DRAFT Minutes Stevenson Planning Commission Meeting Monday, March 10, 2025 6:00 PM		
	Planning Commission Vice-Chair Auguste Zettler called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. A quorum was present.	
MEMBERS PRESENT	Vice-Chair Auguste Zettler; Commissioners Anne Keesee, Charles Hales and Tony Lawson were in attendance. PC Chair Jeff Breckel was not in attendance.	
STAFF PRESENT	Community Development Director Ben Shumaker, Planning & Public Works Assistant Tiffany Andersen	
GUESTS	Mike Green, Brian McKenzie	
PUBLIC PRESENT	Mary Repar	
A. Preliminary Matters		
1. Public Comment Expectations	Shumaker explained use of tools for remote and public participants: For remote, *6 to mute/unmute & *9 to raise hand, or raise hand icon. Commenters must raise their hand and be acknowledged by the Chair. Individual comments may be limited to 3 minutes. Disruptive individuals may be required to leave the meeting. Persistent disruptions may result in the meeting being recessed and continued at a later date.	
2. Public Comment Period:	Mary Repar commented on Lasher Street Parking	
3. Approval of Minutes:	February 10th, 2024 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously following a motion by Commissioner Keesee , seconded by Commissioner Lawson . There were no changes or corrections.	
B. New Business	ZON2024-02: Rezone Request: R2 to R3 on Lasher Street	
4. Zoning Recommendations	Proposal from property owners to rezone a .052 acre parcel on Lasher Street from R2 Two-Family to R3 Multi-Family residential.	

a. Appearance of Fairness	Shumaker explained and administered the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. The Appearance of Fairness Doctrine is a rule of law requiring government decision-makers in a quasi-judicial setting to conduct non-court hearings and proceedings in a way that is fair, impartial and unbiased in both appearance and fact. Any conflicts of interest must be disclosed to ensure fairness and impartiality. Disclosures include any financial interest in the final outcome, any outside (ex-parte) communications made with any party of interest or anything else that could be construed as a conflict or affecting any decision making. Decision makers can be challenged by applicants regarding any perceived conflicts of interest.
	Disclosure None of the Planning Commissioners disclosed any exparte communications concerning the application, and none reported any financial conflicts or other matters that would impede a fair and impartial decision. There were no challenges by the applicant or the public.
b. Presentation by Staff	Community Development Director Ben Shumaker explained the proposal for rezoning. The presentation provides opportunity for public involvement. He noted state statutes require a review, and the City Council will hold a public hearing regarding the application. The subject property lies within the HDR – High Density Residential area of the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map. This designation would support both the existing zoning designation and the requested change. The subject property is the only property served by Lasher Street which does not bear the requested R3 Multi- Family Residential zoning designation. There is no apparent rationale for the disparate treatment of the subject property. Maximum units allowed would be 11.
c. Presentation by Applicant	Brian McKenzie, the applicant stated he was looking for the best use of the area. It is currently bordered by R3 structures on 3 sides. Higher density would allow additional housing units to be constructed.
d. Public Involvement	
1. Comments in Favor	None received

2. Comments in Opposition	Mary Repar spoke about the need to conduct a SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) determination and received clarification of the site's location. She expressed concerns about wildlife habitat. She was informed the SEPA comment period was still open. Shumake r noted the purpose of the presentation was to consider the zoning request. Information provided would help the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the City Council on the proposal.
3. Comments Neither in Favor nor Opposition	None received.
e. Commission Deliberation	Commissioners held a brief discussion. It was determined the proposal would not change the nature of the neighborhood. With surrounding structures zoned as R3, all concurred it was a reasonable request for change. Vice-Chair Zettler noted the presentation was for a zoning determination following the rules and policies currently in place.
f. ACTION	A motion to recommend approval of the proposal to the City Council made by Commissioner Hales , seconded by Commissioner Keesee was approved unanimously.
D. Discussion	
C. Old Business	
5. Staff & Commission Reports:	Community Development Director Ben Shumaker provided an update on staffing levels within the city.
	Planning & Public Works Assistant Tiffany Andersen explained the procedure and timeline regarding the processing of public records requests. One request involves reviewing 17,000 emails.
	Utility Customer Audit Shumaker reported when utility rates changed last year, the rates were not applied equally. The city is undertaking a review of accounts to determine where billing errors took place.
6. Thought of the Month:	DesigningVitruvian Triad: Firmitas, Utilitas, Venustas: Durability, Usability, Beauty https://moss- design.com/vitruvius/ -Components of Venustus: https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/2025/02/24/six-point-

visual-check-better-downtown. Articulated architectural approach of Romans.

Mary Repar questioned when the Planning Commission would hold an affordable housing discussion. She recommended a Community Roots presentation. **Vice-Chair Zettler and Commissioner Hales** noted the issue has been a long time topic. It was suggested without some form of subsidization it is unlikely the housing market will support affordable housing developments. Mary encouraged Commissioners to look at Clark County's programs.

E. Adjournment Vice-Chair Zettler declared the meeting adjourned at 6:48 following a motion by Commissioner Keesee, seconded by Commissioner Lawson.