqcbuilders.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Thu, Jun 18, 2020 at 11:09 AM

Leana, I'd like to submit a comment for consideration during the meeting tonight. I'm sorry for the late email.

My name is Pat Price, I've been a citizen of Stevenson since 1997. I'm a small business owner and father of three children in the public school system here. I've been a builder for 33 years and have worked in communities all across Washington and Oregon. During this time I've worked with several dozen planning departments in as many counties. I've always been impressed with the various employees who have steadfastly been of assistance in helping to bring to fruition the many varied projects I've been involved with over the years. In several cases our project required a variance and the government agencies were quite keen to help us accomplish our goals. I have only encountered a couple of instances where it seems the department had an agenda which was not consistent with following existing guidelines and operating with the intent of helping the land owner accomplish their goal within those guidelines. In this case I see that a person's right to use their property is potentially being restricted and I have to ask the participants why? What sense is there in passing an ordinance which potentially does harm to a land owner? What is the aim of making the downtown area a strictly commercial zone? What are the benefits to the community? It's my impression that a city council and a city government work for the inhabitants of the community, not against them. Please reconsider this concept of removing the possibility of new residential structures from the downtown zone as it smacks more of totalitarianism than of the ownership of property rights we all enjoy as a Constitutional Republic.

Sincerely,

Pat Price



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## SFDD

1 message

---

**Mike Jones** <jonesy72@live.com>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 8:24 AM

To: "leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Before I purchased my home in downtown Stevenson in 2016 I consulted city hall and checked the local zoning laws to make sure my investment was sound. I was assured that there was no agenda or plans in place that might effect my personal or financial commitment based on the information given at that time. The STDD moratorium and zoning changes are a slap in the face to everyone who is vested and has actually has made financial commitments downtown. Get [Outlook for Android](#)

To: Elected officials of City of Stevenson for inclusion in public comments and meeting records.

I am a downtown Stevenson property owner of 17 years (80 & 82 Columbia Ave.) whose property rights will be negatively affected by continuation of the moratorium on construction of new Single-Family Detached Dwellings (SFDD). I oppose adoption of Ordinance 2020-1157. The original moratorium was an example of misguided, arbitrary and autocratic disregard for property rights. It was disturbingly inappropriate of the Mayor and Council to enact the moratorium in the manner it was accomplished. As the Planning Commission noted “There was general agreement the criticism of the moratorium was due to the perception there was no opportunity for public input in the decision making” (Minutes 2/10/ Planning Commission Meeting). That sentiment is growing as more and more stakeholders and the public are made aware of the moratorium and the Council and Planning Commission intention to make it permanent while adding more unnecessary restrictions (ZON2020-01).

I do not feel the moratorium was necessary to the “success” of downtown Stevenson. There have been SFDD in downtown Stevenson since the town was incorporated. Ordinance 2020-1157 will not increase “affordable housing” or “attract businesses” to the downtown area. It will reduce opportunity for both. As then Planning Commissioner Shaun Van Pelt pointed out “... the cost to remove a SFDD by a business seeking to build a commercial entity is prohibitive and makes it hard to attract businesses to the downtown area” (Minutes 2/10/ Planning Commission Meeting). It is noteworthy that Van Pelt resigned after this meeting. The reason that businesses are not flourishing in the downtown area is that Stevenson is an isolated town with only 1500 residents. One road in, one road out. Big box stores are a short distance away, high ticket items can be purchased tax free in Oregon. The marginal small businesses in town are already in trouble. The “business” environment in Stevenson will likely be severely impacted for the foreseeable future.

As a stakeholder, I do not feel I was properly notified while the moratorium was initially under consideration or enacted. I request the moratorium be allowed to expire permanently on May 17, 2020. I also request that the ZON2020-01 Amendment be taken off the Planning Commission agenda until such time as an urgent need be identified. I request written notice of any further meetings or proposed actions pursuant to the moratorium, Ordinance 2020-1156 or the ZON2020-01 Amendment be sent to me by US Postal Service mail via the mailing address the City uses for my water bill.

I also note that any actions at this time by the Council may be prohibited based on PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR AMENDING PROCLAMATION 20-05, 20-28 Open Public Meetings Act and Public Records Act.

“Subject to the conditions for conducting any meeting as required above, agencies are further prohibited from taking “action,” as defined in RCW 42.30.020, unless those matters are necessary and routine matters or are matters necessary to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak and the current public health emergency, until such time as regular public participation under the Open Public Meetings Act is possible”.

Sincerely,

Brian McNamara



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Hope it makes it...

