



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Ben Shumaker, Community Development Director
DATE: February 8th, 2021
SUBJECT: Zoning Amendment – Amended R2 Text and Map Changes

Introduction

This memo summarizes the ongoing community discussion about changes allowing additional construction on all properties currently zoned R2 and a subset of properties currently zoned R1. This discussion builds on the Planning Commission's March request to change course on the previous expansion of the R3 zone to the areas. No decisions are expected as a result of tonight's meeting.

Text Amendment Summary

The draft largely provides greater flexibility for owners of R2 property by:

- a) Allowing townhomes.
- b) Decreasing the minimum lot size.
- c) Allowing for a greater number of units per acre.
- d) Eliminating maximum lot coverage limitations.
- e) Allowing 4-plexes and 3-plexes.
- f) Decreasing front setbacks.

Two aspects of the draft are more restrictive of development on R2 properties involving:

- g) Prohibiting new use of septic systems.
- h) Prohibiting structures near driveways.

Map Change Summary

The initial discussion draft map was modified with the assistance of Commissioner Breckel. This draft:

- 1) Excludes one previously excluded parcel from the consideration area.
- 2) Includes a portion of one previously-excluded parcel within the consideration area.
- 3) Limits the expansion of the R3 District to the properties south of Hot Springs Alameda and the properties along Del Ray Avenue where the lot size is already 25'x100'.
- 4) Includes the previous discussions related to R3 & C1 zones between East Loop and Frank Johns roads and applies the amended R2 designation to the R3 areas.
- 5) Categorizes all other previously-considered properties as the new R2 Middle Density Residential.

Public Involvement Actions

The following public involvement actions have been taken related to this draft:

- A) The website <http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/letsbuild/> has been set up to collect all information on this effort. This website has 3 sub-pages. The first relates to the anticipated discussions on the Zoning Code amendment. The second for the Zoning Map amendment. The third, currently blank page, relates to the discussion of whether to allow City utilities to extend outside of City Limits. The Planning Commission will

be asked to comment on the third amendment, but will not provide the primary public forum for the policy discussion/development.

- B) Hard copy letters were mailed to the owners of all tax parcels in the R2 District and R1 Core Area. There were 5 types of letters mailed, each tailored to the owner's specific situation. The contact information for Commissioner Auguste Zettler (R2) and Councilmembers Paul Hendricks and Annie McHale (Core Area R1) were included depending on the zone of the recipient.
- C) At neighborhood meeting was attended where staff provided background and listened to concerns.
- D) Emails related to tonight's meeting were sent to those known by City staff to own property or have an interest in the area under consideration.

Context & Future Discussions

Past Discussions

The City Council previously passed a Zoning text amendment related to the R3 District. The amendment 1) allowed different types of gardening/cultivation activities, 2) decreased the minimum lot size requirement, 3) required connection to the public sewer system, 4) eliminated the maximum lot coverage requirement, 5) decreased minimum front setbacks, and 6) preserved pedestrian and automotive safety near driveways.

The Planning Commission has previously reviewed some minor Zoning Map changes 1) exchanging areas between the C1 Commercial and R3 Multi-Family Residential districts and 2) eliminating the split zoning of a property currently designated R3 and SR Suburban Residential. Final recommendations on these changes will be sought along with the recommendation on the changes discussed in this memo.

These Policies

At its March regular meeting, the Planning Commission requested modifications to the previous concept of expanding the R3 zone. This request responded to the community's concerns and sought a more middle ground. These policies are presented for the first review at tonight's meeting and additional discussion is anticipated over the coming month(s).

C1 Commercial District Zoning Code Amendments

Potential changes to the parking requirements, especially those of the C1 Commercial District are being reviewed by the City Council and could be adopted as early as this month. Those changes involve 1) clarifying when new parking is required for existing buildings, 2) allowing greater opportunities for uses to share parking, 3) increasing the proximity requirement for the location of off-site, off-street parking, 4) reducing parking requirements for residential, food service & retail uses, 5) differentiating requirements for indoor and outdoor seating at food service uses, and 6) incorporating past Planning Commission interpretations related to parking.

Others

After the May meeting, staff will develop policy questions and engage the public on the other topics under consideration. At this time these topics include 1) consideration of minimum densities for residential developments within and/or adjacent to the downtown area, 2) transitioning the MHR Mobile Home Residential District into a Use Category instead of a "floating" zone, 3) minor adjustments to the use categories of SMC 17.13.040 related to "transportation, communication, information, and utility uses", a category that has not been cleaned up since the 2016 Zoning Code reformat, and 4) reduction of front setbacks in the PR Public Use and Recreation District.

Attachments

1. Public Comments: Crawford, Grotto, Lower Frank Johns, Harris, J May, R May, Stafford (12 pages)
2. Property Owner Outreach (16 pages)

To: Ben Shumaker
Stevenson Planning Commission
From: Phil Crawford
Date: March 18, 2021
Subject: Rezone of Lower Frank Johns Neighborhood

Thank you for seeking input from property owners regarding a proposed zone change for lower Frank Johns Road. I've spent some time looking at the attachments you provided, but I have found it difficult to respond in the way I would like as you have not provided a clear rationale for why this specific zone change is being proposed. You suggest in your memo that an EDC study forecasts a growth rate that demands accommodation by the city, and you suggest property owners face what you call "policy questions." I understand the need for local governments to plan for growth, but I don't understand why you are calling possible property owner wishes policy questions. Do some owners want to do something not permitted by existing zoning? Are you trying to eliminate the R-2 zone? Why not combine R- 1, R-2, and R-3? Why have zoning at all?

This particular zoning change will likely have profound effects on the character of neighborhood. Therefore, I hope you will provide some additional information about the rationale behind this proposal and the likely effects it will have on quality of life and property values for the residents of the neighborhood. For example, how is the proposed change supported by the city's current comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance? Are there community surveys that align this change with the desires of the citizens who live here? How do residents view the quality and future of their neighborhood? Do they see low income multifamily housing next door as something positive in their community? What is the relationship between the EDC and the city with respect to planning and zoning?

I think it is important to remember that the citizens who currently live in Stevenson are the most important factor in making decisions like this zoning change, not those who may or may not come to take advantage the kind of housing that might be offered in an R-3 zone, and not just those who have a specific interest such as business or economic development. We are the ones who pay the taxes and utility bills that support city government. We are the ones who have the most to gain or lose through things like zoning changes. Through our planning and zoning processes we are supposed to be able decide how much, what kind, and where we want growth to occur. We should not view ourselves as victims of outside (or local) forces that we must accommodate. But in order to do that we have to be heard. We have to be part of the process. You are the single most important person to help us do that.

