

STEVENSON PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
Minutes
Monday, December 4, 2019
6:00 PM

Attending: Auguste Zettler, Jeff Breckel, Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel, Mike Beck

Staff Attending: Ben Shumaker, Community Development Director

Community members present: Pat Rice, Chris Malone, Scott Anderson, Brian Adams

The meeting was called to order @ 6:03 p.m. by chair Hoy-Rhodehamel

Preliminary Matters

1. Chair Selected Public Comment Option 2

Any member of the public may participate in discussion throughout the meeting, provided the Chair acknowledges them prior to their contribution.

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

No comments received

New Business

3. Conditional Use Permit CUP2019-01: SDA Mural #2.

- a. Review Purpose of Meeting (to take public comment and decide whether to grant or deny the proposal)

The purpose is to approve or deny a conditional use proposal for a mural in downtown zone.

- b. Appearance of Fairness

Shumaker explained the purpose of the Appearance of Fairness and asked Commission members for statements regarding their financial interests in outcome of this decision, ex-parte communications on the proposal, and general concerns that may affect the objectivity of any decision maker.

Decision makers are intended to provide information regarding any possible bias or conflict of interest that could unfairly influence their vote on proposals. Any potential conflicts must be disclosed to ensure fairness and impartiality. Members of the Commission can be challenged regarding any perceived conflicts of interest.

- **Zettler, Beck and Breckel** individually noted no disclosures.
- **Hoy-Rhodehamel** provided information on two conversations she had with one of the painters of the project. The artist had asked her if any decision had been reached and if the next PC meeting could be re-scheduled.
- **Shumaker** noted the one disclosure and asked if anyone in attendance wished to challenge the Commission members' ability to be fair and impartial. No challenges were received.

- c. Presentation by Staff
Shumaker pointed out to Commission members the current project was similar to the first mural located on the NAPA building. He noted the analysis used was the same and recommended approval. He referred to Attachment 1, pages 1 & 2, and called attention to several minor changes needed, including correcting the address to 131 SW Cascade and the current date as the decision date.
- d. Presentation by Applicant
 Scott Anderson with the SDA provided some background knowledge on the project. The newest mural is the second in a series of five planned to become part of the walking tour of Stevenson. The SDA is looking for other businesses to participate and can offer scholarships to help with costs. He described the project's intent to improve the walking experience throughout Stevenson and provide visitors a glimpse into Stevenson's history. He is hoping to streamline the conditional use permit process to make it easier and less costly.
- e. Public Hearing
Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel opened the public hearing at 6:09 p.m.
 - i. Comments in Favor
 Brian Adams, acting president of the SDA stated he believed all of Stevenson would benefit with the mural project due to the tourism interest. Scott Anderson and Chris Malone also spoke in favor of the project.
 - ii. Comments Opposed
 None received
 - iii. Comments Neither in Favor Nor Opposed
 None received
- f. Commission Discussion
 None
- g. Findings of Fact
Beck noted the mural project appears to be consistent with Stevenson's downtown plan, won't endanger health or safety, did not appear to reduce property values and is consistent with Stevenson municipal code. **Breckel** echoed **Beck's** comments and complimented the historical value. **Beck** compared the project to one in Sequim and observed the increase in tourism as a benefit.
- h. Decision
MOTION: Zettler motioned to approve CUP2019-01: SDA Mural #2 with corrections. **Breckel** seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

A brief follow-up conversation was held regarding future murals. **Hoy-Rhodehamel** asked about simplifying the permitting process and Scott Anderson related he was working on it. **Breckel** asked if a single permit could be used for the additional murals planned, and **Zettler** reminded everyone other locations had not been determined. **Beck** likened the murals to commercial signs, and if approval has met code, then periodic review is not needed. Several questions on maintenance were raised. Chris Malone explained the mural was coated with an anti-graffiti covering but it would be checked periodically.

Old Business

4. **Land Division Code Update** Draft SMC 16.01.005, "L" Definitions+, SMC 16.02.190&195, and SMC 16.30 (Partial)

Shumaker presented to the Commission information intended to guide discussion on several proposed changes to 1) SMC Title 16, related to Short Subdivisions, Subdivisions, and Boundary Line Adjustments and 2) SMC Title 17 related to Zoning.

He explained to the Commission how the formatting for document changes worked. He has developed a color scheme to more easily highlight changes due to 4 separate codes being combined and shared that many changes were intended to do away with jargon and redundant language. Other municipal code examples were incorporated for comparison and reference.

Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel was called away from the meeting at 6:21 p.m. Vice-Chair Zettler became the acting Chair.

Shumaker asked if the revised format was acceptable and if the draft could be used for future public review when completed. The consensus was it was useful. **Zettler** noted as they become familiar with the format it would become easier to understand.

Shumaker presented 12 guidance points to the Commission for their input. **Shumaker** pointed out specific areas to consider and referred to the attachments highlighting potential changes. **Beck** suggested it would be valuable to keep language aligned with RCW's and other regulatory documents in order to avoid confusion and maintain consistency. It was agreed that specificity was important to ensure clarity in interpreting code. Language regarding schools and schoolyards was one set of terms the Commission asked to retain as in current use.

Shumaker asked the Commission if the use of figures was beneficial in his staff reports. All members agreed the use of figures was helpful as a visual guide in defining lots and making things easier to understand.

Clarifying purpose and intent, lot size thresholds, utility easements and restrictions, keeping or discarding "lease" as a term, short plat and subdivision terms and review standards and other items were discussed. One subject the Commission focused on was deciding how lot areas are defined and configured. Currently the definition of lot areas and the method of calculation differs or is absent between zoning, short plat and subdivision codes.

Pat Rice, an audience member asked for clarification regarding what changes in how lot areas are defined and configured would mean in determining buildable areas or footprints. He was curious if it would result in some existing lots losing the ability to build in the future. **Shumaker** explained it would change how lots would be proportioned and divided and how boundary lines are adjusted. He also noted it meant the definition would be moved to one section of the code rather than three. **Zettler** pointed out that in some cases variances may be applied for if needed.

Another area of discussion was on access panhandle dimensions. The Commission agreed on 20' for driveway widths, 150' for maximum length and 1/2 the length for minimum lot width.

After further deliberation the Commission came to consensus regarding additional code changes and made their recommendations to **Shumaker**. He asked the Commission if they were comfortable with the decisions they had made during the meeting. They agreed expanding the process for public review and involvement was important and to have **Shumaker** develop a full draft proposal of changes leaving the colored boxes with change language in.

Shumaker advised the Commission of upcoming issues for future meetings. Pat Rice verified the December 9th PC meeting would include discussions and decisions on driveway standards and asked about public notice procedures on PC meeting agendas. Shumaker explained how the process would be structured regarding how ordinances are amended and that the recent public comments about notice would be included in any decision-making. **Shumaker** thanked the PC for holding a special meeting to accommodate the new mural applicants.

Acting Chair Zettler adjourned the meeting at 8 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Johanna Roe