1 message

---

**Meg Gittins** <meg@megsmobile.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 1:59 PM

Hello,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Zoning Code Amendment ZON2020-1157. The underhanded way in which the entire zoning code was processed seems suspect. None of the public, or any of the property owners, residents were consulted.

I like the rural way our businesses are combined with SFDD. I do not want our downtown area looking like a strip mall. I don't understand why you want to punish those residents who have rentals in the commercial district by not allowing them to revert back to a SFDD once they housed a business.

I agree with both Mr. VanPelt and Mary Repars comments.

I have disagreed with many of the Planning Commissions decisions, such as forcing the poor couple who took over the burnt down structure on Russell to build a 3 plex. It looked SO much nicer as a burnt out house for several years.

Currently there are several rentals where the parking issue is not enforced ( 2 off street parking spots for each unit.) making residential streets flooded with parked cars.

In fact parking in general is not ever addressed, has anyone tried to park near the Post Office on a busy day?

My main point though is that the ZON1157 Code was slid by in an underhanded way, and does not promote income for the city and punishes long term homeowners.

Shame on you.

**PLEASE INCLUDE THIS IN THE PACKET AND RECORD OF THE MEETING**

*Meg Gittins*  
360-601-8114



**Megs Mobile Notary**

Background Screened  
360-601-8114

**Serving both Oregon and Washington States**

Counties of Hood River, Multnomah, Wasco, Klickitat, Skamania, and Clark



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## moratorium, Ordinance 2020-1157 or the ZON202001 Amendment

---

**Donna Schumacher** <donnaaschumacher@gmail.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 9:08 AM

To the elected officials of the City of Stevenson,

I'm against Ordinance 2020-1157, I strongly believe there was not enough notice by the city to take away rights of downtown property owners.

The moratorium should not be extended and existing downtown residential houses should be allowed flexibility to be used the way the market dictates.

It seems to me we have done enough studies on downtown in the last 20 years. One of these studies, even picked out colors that I should paint my building.

Now this new dream study is showing my property on Leavens st. being a creative development center whatever that is supposed to mean.

As someone renting out these store fronts, I'm confused about all this pent up demand for commercial space.

The only new commercial building to be built was the welfare office building.

Do the right thing city council and vote against this Ordinance.

Thank you,  
Harry Schumacher





Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Single Family Detached Dwelling

1 message

---

**Susan Storie** <sstorie@aol.com>

Thu, May 21, 2020 at 8:42 AM

Reply-To: Susan Storie <sstorie@aol.com>

To: "leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

As a property owner in the downtown commercial zone, I am against the moratorium on SFDD and that it should not be extended.

**Susan Carroll Storie**

phone 503.502.5304

e-mail: [sstorie@aol.com](mailto:sstorie@aol.com)



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## SFDD

1 message

---

**Mike Jones** <jonesy72@live.com>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 6:29 PM

To: "leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

My friends,

You may not own a downtown residential property or business. Some of you may not read the Skamania Pioneer (see attachment below). Your elected City officials are making officious decisions without due public and stakeholder comment. None of these current elected officials (who ran unopposed) do either. They need to know your feelings about how this town can live and grow sustainably in keeping with our rural roots. Please send this to other residents who may not know, as we did not, what audacious actions the current city government are taking to enact in their their vision of a "Plan for SUCCESS" for Stevenson. You know this town better than them. Do you want a Hood River or Portland here? Is it even a possibility? We need a dose of reality here in Stevenson as we face a serious downturn in our economy due to Covid-19. You can support me/us by sending a simple comment that you do not support the Single Family Detached Dwelling (SFDD) moratorium renewal Ordinance 2020-1157 or ZON2020-01 to

Dear Leana,

As a resident of Stevenson, I oppose the extension of the Single Family Detached Dwelling (SFDD) moratorium renewal Ordinance 2020-1157 by the Stevenson City Council and any consideration of the proposed ZON2020-01 Amendment by the Stevenson Planning Commission. Until such time as an urgent need be established and full public comment pursuant to current Washington State Public Meeting Act General Guidance parameters for open public comment can be met these issues should be tabled.