In this particular case, and I suspect most others in the city where important changes are proposed, I feel the property owners are being put at a real disadvantage in understanding and participating in something that is vital to them. I've spent most of my adult life working on community issues, both professionally and personally, including land use issues, and I find the documents related to this zone change to be a real challenge to wade through and understand. Nowhere have a found even an attempt to provide something the average citizen could reasonably understand as they try to make sense of this proposal.

Who would benefit from this zone change? Perhaps the foremost benefactors would be the real estate and development industries and local businesses (as a result of increased trade). As the founder of the EDC (yes, that was a long time ago), I have been pleased to see its continuing success as well as the strengthening of the other organizations representing small businesses. Business is well represented: EDC, Port, Chamber, Downtown Association. Unfortunately, we have not seen a similar strengthening of representation for the rest of the community. You, the planning commission, and the city council are the only advocates we ordinary citizens have to represent our interests in situations like this. And you must also serve the business community. Do we need neighborhood associations to support our interests at city hall?

For several years I have studied the Assessor's records to follow property trends in the county. Of course, I am most familiar with what has been happening in the proposed rezone neighborhood where I live on property I have owned since 1979. Here are some of the things I have observed.

1. Over the past 42 years only one multiple family structure has been built in this area even though such construction was allowed either by city policy or zoning.
2. During that same period two new single family houses have been built in this area, both relatively recently. If you back up a few more years, you can add another single family house to that list.
3. By far the most common activity is the improvement of existing single family houses. In fact that kind of improvement is, in my opinion, astounding. Two houses that were considered for demolition have been rehabilitated to continue their life, not as the deteriorating rentals they were, but as owner occupied single family homes. The purchasers of another house intended to rehabilitate it, but found that was not possible so they replaced it with a new house.
4. Owners have continuously made substantial improvements to the external appearance of their properties, including landscaping, building maintenance, and additions.
5. This is a neighborhood rapidly improving in value, livability, and overall quality. The trend is away from rental houses to owner occupied residences. It is highly desirable area due to its closeness to downtown, its abundance of desirable vegetation, relatively low housing density, and its rural character, all characteristics commonly cited as desirable by citizens of Stevenson, as well as those who have recently come to the neighborhood.
6. Not once in the 42 years we have owned property in this neighborhood have we been approached by a developer to build multifamily housing even though we have three undeveloped lots (total 2 acres) with utilities and street access readily available. However, we have been approached by people seeking to build single family houses.

How do these observations relate to the proposed rezoning to R-3? There is a strong demand for **affordable** single family properties. I emphasize "affordable" because that's a common characteristic of many of the properties in this neighborhood, at least compared to the values in the city's new subdivisions. A review of the prices paid recently for properties in this area will show that people are willing to pay handsomely for what professionals in the CDC study refer to as low house values relative to lot values. I have serious concerns about this latter point. In reviewing the EDC demand study, one criterion for selecting the lower Frank Johns Road area

for rezone seems to be this relatively low house value to land value. This suggests that city policy is to replace affordable single family housing with much more expensive multiple family housing. Neither Stevenson nor the nation as a whole can meet its housing needs by replacing existing housing with new, more expensive housing. Too many people can't afford it. Wages have been stagnate for decades. The city should, as policy, encourage the improvement of existing structures, as owners are demonstrating, rather than rezoning to discourage such improvements.

Another point about the area the plan offers up for rezoning. It may appear this is area has a relatively large amount of undeveloped land, the Crawford and Schupbach properties being the largest. I hope the writers of the study and the city took into account that a significant part of almost all the properties in the proposed zone are not buildable due to the 150 feet set back requirement for Vallett Creek due to its fish bearing classification.

I predict the proposed rezone will do nothing but reduce or suppress the growth of property values, at least in any time frame that matters to most owners. Of course, it is possible land values could in time increase somewhat due to the rezone, but the house values will very likely decrease. After all, that's the underlying premise for proposing the rezone. In looking at lot prices among the various zones within Stevenson, I conclude the land value will not likely change very quickly with a rezone to R-3, but the neighborhood will be viewed as less desirable for single family residential use, thus depressing or slowing house values. Who wants to buy a single family house next to a multi-story apartment house and its associated parking lot? I suggest a better way to look at the relationship between values and rezoning would be to use sale price data, just as the assessor is required to do. When looking at it this way, the Frank Johns neighborhood is not such a good candidate to sacrifice for R-3 level exploitation.

An annotated zoning map included in the EDC study raises a question about "fingers" of one zone intruding into another zone in certain parts of the city. Although not included in this map, I've wondered about the reasoning behind the city designating a large "finger" of commercial zoning extending from the Rodeway Inn to the Cox-Brown property on the west side of the Frank Johns Road neighborhood. I include this point here because it is relevant to the changes you are proposing from R-2 to R-3. This commercial finger intruding into a residential zone excludes the commercially-used Stevenson Veterinary Clinic property, City Hall, and the Faith Tabernacle property, all of which are contiguous and would seem to be more "commercial" than all the single family houses currently in the zone. Did certain property owners request this zone change, creating what the EDC study consultants refer to as "illogical zoning" situations?

Then there's the question of demand. A commonly held belief is there is a shortage of "affordable" rentals in Stevenson. If that is the case, why are not builders busy taking advantage of the opportunity already available on Frank Johns Road with R-2 zoning and elsewhere in the city in R-3 zoning? I suggest the problem is largely the inability of a great many potential renters to afford the rental rates required for new construction to pay its way. A relatively small number of renters have jobs at businesses like Insitu to provide them with an income sufficient to live in newly constructed multiple family housing. If builders are not now clamoring to build duplexes in the current R-2 zone, will rezoning to R-3 encourage their interest? Does Stevenson or the region have builders even interested in the kind of construction expected to result from

R-3 zoning? Wouldn't they be more attracted to the Portland-Vancouver area where there is a much larger pool of renters who can afford newly constructed multiple family housing? Anecdotal information suggests financing in the Stevenson economy may be a major deterrent for builders seeking to build larger multifamily structures, especially given the low income situation and employment outlook for much of the potential renter clientele.

So what is the solution to the affordable housing problem? Certainly, one solution would be to improve incomes for people so they can afford to live here, but that is not likely to happen soon, if at all. Does this situation imply that construction in a new R-3 zone would only be possible as publicly subsidized housing? Is such funding available? If so, that should be disclosed to current property owners so that they know if their new neighbor is going to be a large subsidized apartment complex.

At this point I conclude that rezoning from R-2 to R-3 on Frank Johns Road is an unwelcome idea because:

1. It will adversely affect a neighborhood of single family residences that are in high demand for their affordability, location, and quality of life characteristics, factors very appealing to both local and outside interests.
2. A rezone will tend to reduce affordable single family housing stock, potentially displacing those people to try to find more expensive housing elsewhere.
3. From a socio-community perspective it does not make sense to damage a stable, improving, functional neighborhood by rezoning it on speculation that something better or more important will replace it.
4. It is not in the best financial or social interest of the current property owners to rezone this area.
5. There are many other places in the city and county to zone R-3 that don't require sacrificing an existing neighborhood.

