



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

Planning Commission meeting ~ Tonight? Not on the calendar online

Julie May <julie@bowlesmarketplace.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 11:06 AM

To: planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us

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

Hello Ben & Planning Commission~

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

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

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

Thank you~

~Julie

Julie May;

Marketing & Public Relations Manager for Bowles Marketplace

julie@bowlesmarketplace.com

(cell) 503-201-9460

www.BowlesMarketplace.com

"Your Littleton Community Marketplace"



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

Plans

Susan Krug <lvkrug30@yahoo.com>

Thu, Apr 15, 2021 at 9:26 AM

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

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

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

Hi Susan-

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

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

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

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

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

Residential.

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

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

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

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

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

Please let me know if you have other questions,

BEN SHUMAKER

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

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

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

To: planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Subject: Plans

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

Susan Krug, Stevenson



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

Housing memo for PC


Mary Repar <repar2014@gmail.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 10:54 AM

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

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

Mary Repar

 **Housing_29April2021.docx**
16K

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Housing Need Figures

Robert Muth <rcmuth88@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 29, 2021 at 8:17 AM

To: Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

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

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

Thanks.

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

Robert,

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

Rick May

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

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

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

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

Robert C. Muth

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

Good afternoon Ben

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

Rick May

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

Hi Rick-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

BEN SHUMAKER

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

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

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

Cc: Robert Muth <robert.muth@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Amy Weissfeld <amy.weissfeld@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Paul Hendricks <paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Annie McHale <annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Dave Cox

<dave.cox@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Scott Anderson <scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; David Ray

<david.ray@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>;

Valerie Hoy <valerie.hoy@ci.stevenson.wa.us>; Auguste Zettler <auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Subject: Re: Housing Need Figures

Good Morning Ben,

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

Rick May / 503-341-2932

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

Hello-

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

BEN SHUMAKER

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

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

To: robert.muth@ci.stevenson.wa.us; amy.weissfeld@ci.stevenson.wa.us; Paul Hendricks <paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us>;

annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us; dave.cox@ci.stevenson.wa.us; scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us; david.ray@ci.stevenson.wa.us;

mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us; jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us; valerie.hoy@ci.stevenson.wa.us; auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us;

Ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Subject: Housing Need Figures

City Council and Planning Commission Members,

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

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

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

Rick May / 503-341-2932

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932

--

Robert C. Muth

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932

--

Robert C. Muth



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

zoning proposals

Barb Robinson <robinson@gorge.net>

Sat, May 1, 2021 at 5:02 PM

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

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

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

Thank you.

Barbara Robinson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10