Thank You,

Michael Jones

Get [Outlook for Android](#)



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## moratorium on construction of new Single-Family Detached Dwellings

1 message

---

**Rocio Marquez** <roccomarquez@gmail.com>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 10:54 PM

To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Leana,

I am a downtown property owner whose property rights will be negatively affected by the continuation of the moratorium on construction of new Single-Family Detached Dwellings (SFDD). I do not feel the moratorium was necessary to the success of downtown Stevenson. I do not feel I was properly notified while the moratorium was initially under consideration or enacted. I request the moratorium be allowed to expire permanently on May 17, 2020. I also request that the ZON2020-01 Amendment be taken off the Planning Commission agenda until such time as an urgent need be identified. I request written notice of any further meetings or actions pursuant to the moratorium or the ZON2020-01 Amendment be sent to me by US Postal Service mail via Skamania County Treasurer taxpayer addresses."

Rocio Marquez  
[308 NW Vancouver Ave](#)  
PO Box 473  
Stevenson WA 98648  
503.577.7317  
[roccomarquez@gmail.com](mailto:roccomarquez@gmail.com)



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## moratorium on construction of new Single-Family Detached Dwellings

1 message

---

**Brian M** <alkasazi@gmail.com>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 10:51 PM

To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

I am a downtown property owner whose property rights will be negatively affected by the continuation of the moratorium on construction of new Single-Family Detached Dwellings (SFDD). I do not feel the moratorium was necessary to the success of downtown Stevenson. I do not feel I was properly notified while the moratorium was initially under consideration or enacted. I request the moratorium be allowed to expire permanently on May 17, 2020. I also request that the ZON2020-01 Amendment be taken off the Planning Commission agenda until such time as an urgent need be identified. I request written notice of any further meetings or actions pursuant to the moratorium or the ZON2020-01 Amendment be sent to me by US Postal Service mail via Skamania County Treasurer taxpayer addresses.”

Brian Massey  
75 1st Street  
PO Box 473  
Stevenson WA 98648  
503.577.5085  
[alkasazi@gmail.com](mailto:alkasazi@gmail.com)



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

**(no subject)**

1 message

---

**Juli Miller** <milljam@gmail.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:11 PM

I am not in support of SSFD. PUBLIC INPUT IS NEEDED,!  
Thank you, Julie Miller

Sent from my iPad



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Do not renew

1 message

---

**Betty Reaney** <reaneyj@embarqmail.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 9:07 PM

Dear sirs:

This is not the time to be taking action when residents cannot gather to discuss issues publicly. I do not support the Single Family Detached Dwelling (SFDD) moratorium renewal Ordinance 2020-1157 or ZON2020-01.

The proposed restrictions would be taking rights away from long-time property owners in the downtown area. Unacceptable.

John and Betty Reaney

450 Spruce St

Stevenson, WA, 98648



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Repar--comments on home to business and business to home issue

---

repar@saw.net <repar@saw.net>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 3:38 PM

To: Stevenson <citycouncil@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Dear Stevenson City Council, City Administrator Kinley, and City Planner Shumaker,

I attended the Planning commission meeting where this was discussed and where members of the public had input on the issue of whether the City should control what happens to the businesses that operate in homes and what happens if a business stops (for whatever reason) and the building becomes a home; the discussion turned on the fact that we have businesses that again become homes once a business leaves the building. We can also have homes that become businesses--which in the age of pandemics may become the norm as people work more from home and should be considered.

Frankly, I don't think the City should control what happens to houses that become businesses, and businesses that are housed in a home that become a home again. For one thing, the City doesn't control what businesses come to fruition and which ones do not. So, why should the City control what happens once a business fails or leaves, or if a business opens in a home? Businesses come and go in our community. That has happened for the last 30 years that I have lived here.

IF the City wants to control the housing stock, that is another thing. More houses could become available for actual housing and not businesses then. BUT, that is the larger issue of whether multiple rentals owned by only a few individuals in our community are a good or bad thing for a community in which housing stock is at a premium. (I have spoken at the Planning Commission meetings on this issue.)

I believe there are legal aspects to how much control a City can have over this issue. That is something to be addressed by your counsel. The other issue, and one more pertinent I believe, is why would the City want to control this. If a business is housed in a home, then at least we have a business in town. If a business home again becomes a house, then we have a house in which humans live. Win-Win.

Stevenson has always been a City that does not seem to have an overall identity. It's a place where real people work, live, and play. And, trying to push it in a direction that reeks of too much interference from local government may not be the path that leads to anything good. We have the Stevenson Downtown Plan which can give a broad overview of where the City wants to go, but trying to control the minutia of how to get to a community identity is not the way to go. We are not a recreation park that needs control.

Sincerely,

Mary Repar  
50561 WA-14  
P.O. Box 103  
Stevenson, WA 98648

tel: (360) 726-7052





Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## SFDD

1 message

---

**pete reseter** <1petetar@gmail.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 4:29 PM

Leana

I have viewed the entire 87 pages of the "Plan for SUCCESS for Stevenson". I do not support this intention, and I do not support the Single Family Detached Dwelling moratorium renewal ordinance 2020-1157/ZON2020-01.