I hope we can continue and expand this conversation between you and the property owners on Frank Johns Road. I know there is a tremendous amount of talent in this small neighborhood regarding public participation, municipal planning, and economic development. I hope we can engage this talent to work with you and others in city government to further the best interests of the citizens of this great community.



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

Potential zoning map amendments

art yeoman <ayeoman@msn.com>

Fri, Apr 9, 2021 at 9:14 AM

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

TO: Ben Shumaker, et al
FROM: Art Yeoman, [293 NW Roosevelt St.](#)
DATE: April 9, 2021

SUBJECT: Potential zoning amendment considerations

Economic council recommendations and forecasts are usually about increasing revenues one way or another. I think the more important question for Stevenson to consider is how increasing the zoning density from R-1 to R-2 (like around the high school for one) will contribute to the rural quality-of-life we currently enjoy. Current R-1 properties have comfortable privacy and are generally sheltered from a throng's noise. Stevenson is a very desirable place to live, but with finite building sites the cost of housing will follow the standard supply/demand curve. No matter how many housing units you allow to be built, they ultimately will become expensive. Increasing the zoning density now just prolongs the inevitable. This process is inexorable and not reversible. Hood River is a good example of a small town that has become expensive, difficult to navigate and is losing its identity. If a person desires to live in a certain area there are many considerations involved in that decision. However, the cost of housing, while a major influence, is not the sole determining factor. I say, keep Stevenson small and let the economics guide the housing costs not zoning changes. A further consideration for the city is the potential exponential increase in problems as the population density increases and their linear ability to respond.



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

New changes proposed

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

Fri, Apr 9, 2021 at 4:39 PM

Hi Ben~

I have just received all the mailings about zone changes.

I'd appreciate very much also having this emailed so the links are available to use.

Feedback:

In written/paper form, links are incredibly awkward to manage/look up and the printed maps are hard to read.

More time is needed~ If this is to be digested and gain better understanding, ask questions and/or get more information, much more time is needed for this type of thing before any meetings.

Requests:

- Please give owners & the public more time before a Planning Commission meeting to be able to receive new documents or learn about changes.
~Examples: What if I had not checked my mail this week before the meeting? What if people are out of town and getting mail forwarded? What if owners are dealing with heavy schedules, illness or the layers of life that would make getting information 3 or 4 days before a scheduled meeting not at all adequate for enough time to adequately assess and digest?
- Please give this information out in as many forms as possible to aid in receiving it timely and to utilize the links, read the maps better and look up the data mentioned in the letter form or to give feedback.

Would you be able to please add an additional address to mail future copies of such mailings out to me here:

Julie Fitzpatrick-May
PO Box 1337
Stevenson, WA 98648

Also, I don't believe I've seen the Planning Commission meeting agenda. Have you sent that out already &/or is it available? Thanks.

Thank you for your time~

~Julie

Julie May;
Marketing & Public Relations Manager for Bowles Marketplace
julie@bowlesmarketplace.com
(cell) 503-201-9460



Damage from R-2 Zoning Change

1 message

Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

Sat, Apr 10, 2021 at 11:01 PM

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

RE: Damage from proposed R-2 rezoning.

Dear Planning Commission,

The Planning Department is presenting a second rezoning proposal on Monday. This proposes a rezoning of a large area of Stevenson from lower density R-1, to middle density R-2 and high-density R-3 zoning. Planning notes this second draft as a "scaled-back change" due to the negative public response to the March 8th proposal. This new proposal would change the zoning of the same area as the original, with the exception of one parcel of land. This proposed zoning change is an unnecessary, ineffective and damaging proposal for the following reasons:

(1) If zoning is changed, all development would require sewer hooking up. However, sewer lines do not exist in a substantial portion of the proposed area. Sewer lines are expensive to build, require extensive engineering, along with easements and the tearing up of public roads.

Requiring sewer connection to develop a home where sewer lines do not exist and where sewer cannot be economically brought in by the landowner would be an economic hindrance and a public relations nightmare. The punitive cost of this requirement would stop home development in a large area of Stevenson. Significant areas in Stevenson that can currently be developed would become undevelopable. There would be a massive decrease in the value of these lands, as parcels go from developable to economically undevelopable.

(2) No studies have been done by the Planning Department on the cost impact and adverse effects to landowners of bringing sewer into these unserved areas or the adverse effects of requiring sewer hookup where sewer does not exist. No survey of public opinion for this second zoning change has been made. Due to a lack of studies, lack of an adequate community outreach, along with significant economic damage, there will be substantially pushback on this proposal, if it moves forward.

(3) The current R-1 zoning allows one dwelling and one accessory dwelling unit per every 6,000 sq. ft. of site area. This equates to an allowable density on one unit for every 3,000 square feet of site area. As proposed, R-2 zoning would allow one unit per every 3,000 square feet, with no accessory units allowed. Therefore, R-1 and R-2 zoning would allow for *exactly* the same density of unit development.

(4) Page 62 of the FCS Land Report states – "*Stevenson has a significant amount of its developable land classified as vacant, including 54 acres in the medium-density category.*" Medium density zoning allows for 14.52 units per acre. So even if this R-2 land is developed at only 65% of its allowable capacity, we can build over 500 residential units on this existing 54 acres. The Johnson Economics report noted Stevenson will need 57 multi-family and single family attached units over the next 10 years. At this rate of development, Stevenson has a 90-year supply of R-2 land available today. If so, why is this zoning change needed?

The Stevenson Planning mailing, postmark April 5th, 2021, sent out to property owners on this proposed zoning change states:

"This letter updates you on the ongoing conversation to allow landowners in your area to do more with their property."

As proposed, this R-2 zoning change, instead of doing more for landowners, would harm land values and stop development in large areas of our town. There would be substantial decreases in land values along with the taking away of the right to economically develop a home site.

This proposal also changes the zoning for an area along the north side of the undeveloped Del Ray Ave. Right of Way from low density to high density residential. To keep this letter short, I will not go into the history of this area or why this proposal is a bad idea. Suffice to say, this zoning change is not driven by any viable need and is not supported by the owners along Del Ray Ave.

In conclusion, the proposed zoning changes are not driven by any supportable need, are damaging and do not meet Planning's stated goals. It proposes harmful and restrictive constraints over a large area of our town and has little if any benefits. If the goal is to allow landowners to do more with their property and create more development opportunities, this proposal will have the opposite effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net - 503-341-2932.



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

Lower Frank Johns Rd zoning response

1 message

Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com>

Sun, Apr 11, 2021 at 6:33 PM

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

Hi Ben,

I wanted to reach out and share in writing our neighbors formal communication and statement of concern. Also, I plan on attending tomorrow to propose a more formal public engagement approach. I know you agreed to attend a few forums but I thought there would be a little more City support offered than the reference you made in the letter for folks to reach out to "someone who lives in lower Frank Johns Rd".

Again, I will be bringing this recommendation in the spirit of partnership, but do feel strongly that things slow down enough to offer Stevenson residents a more educated understanding to participate in giving informed feedback.

I am not certain the process for submitting letters from our neighborhood, so please let me know if there is another means to do so.

Thank you!

--

Be well ~ Tracy

pronouns: she/her

phone: 503 702 9714

 **LFJR_zoning response 3 21 21.docx**

14K

Date: March 25, 2021

Subject: Rezone of Lower Frank Johns Neighborhood

To: [Ben Shumaker Stevenson Planning Commission](#)

On March 13, 2021 several neighbors living below Loop on Frank Johns Road gathered to discuss the proposed zoning changes from R-2 to R-3. The following response represents both an annotated version of Phil Crawford's letter to the Planning Commission, which the group holistically supports, along with additional commentary from the group during our meeting.

We think it is important to remember that the citizens who currently live in Stevenson are the most important factor in making decisions like this zoning changed. We are the ones who have the most to gain or lose through things like zoning changes. We like our street's character and assets and chose to live on this street for the larger greenspaces and lack of housing density. While we all understand the need to consider growth in our community, we believe this should be balanced with the desires and best interest of its current residents.

Our current position is that rezoning from R-2 to R-3 on Frank Johns Road is an unwelcome idea because:

1. It will adversely affect a neighborhood of single family residences that are in high demand for their affordability, location, and quality of life characteristics, factors very appealing to both local and outside interests.
2. A rezone will tend to reduce affordable single family housing stock, potentially displacing those people to try to find more expensive housing elsewhere.
3. From a socio-community perspective it does not make sense to damage a stable, improving, functional neighborhood by rezoning it on speculation that something better or more important will replace it.
4. It is not in the best financial or social interest of the current property owners to rezone this area.
5. There are many other places in the city and county to zone R-3 that don't require sacrificing an existing neighborhood.

I hope the writers of the study and the city took into account that a significant part of almost all the properties in the proposed zone are not buildable due to the 150 foot set back requirement for Vallett Creek due to its fish bearing classification.

We possess talent in this small neighborhood regarding public participation, municipal planning, and economic development. I hope we can engage this talent to work with you and others in city government to further the best interests of the citizens of this great community. The residents of Frank Johns Road want to be part of the process and look forward to getting guidance from you on how best to be involved. Considering technology barriers and COVID restrictions, we will need to be creative to be inclusive. Thank you for inviting our input and we look forward to further discussions.

Frank Johns Road Signees

Tracy Gratto and Nick Iannarone – 300 NE FJR Rd

Joan and Emily Joyce – 278 NE FJR Rd

Linda Brown – 287 NE FJR Rd

Phil and Enid Crawford – 234 NE FJR Rd

Art Hernandez and Denise Baxter 233 NE FJR Rd

Ian Lowe – PO Box 291



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

city planning

Twigy Weed <icydalma@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 11:23 AM

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

Hi Ben, say while you are planning stevenson, could you try to put a Dog Park in somewhere, a large Fenced area, my puppy loves to run but the park is now a camp ground, just a thought. Thank you Lesley Harris



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

Meeting 4/12

Gregory And debra stafford <galan1@centurylink.net>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 1:14 PM

To: planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us

Cc: Greg Stafford <galan1@centurylink.net>

Hi Ben,

Thank you for keeping us informed. And would like to give my contributions to the discussion. Greg Stafford Block 5 of Roselawn Extension, live bellow High School. Please share my Contributions. Thank You

1. We were involved with the zoning of High School & Middle School to form Educational Zoning. And have contributions to add to this Subject as well.
2. The R1 Single-Family District surrounding the High School & Middle School should remain the same for several reasons.
 - A. The safety of the students on campus and traveling to and from High School & Middle School.
 - B. Keeping and Preserving The Green Areas and Wildlife Sanctuary. Our Towns Beauty and Environmental impacts.
3. We have walkable areas in place currently. And they are safe and easy to Maintain. Sidewalks on perimeter of School Property is important. New trail systems have failed in many Communities (Metropolitan Park System).
 - A. Homeless Crises and Pollution that occur on Metropolitan Park Walkways.
 - B. Crime Rate & Drug Use increase and Ruin Neighborhoods because of Metropolitan Park Walkways. Look at Portland OR.



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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

TO: R2 District Property Owners
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: April 3rd, 2021
SUBJECT: R2 Two-Family District Owners—Zoning Text Amendment Instead of Map Change

This letter updates you on the ongoing conversation to allow landowners in your area to do more with their property. Based on your participation in this conversation, it is clear to the Planning Commission that the previous direction would have allowed for too much. They have listened to the community's concerns and a scaled-back change is now being considered. The full updated draft amendments are attached. Key aspects of the new draft:

	Existing	Updated Draft	Previous Draft
Uses Allowed	61 total categories	2 categories changed	14 categories changed
Minimum Lot Area	6,999 sf or less = 1 dwelling 7,000 sf or more=2 dwellings	3,000 sf lot area per dwelling	1 dwelling per 2,000 sf
Maximum # Dwellings	2 units	4 units	No maximum, determined by lot area
Maximum Lot Coverage	50%	No maximum, determined by setbacks	No maximum, determined by setbacks
Minimum Front Setback	20 ft	15 ft (with caveats for driveway safety)	10 ft (with caveats for driveway safety)
Maximum Building Height	35 ft	Same as existing	Same as existing
Required Parking	1 space for studio/1 bedroom 2 spaces for 2 bedroom+	Same as existing	Same as existing
Environmental	See SMC Title 18	Same as existing	Same as existing
Noise	Quiet hours 10pm-7:00am	Same as existing	Same as existing
New Septic Systems	Technically prohibited (all properties are within 300 ft of sewer)	Formally prohibited	Formally prohibited
Required Street Improvements	Not required for construction, Required for land division	Same as existing	Same as existing

The discussion on these draft changes is still ongoing, and the City is not treating this draft as the desired endpoint of the discussion. Your contributions to this discussion remain important. The attachments provide more in depth comparisons between the current draft, previous draft and existing Zoning Maps/Codes. For more detailed, electronic versions of these maps, please go to: http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/SecondDraftConsiderationArea_BeforeAfter.pdf

Request: Please plan to attend the Planning Commission meeting at 6:00pm on Monday, April 12th, 2021 to learn more about the policies and process and to share your thoughts of apprehension or support. The meeting will have both in-person options at City Hall and a remote option through Zoom. Phone: 253-215-8782, ID: 882 6542 5672. Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88265425672>

If you have questions in advance, please feel free to contact me via telephone (509-427-5970), in writing (planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us or PO Box 371, Stevenson, WA 98648). A Planning Commissioner living in the R2 zone, Auguste Zettler, remains open to discuss things as well: auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us. Several of the neighbors on lower Frank Johns Road are also working to organize discussions which feel less formal than the City meetings. If you know any of them, please feel free to contact them for more information.