I don't want Stevenson Wa. to become another Hood River or Tualatin Or., with glitz and glamour.  
thank you for your time and consideration

Pete Reseter



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## SFDD moratorium

1 message

---

**Sikora Photography** <sikoraphotography@yahoo.com>  
Reply-To: Sikora Photography <info@sikoraphotography.com>  
To: "leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Wed, May 20, 2020 at 10:25 PM

Dear Leana,

As a resident of Stevenson, I oppose the extension of the Single Family Detached Dwelling (SFDD) moratorium renewal Ordinance 2020-1157 by the Stevenson City Council and any consideration of the proposed ZON2020-01 Amendment by the Stevenson Planning Commission. Until such time as an urgent need be established and full public comment pursuant to current Washington State Public Meeting Act General Guidance parameters for open public comment can be met these issues should be tabled.

Thank You,  
Thomas Sikora

Thomas Sikora • 503.866.2645 • [www.sikoraphotography.com](http://www.sikoraphotography.com)



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Building restrictions on downtown property owners

1 message

---

**Steven Emond** <steveemond6@gmail.com>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 7:15 PM

To: Leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Just to let you know that I am opposed to the moratorium on construction of single-family dwellings in downtown Stevenson. It seems like an unreasonable restriction on people who have spent their hard earned money on property. What in the world is the big hurry to restrict downtown to only businesses and multi unit dwellings? Seems like an overreach to me.

I also think it is apparent that there was a not sufficient public involvement in the implementation of this moratorium.

Please add this to the minutes of the May 21 City Council meeting.

Sincerely,

Steve Emond

Sent from my iPhone

As a former downtown Stevenson property owner who owned multiple properties in the C1 Zone, please know that I am completely opposed to continuation of the moratorium on construction of new Single Family Detached Dwellings (SFDD) in the downtown C1 Zone. If the Planning Commission adopts Ordinance 2020-1157, that will negatively affect the property rights of every property owner in the C1 Zone. My question to the commission is “what right do you have to prescribe an ordinance without any public input from the stakeholder”? How would you feel if someone arbitrarily changed your zoning and dictated what you could use your property for? What if the proposed zoning change was done without your input and then reduced your value and limited personal use? I am sure you would be quite upset!!

There is not a long list of business owners looking for commercial property in Stevenson especially with the pandemic in full swing! Therefore, please allow the moratorium to expire permanently as of May 17, 2020. Consider looking at this proposal again when there are more people interested in having a business in the downtown. Take the ZON2020-01 Amendment off the Planning Commission agenda until such time as an urgent need is identified and open public comment can be safely afforded. I request written notice of any further meetings or proposed actions pursuant to extending the moratorium, Ordinance 2020-1157 or the ZON202001 Amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Libby Johnson  
POB 707  
Stevenson, WA



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Public comment regarding zoning change

---

**Chris Anderson** <homevalleychris@gmail.com>  
To: leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Mon, May 18, 2020 at 8:47 PM

To city of stevenson and city council members. Please consider this my public comment and add to the record and you meeting packet for the may21, 2020 meeting. I oppose proposed zoning change amendment ZON2020-01 proposed ordinance 2020-1157, and the moratorium on single family detached dwellings . I own several properties in downtown stevenson area. I do not want restrictions put on my property such as " The Birkenfield House " at 96 columbia street . Currently it is a commercial rental to SCDVSA. What if the need changes ? What if my commercial tenant vacates? Iam requesting written notice of future meetings with regards to this subject be mailed to my PO box 151 stevenson so i can be informed of important issues/ changes being considered. Thank you Chris Anderson

5/18/2020

To the elected officials representing our City of Stevenson

Please consider this public comment and add to the record for your meeting May 21, 2020.

I am concerned with and oppose proposed zoning code amendment ZON2020-01, proposed Ordinance 2020-1157, and the moratorium on Single Family Detached Dwellings.

I have lived at my historic (built as a Homestead in the 1890s) downtown Stevenson 235 First Street house for 27+ years and have had a business at the property serving our community for almost the same amount of time. What I could and couldn't do in the future would be negatively impacted by the proposed changes as well many neighbors in similar situation. I am requesting these issues be removed from agendas until the Stay Home Stay Healthy Order is lifted and people can contribute and work together face to face in an open public meeting which is in line with the current proclamation from Washington State Governor Inslee.