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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

TO: R2 District Property Owners
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: April 3rd, 2021
SUBJECT: R2 Two-Family District Owners—Modified Map Change

This letter updates you on the ongoing conversation to allow landowners in your area to do more with their property. Based on your participation in this conversation, it is clear to the Planning Commission that the previous direction would have allowed for too much. They have listened to the community's concerns and a scaled-back change is now being considered for properties north of Hot Springs Alameda. For properties south of Hot Springs Alameda, the previous draft remains under consideration.

The discussion on these draft changes is still ongoing, and the City is not treating this draft as the desired endpoint of the discussion. Your contributions to this discussion remain important. The attachments provide more in depth comparisons between the current draft, previous draft and existing Zoning Maps. For more detailed, electronic versions of these maps, please go to: http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/SecondDraftConsiderationArea_BeforeAfter.pdf

Request: Please plan to attend the Planning Commission meeting at 6:00pm on Monday, April 12th, 2021 to learn more about the policies and process and to share your thoughts of apprehension or support. The meeting will have both in-person options at City Hall and a remote option through Zoom. Phone: 253-215-8782, ID: 882 6542 5672. Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88265425672>

If you have questions in advance, please feel free to contact me via telephone (509-427-5970), in writing (planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us or PO Box 371, Stevenson, WA 98648). A Planning Commissioner living in the R2 zone, Auguste Zettler, remains open to discuss things as well: auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us. Several of the neighbors on lower Frank Johns Road are also working to organize discussions which feel less formal than the City meetings. If you know any of them, please feel free to contact them for more information.



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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

TO: R1 District Property Owners
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: April 3rd, 2021
SUBJECT: R1 Single-Family District Owners—Scaled-Back Zoning Change Text/Map

This letter updates you on the ongoing conversation to allow landowners in your area to do more with their property. Based on your participation in this conversation, it is clear to the Planning Commission that the previous direction would have allowed for too much. They have listened to the community's concerns and a scaled-back change is now being considered. The full updated draft amendments are attached. Key aspects of the new draft:

	Existing	Updated Draft	Previous Draft
Uses Allowed	61 total categories	8 categories changed	14 categories changed
Minimum Lot Area	5,999 sf or less = 1 dwelling 6,000 sf or more=2 dwellings	3,000 sf lot area per dwelling	2,000 sf lot area per dwelling
Maximum # Dwellings	2 units	4 units	No maximum, determined by lot area
Maximum Lot Coverage	35%	No maximum, determined by setbacks	No maximum, determined by setbacks
Minimum Front Setback	20 ft	15 ft (with caveats for driveway safety)	10 ft (with caveats for driveway safety)
Maximum Building Height	35 ft	Same as existing	Same as existing
Required Parking	1 space for studio/1 bedroom 2 spaces for 2 bedroom+	Same as existing	Same as existing
Environmental	See SMC Title 18	Same as existing	Same as existing
Noise	Quiet hours 10pm-7:00am	Same as existing	Same as existing
New Septic Systems	Prohibited when within 300 ft of sewer	Formally prohibited	Formally prohibited
Required Street Improvements	Not required for construction, Required for land division	Same as existing	Same as existing

The discussion on these draft changes is still ongoing, and the City is still not treating this draft as the desired endpoint of the discussion. Your contributions to this discussion remain important. The attachments provide more in depth comparisons between the current draft, previous draft and existing Zoning Maps/Codes. For more detailed, electronic versions of these maps, please go to: http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/SecondDraftConsiderationArea_BeforeAfter.pdf

Request: Please plan to attend the Planning Commission meeting at 6:00pm on Monday, April 12th, 2021 to learn more about the policies and process and to share your thoughts of apprehension or support. The meeting will have both in-person options at City Hall and a remote option through Zoom. Phone: 253-215-8782, ID: 882 6542 5672. Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88265425672>

If you have questions in advance, please feel free to contact me via telephone (509-427-5970), in writing (planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us or PO Box 371, Stevenson, WA 98648). Two City Council members living in the R1 zone where a change is still being considered are available to discuss the project in more detail. Paul Hendricks (paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us) or Annie McHale (annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us) are available to help you. Several of the neighbors on lower Frank Johns Road are also working to organize discussions which feel less formal than the City meetings. If you know any of them, please feel free to contact them for more information.



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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

TO: R1 District Property Owners
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: April 3rd, 2021
SUBJECT: R1 Single-Family District Owners—Modified Map Change

This letter updates you on the ongoing conversation to allow landowners in your area to do more with their property. Based on your participation in this conversation, it is clear to the Planning Commission that the previous direction would have allowed for too much. They have listened to the community's concerns and a scaled-back change is now being considered for properties to the north and east of yours. For the 25' wide properties along Del Ray, the previous draft remains under consideration.

The discussion on these draft changes is still ongoing, and the City is not treating this draft as the desired endpoint of the discussion. Your contributions to this discussion remain important. The attachments provide more in depth comparisons between the current draft, previous draft and existing Zoning Maps. For more detailed, electronic versions of these maps, please go to: http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/SecondDraftConsiderationArea_BeforeAfter.pdf

Request: Please plan to attend the Planning Commission meeting at 6:00pm on Monday, April 12th, 2021 to learn more about the policies and process and to share your thoughts of apprehension or support. The meeting will have both in-person options at City Hall and a remote option through Zoom. Phone: 253-215-8782, ID: 882 6542 5672. Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88265425672>

If you have questions in advance, please feel free to contact me via telephone (509-427-5970), in writing (planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us or PO Box 371, Stevenson, WA 98648). Two City Council members living in the R1 zone where a change is still being considered are available to discuss the project in more detail. Paul Hendricks (paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us) or Annie McHale (annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us) are available to help you. Several of the neighbors on lower Frank Johns Road are also working to organize discussions which feel less formal than the City meetings. If you know any of them, please feel free to contact them for more information.



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

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


TO: R1 District Property Owners
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: April 3rd, 2021
SUBJECT: R3 Zoning Map Change No Longer Considered for Your R1 Property

This letter updates you on the City's ongoing conversation to allow landowners in your area to do more with their property. Based on community participation in this conversation, it is clear to the Planning Commission that the previous direction would have allowed for too much. They have listened to the community's concerns and a scaled-back change is now being considered. The full updated draft map amendments are attached, and your property on the fringe of the initial discussion area has been removed from consideration at this time.

The discussion on the draft changes for other areas is still ongoing, and the City is not treating this draft as the desired endpoint of the discussion. Your contributions to this discussion remain important. The attachments provide more in depth comparisons between the current draft, previous draft and existing Zoning Maps. For more detailed, electronic versions of these maps, please go to: http://ci.stevenson.wa.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/SecondDraftConsiderationArea_BeforeAfter.pdf

Request: Please plan to attend the Planning Commission meeting at 6:00pm on Monday, April 12th, 2021 to learn more about the policies and process and to share your thoughts of apprehension or support. The meeting will have both in-person options at City Hall and a remote option through Zoom. Phone: 253-215-8782, ID: 882 6542 5672. Webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88265425672>

If you have questions in advance, please feel free to contact me via telephone (509-427-5970), in writing (planning@ci.stevenson.wa.us or PO Box 371, Stevenson, WA 98648). Two City Council members living in the R1 zone where a change is still being considered are available to discuss the project in more detail. Paul Hendricks (paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us) or Annie McHale (annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us) are available to help you. Several of the neighbors on lower Frank Johns Road are also working to organize discussions which feel less formal than the City meetings. If you know any of them, please feel free to contact them for more information.




Zoning Map

April 12th Discussion Draft

- Commercial (C1)
- Education District (ED)
- Commercial Recreation (CR)
- Light Industrial (M1)
- Public Use and Recreation (PR)
- Single Family Residential (R1)
- Middle Density Residential (R2)
- Multi-Family Residential (R3)
- Multi-Family Residential Overlay (R3)
- Suburban Residential (SR)


- Stream
- Parcel
- City Limits
- Urban Area



Zoning Map Existing

- Commercial (C1)
- Education District (ED)
- Commercial Recreation (CR)
- Light Industrial (M1)
- Public Use and Recreation (PR)
- Single Family Residential (R1)
- Two Family Residential (R2)
- Multi-Family Residential (R3)
- Multi-Family Residential Overlay (R3)
- Suburban Residential (SR)

- Stream
- Parcel
- City Limits
- Urban Area



Zoning Map

March 8th Discussion Draft

- Commercial (C1)
- Education District (ED)
- Commercial Recreation (CR)
- Light Industrial (M1)
- Public Use and Recreation (PR)
- Single Family Residential (R1)
- Multi-Family Residential (R3)
- Multi-Family Residential Overlay (R3)
- Suburban Residential (SR)

- Stream
- Parcel
- City Limits
- Urban Area

Chapter 17.15 - RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

17.15.010 - Purpose.

Residential districts encourage a range of residential land uses, housing sizes, types, and price ranges for the diverse array of residents' personal preferences and financial capabilities. The standards in this chapter are intended to encourage mixtures of land uses and intensities while minimizing negative impacts related to conflicting land uses.

(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017)

17.15.020 - List of zoning districts.

- A. R1 Single-Family Residential District. The single-family residential district (R1) is intended to provide minimum development standards for residential uses where complete community services are available and where residential uses are separated from uses characteristic of more urban and/or rural areas.
- B. R2 ~~Two-Family Middle Density~~ Residential District. The ~~two-family Middle Density~~ residential district (R2) is intended to ~~provide minimum development standards for~~ facilitate a range of higher-density residential uses in walkable areas where complete community services are available. ~~The development standards of the district -and where residential uses are separated~~ residential uses from uses characteristic of more urban and more rural areas.
- C. R3 Multi-Family Residential District. The multi-family residential district (R3) is intended to ~~provide minimum development standards for~~ facilitate higher-density various residential uses in walkable areas where complete community services are available. ~~The development standards of the district allow and where~~ residential uses ~~are~~ in close proximity to each other and to uses characteristic of more urban areas ~~and separated from uses characteristic of more rural areas~~.
- D. MHR Mobile Home Residential District. The mobile home residential district (MHR) is intended to provide minimum development standards for affordable residential uses within the city.
- E. SR Suburban Residential District. The suburban residential district (SR) is intended to provide minimum development standards for a variety of uses and provide a transition area where service levels are less than urban and where low-density residential uses coexist with uses otherwise characteristic of more rural areas.

(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017)

17.15.030 - Residential district location criteria.

- A. Residential districts can be appropriately applied and maintained within any LDR low density residential or HDR high density residential area on the future land use map.
- B. Areas designated as LDR low density residential and HDR high density residential shall not be rezoned for trade districts. Under limited circumstances HDR areas may be rezoned for public districts.

(Ord. No. 1103, § 3, 2-16-2017)

17.15.040 - Uses.

- A. Types of Uses: For the purposes of this chapter, there are 4 kinds of use:
 1. A permitted (P) use is one that is permitted outright, subject to all the applicable provisions of this title.
 2. An accessory (A) use is permitted on properties containing permitted uses, provided that:

- a. The accessory use or activity may be regarded as incidental or insubstantial in and of itself or in relation to the principal use on the lot; and
 - b. The accessory use or activity is commonly or frequently associated with the principal use on the lot.
3. A conditional (C) use is a discretionary use reviewed by the Planning Commission according to the process and criteria in SMC 17.39 - Conditional Uses.
 4. A prohibited (X) use is one that is not permitted in a zoning district under any circumstances.
 5. When a letter or use category is not listed in this table, an interpretation may be initiated under SMC 17.12.020.

B. Use Table. A list of permitted, accessory, conditional and prohibited uses in residential districts is presented in Table 17.15.040-1: Residential Districts Use Table.

Table 17.15.040-1 Residential Districts Use Table					
Use	R1	R2	R3	MHR	SR
Residence or Accommodation Uses					
Dwelling					
Single-Family Detached Dwelling	P	P	P	P	P
Mobile Home	X	X	X	P	X
Travel Trailer	—	—	—	—	X
Accessory Dwelling Unit (SMC 17.40.040)	A	—	—	—	A
Multi-Family Dwelling	C ¹	P / C ¹	P	C ¹	C ¹
Temporary Emergency, Construction or Repair Residence	C ²	C ²	C ²	—	C ²
Townhome (SMC 17.38.085)	—	C / P ⁸	P	—	—
Renting of no more than 2 rooms, rented by the month or longer, provided the parking requirements of SMC 17.42 are met.	A	A	A	A	A
Boarding House	C	C	C	—	C
Residential Care					
Adult Family Home	P	P	P	P	P
Assisted Living Facility	—	—	C	—	C
Nursing Home	—	—	C	—	—
Overnight Lodging					
Vacation Rental Home	P	P	P	P	P
Bed & Breakfast	C	C	P	C	C
Hostel	C	C	P	C	C
Hotel	X	X	C	X	C
Campground	X	X	X	C	C
Dormitory facility related to a public, private or parochial school	C	C	C	—	C
Miscellaneous Incidental Uses					
Residential Outbuilding	A/C _{3,4}	A/C _{3,4}	A/C ⁴	A/C _{3,4}	A/C ₃