***Only Remote Meetings and Actions on Matters That Are "Necessary and Routine" or Are Necessary to Respond to COVID-19 Are Allowed Under the OPMA***

Under the proclamation, public agencies may take "action" only on matters that are either "necessary and routine" or necessary to respond to the COVID-19 outbreak and current health emergency. Agencies are further prohibited from taking "action," as defined in RCW 42.30.020. Proclamations attached.

Also I am requesting written notice to my PO Box 1043 Stevenson, same address my city water bill is mailed to, of any further meetings/agenda items on proposals that would impact my 235 First Street Stevenson property.

Thank you,

Monica Masco

4 Attachments:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR AMENDING PROCLAMATION 20-05 20-28 Open Public Meetings Act and Public Records Act

Extended via Proclamations 20-28.1, 20-28.2 and 20-28.3



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## city council meeting

1 message

---

**Barb Robinson** <robinson@gorge.net>

Mon, May 18, 2020 at 2:59 PM

To: "leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

To Council Members - I am a long time Stevenson downtown resident and former business owner whose property rights will definitely be affected by the moratorium and the prevention of change of use for a building owner. I agree with others that this is of no benefit to the success of downtown Stevenson and I request the moratorium be allowed to expire permanently. I also request that the ZON2020-01 Amendment be taken off the Planning Commission agenda until such time as an urgent need is identified. I also would like written notice of meetings concerning the moratorium or the Amendment.

As a retired person, I don't attend many meetings any more and assume our elected persons are acting in my best interest when it comes to property rights. I am probably the oldest (long term) resident in downtown Stevenson and have a vested interest in keeping this a good place to live and operate a business. Bob and I worked jointly over 60 years to develop positive things in the Stevenson area and improve our own property and naturally assumed we could pass that on to our family, letting them live here or have a small business, if they chose, and the opportunity arose. Over the years we've seen many small shops start up and then close when they could not afford to compete with larger areas. Those owners should be able to that space for whatever they want – possibly for someone needing a place to live (sometimes a single person) which allows the owner to pay his bills, provides income to the city and prevents another vacant eyesore because it can't generate any income. Much more input from stakeholders needs to be heard before measures severely restricting property rights are adopted.

Thank you.

Barbara Robinson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## moratorium zon2020-01

1 message

---

**Rick** <thecrossing4lunch@gmail.com>

Mon, May 18, 2020 at 2:09 PM

To: "leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hi, I am a thirty year downtown property owner and a twenty year business owner in that property. My husband and I have lived in our house(SFDD) for thirty years and have had a cafe in it for twenty of those years. As both a residence and a business I feel our property has been an asset to the community. We plan someday to retire our business and continue to live in our house hopefully for another thirty years. To limit peoples options for the uses of their property limits the growth of our community to the view of a select few. In our thirty years here there has never been a time when all of the business properties have been full, and the SFDD or the residents of the properties kept the downtown looking homey instead of ghostly. I do not want to live in Hood River, I do not want townhouses and commercial buildings to be the bases for our town. I want a community that is warm and welcoming and I feel mixed use creates that environment. I ask you to let the moratorium expire.

I would appreciate these comments being part of the record and in the council meeting packet for the 5/21/2020 meeting, which I will not be able to attend.

Thanks for your time, Jennifer Toledo

The crossing

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10





Leana Kinley <leana@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

## Harry schumacher imput

1 message

---

**Donna Schumacher** <donnaaschumacher@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 13, 2020 at 6:10 PM

To: info@ci.stevenson.wa.us

To: City Council:  
From: Harry Schumacher

It has come to my attention, that it was more then a phone calls worth to put restrictions on commercial property in Downtown Stevenson. So say one of these so called creative developers wants to put an outdoor type restaurant at 36 leavens and it fails, now according to these new rules, I can no longer rent it out as a home. I understand about new construction requirements, but property owners want the rights to use our property that we deserve for investing in commercial property in the first place.

Harry Schumacher  
541-490-1936



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

---

## Downtown Building Moratorium

1 message

---

**Terese Stacy** <terese.stacy@gmail.com>  
To: Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Fri, Feb 21, 2020 at 11:06 AM

Ben

As a property owner with vacant lots in downtown Stevenson we continue to support the restrictions on single family dwellings being built in the downtown area. Currently the amount of trash and street parking of some residences in the downtown corridor not only impacts property values but also limits opportunities for commercial enterprises. Please keep downtown for economic development. More businesses bring more businesses and much need jobs!

Thank you.

Beverly and Terese Stacy