Garage or storage building for the parking of commercial vehicles	—	—	—	—	C
Swimming pool, spa or hot tub, and associated equipment	A	A	A	A	A
Buildings and uses related to, and commonly associated with a mobile home park such as a recreation area, laundry, facility office, and meeting rooms	—	—	—	A	—
General Sales or Service Uses					
Electric Vehicle Station					
Restricted Access, Gradual Charging EV Station	A	A	A	A	A
Restricted Access, Rapid charging EV Station	C	C	C	C	C
Public Access, Gradual Charging EV Station	—	—	C	—	—
Street—Side Access, Gradual Charging EV Station	—	—	C	—	—
Retail and wholesale sales of agricultural and animal products raise or produced on the premises	—	—	—	—	A
Professional Office	—	C	C	—	—
Veterinarian	—	—	—	—	C
Child Day Care Facility					
Family Day Care Home	P	P	P	P	P
Mini-Day Care Center	C	C	C	C	C
Child Day Care Center	—	C	C	C	C
Home Occupation	A	A	A	A	A
Transportation, Communication, Information, and Utilities Uses					
Public Transportation Stop or Shelter	—	—	—	—	C
Utility or Communication Facility	C	C	C	C ⁵	C
Wireless Telecommunications Facility ⁶					
Minor Wireless Telecommunications Facility	P	P	P	P	P
Intermediate Wireless Telecommunications Facility (SMC 17.39.170)	C	C	C	C	C
Major Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (SMC 17.39.170)	C	—	—	—	C
Wind Power Generation Facility ⁶					
Minor Wind Power Generation Facility (SMC 17.39.165)	C	C	C	C	C
Hazardous Waste Storage	C	C	C	C	C
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation Uses					
Public Assembly	—	—	—	-	-
Wedding Venue	—	—	—	—	C
Park, Playground or Outdoor Recreation Area	C	C	C	C	C
Golf Course	—	—	—	—	C
Education, Public Administration, Health Care, and Other Institutions Uses					
Public, Private or Parochial School	C	C	C	—	C
Nursery School or Similar Facility	—	—	—	C	—
Library	C	C	C	—	—
Government Administration Building	—	—	C	—	—

Fire, Police, or Emergency Services Station	C	C	C	—	C
Hospital	—	—	C	—	—
Church or Other Religious or Charitable Organization	C	C	C	—	C
Cemetery or Mausoleum	—	—	—	—	C
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting Uses					
Subsistence or hobby type gardening	P	P	A	P	P
Indoor or Outdoor Horticultural Activity	P	P	P	P	P
Nursery	—	—	C	—	P
Farm Animals (SMC 17.40.095)	C ⁷	X	X	X	P
Urban Farm Animals (SMC 17.40.095)	A	A	A	A	P
Pets	A	A	A	A	A
Kennel	C	X	X	X	C
Miscellaneous/Other Uses					
Signs listed with a "C" in Table 17.15.145-1 and any other sign identifying and/or related to any conditional use or existing nonconforming use.	C	C	C	C	C
Signs identifying and/or related to any principal or accessory use allowed in this chapter.	A	A	A	A	A

1-Conditional use permits for these uses are only considered when submitted as part of an R-PUD proposal under SMC 17.17 - Residential Planned Unit Developments.

2-A conditional use permit is only required for a temporary emergency, construction or repair residence after the expiration of the initial 6-month grace period.

3-Up to 4 residential outbuildings on a property is considered an accessory Use. When at least 4 residential outbuildings already exist on a lot then an additional residential outbuilding is considered a conditional use. During the conditional use review process, the planning commission may establish size, serial proliferation and other limitations on such buildings.

4-A residential outbuilding that is subordinate to the main use on the lot is considered an accessory use. A residential outbuilding which is not subordinate to the main use on the lot is considered a conditional use. During the conditional use review process, the planning commission may establish size, serial proliferation and other limitations on such buildings.

5-Despite the general exclusion of overhead elements from this use category, any utility or communication facility in the MHR district with an overhead element greater than 35 feet is considered a conditional use.

6-See also SMC 17.36-WW Wind/Wireless Overlay District.

7-In granting a conditional use request for farm animals in the R1 district, the planning commission shall find, at a minimum, that the proposal is compliant with the performance standards in SMC 17.40.095.

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.~~

(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017; Ord. No. 1104, § 3A, 6-15-2017; Ord. No. 2019-1141, § 4, 5-16-2019)

17.15.050 - Residential density standards.

A. Density and Lot Size. The maximum density and minimum lot dimensions for Residential Districts are contained in Table 17.15.050-1: Residential Density Standards.

District	Utility Availability	Minimum Lot Area	Minimum Lot Width	Minimum Lot Depth	Maximum Number Dwelling Units	Maximum Lot Coverage
----------	----------------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

R1	Water, Sewer	6,000 sf	40 ft	90 ft	1 Unit ²	35%
	Water, Septic	15,000 sf ¹	90 ft	120 ft	1 Unit ²	25%
	Well, Septic	1 acre ¹	200 ft	200 ft	1 Unit ²	10%
R2	Water, Sewer ^{6,7}	5,000 sf + 2,000 sf per unit over 13,000 sf per unit	50-30 ft ³	90 ft	2-4 Units	50%-n/a
	Water, Septic	15,000 sf ¹	90 ft	120 ft	2 Units	30%
	Well, Septic ⁶	—	—	—	—	—
R3	Water, Sewer ^{6,7}	2,000 sf per unit	20 ft	90 ft	—	n/a
MHR	Water, Sewer	5 ac + 5,000 sf per unit over 40	200 ft	200 ft	—	40%
	Water, Septic	5 ac + 2 acres per unit over 2	200 ft	200 ft	—	40%
	Well, Sewer	5 ac + 2 acres per unit over 2	200 ft	200 ft	—	40%
	Well, Septic	5 ac + 2 acres per unit over 2	200 ft	200 ft	—	40%
SR	Water, Sewer	15,000 sf	100 ft	100 ft	1 Unit ²	25%
	Water, Septic	20,000 sf ¹	100 ft	100 ft	1 Unit ²	20%
	Well, Septic	1 acre ¹	200 ft	200 ft	1 Unit ²	10%

1-When sewer is unavailable, minimum lot area may be increased based on current health district regulations.

2-Unless an accessory dwelling unit (SMC 17.13.010) is allowed under SMC 17.40.040.

3-~~Except 40 ft for single family detached dwellings-Reserved.~~

6-Service by the public water system is required.

7-Service by the public sewer system is required.

B. Exceptions. The following exceptions are permitted to the standards of Table 17.15.050-1:

1. Properties receiving approval to deviate from standards according to SMC 17.38 - Supplementary Provisions.
2. Properties obtaining variance approval in accordance with SMC 17.46 - Adjustments, Variances, and Appeals.
3. Properties receiving modification approval in accordance with SMC 17.17 - Residential Planned Unit Developments.

(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017; Ord. No. 1104, § 3.B.C, 6-15-2017)

17.15.060 - Residential dimensional standards.

A. Compliance Required. All structures in residential districts must comply with:

1. The applicable dimensional standards contained Table 17.15.060-1: Residential Dimensional Standards.
2. All other applicable standards and requirements contained in this title.

Table 17.15.060-1: Residential Dimensional Standards						
District	Maximum Height of Building	Front	Minimum Setbacks			
			Side, Interior	Side, Street	Rear, Interior Lot	Rear, Through Lot
R1	35 ft	20 ft	5 ft	15 ft	20 ft ¹	20 ft
R2	35 ft	20-15 ft ^{3,4}	5 ft	15 ft ^{3,4}	20 ft ¹	20 ft
R3	35 ft	10 ft ^{3,4}	5 ft ²	15-10 ft ^{3,4}	20 ft ¹	20 ft
MHR	35 ft	30 ft	15 ft	20 ft	20 ft ¹	20 ft

SR	35 ft	30 ft	15 ft	20 ft	20 ft	20 ft
----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- 1-5 ft for residential outbuildings that are both 12 ft in height or less and 200 sq ft in size or less.
- 2-A 10-foot setback is required when adjacent to an R1 or R2 district.
- 3-See also SMC 17.15.130(B)(3).
- 4-~~10~~ However, no structure shall be located within a pedestrian visibility area [SMC 17.10.632].

B. Exceptions. The following exceptions are permitted to the standards of Table 17.15.060-1:

1. Properties receiving approval to deviate from standards according to SMC 17.38 - Supplementary Provisions.
2. Properties obtaining variance approval in accordance with SMC 17.46 - Adjustments, Variances, and Appeals.
3. Properties receiving modification approval in accordance with SMC 17.17 - Residential Planned Unit Developments.

(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017; Ord. No. 1104, § 3.D, 6-15-2017)


17.15.130 - Residential districts parking.

A. Off-Street Parking Required. Off-street parking shall be provided in all residential districts in accordance with the requirements of SMC 17.42: Parking and Loading Standards.

B. Parking Location Requirements.

1. Required parking shall be located on the same lot as the dwelling it serves.
2. No motor vehicle, recreational vehicle or equipment, or other equipment, whether operational or not, shall be parked, stored or otherwise located in an Interior Side Setback required by Table 17.15.060-1: Residential Dimensional Standards.
3. No driveway shall be less than 20 feet in length. This shall be done to eliminate the parking of vehicles on or over curbs, sidewalks, or vehicle travel areas [SMC 17.10.855]. For the purposes of this chapter driveway length is measured conservatively as the shortest distance between a) a garage door or other physical obstruction to the parking of a vehicle and b) a curb, sidewalk, public pedestrian way [SMC 17.10.660], property line, or right-of-way line.

FIGURE 17.38.085-1 Driveway Length Illustration



(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017)

17.15.145 - Residential districts signs.

- A. Allowed Sign Types and Characteristics. A list of permitted, accessory, conditional and prohibited sign types and characteristics in Residential Districts is presented in Table 17.15.145-1: Allowed Signage.

Table 17.15.145-1: Allowed Signage					
	R1	R2	R3	MHR	SR
Animated Sign	X	X	X ¹	X	X
Sign Structure					
Temporary	P	P	P	P	P
Awning/Marquee	X	X	X	X	X
Portable	—	—	—	—	—
Sign Type					
Community Information Sign	C	C	C	C	C
Dilapidated Sign	X ²	X ²	X ²	X ²	X ²
Mural	C	C	C	C	C
Off-Premises Sign	X	X	X	X	X
Sign Placed by a Governmental Agency	P	P	P	P	P
Sign of Outstanding Design	—	—	C	—	—
Sign Illumination					
Back-lit Cabinet	X	X	X	X	X
Back-lit Channel Letter	X	X	X ¹	X	X
Dark-Sky Friendly	C	C	P	C	C
Directly -Illuminated	X	X	A ³	X	X
Externally-Illuminated	X	X	X ¹	X	X
Halo-Lighted	X	X	X ¹	X	X
Pedestrian-Oriented Video Display	X	X	—	X	X

1-Unless a bonus allowance is granted for a sign of outstanding design under SMC 17.39.145.

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.

3-Allowed as an accessory sign only when placed in windows and limited to 4 sq ft in area.

- B. Sign Standards. Signs allowed in Residential Districts are subject to the dimensional and duration standards in Table 17.15.145-2: Sign Standards.

Table 17.15.145-2: Sign Standards					
	R1	R2	R3	MHR	SR
Number of Signs	Any	Any	Any	Any	Any
Maximum Sign Area					
Individual Sign	5 sf ¹	5 sf ¹	12 sf ^{2,3}	5 sf ¹	5 sf ¹
Total Cumulative Signage Allowed	32 sf	32 sf	40 sf	32 sf	32 sf
Maximum Sign Height					
Building Sign	16 ft ⁴	16 ft ⁴	26 ft ^{3,4}	16 ft ⁴	16 ft ⁴

Freestanding Sign	6 ft	6 ft	12 ft ³	6 ft	6 ft
Temporary Sign	6 ft	6 ft	6 ft ³	6 ft	6 ft
Minimum Sign Clearance					
Building Sign Projecting More than 12" from a Building	8 ft	8 ft	8 ft	8 ft	8 ft
Sign Placement ^{5,6}					
Setback from any property line	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Allowed Sign Duration					
Temporary Sign	45 days ⁷	45 days ⁷	45 days ⁷	45 days ⁷	45 days ⁷
Political Sign ⁸	Until 5 days after election	Until 5 days after election	Until 5 days after election	Until 5 days after election	Until 5 days after election
Real Estate Sign	Until 5 days after the property is taken off the market	Until 5 days after the property is taken off the market	Until 5 days after the property is taken off the market	Until 5 days after the property is taken off the market	Until 5 days after the property is taken off the market

1-When allowed as conditional uses, the planning commission may permit individual signs no larger than 16 sq ft.

2-When allowed as conditional uses, the planning commission may permit individual signs no larger than 24 sq ft.

3-Subject to bonus allowance when approved as a Sign of Outstanding Design under SMC 17.39.145.

4-No part of a building sign shall be higher than the highest point of the building to which it is attached.

5-No sign may be placed in a Vision Clearance Area (SMC 17.10.862).

6-Signs within a public right-of-way may be permitted according to SMC 12.02-Use of City Rights-of-Way.

7-Signs related to a specific event, sale, etc. must be removed within 5 days after such event.

8-Political signs not related to an upcoming election in the voting district where the sign is placed are subject to the temporary sign duration standards.

(Ord. No. 1103, § 5, 2-16-2017)