



White Salmon Planning Commission Meeting
A G E N D A
July 22, 2026 – 5:30 PM
119 NE Church Ave and via Zoom Teleconference

Meeting ID: [830 5878 6641](#)
Call in Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 US (Tacoma)

Call to Order/Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

- [1.](#) Approval of Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2026
- [2.](#) Approval of Meeting Minutes – June 24, 2026

Public Comment

Members of the public attending the meeting, either in person or via Zoom, are welcome to provide general public comment. Each speaker will be allotted three minutes.

Discussion Items

- [3.](#) Short-term rentals in Commercial zones

Adjournment



File Attachments for Item:

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2026



DRAFT

White Salmon Planning Commission MEETING MINUTES

May 13, 2026 – 5:30 PM

119 NE Church Ave and Zoom Teleconference

COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT

Commission Members:

Carl Trabant, Chair
Michael Morneault
Brendan Brown
Erika Price
Nate Loker

Staff:

Rowan Fairfield, City Planner
Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chair Carl Trabant called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. A quorum of planning commissioner members was present.

Roll call was conducted by staff:

Chair Carl Trabant — Present

Commissioner Erika Price — Present

Commissioner Michael Morneault — Present

Commissioner Nate Loker — Present

Commissioner Brendan Brown — Present (Online)

Staff confirmed that a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public provided comment.

Public Hearing

Type II Site and Building Plan Review. A proposal for a multiplex residential use with four (4) dwellings on a 6,012 sq. ft. parcel in the R2 zone, located at 130 SE Wyers Street, planning file WS-SPR-2026.002.

1. Chair opens the hearing

Chair Carl Trabant opened the public hearing for Planning File WS-SPR-2026.002, a Type II Site and Building Plan Review for a proposed multiplex residential development consisting of four (4) dwelling units on a 6,012-square-foot parcel located at 130 SE Wyers Street.

The Chair explained that the application was being considered as a quasi-judicial matter and reviewed the applicable hearing procedures, including the requirements of the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine and the prohibition on ex parte communications. The Chair asked Planning Commission members to disclose any ex parte communications, conflicts of interest, financial interests, or other circumstances that could affect their ability to hear the matter fairly and impartially. The Chair also invited members of the public to raise any concerns regarding the impartiality of the Commission.

No Planning Commissioners disclosed ex parte communications or conflicts of interest, and no requests for disqualification were made by members of the public.

The public hearing proceeded with the staff presentation.

2. Staff presentation

City Planner Rowan Fairfield presented the staff report for Planning File WS-SPR-2026.002, a Type II Site and Building Plan Review for a proposed four-unit multiplex development on a 6,012-square-foot parcel zoned R2 at 130 SE Wyers Street.

Fairfield reviewed the application timeline, including the pre-application conference, application submittal, public notice process, and hearing timeline. They explained that the proposal was evaluated against the applicable provisions of the White Salmon Municipal Code, including zoning, development standards, parking, setbacks, utilities, tree protection, stormwater management, and access requirements.

Staff found that the proposed use is permitted in the R2 zone and complies with the majority of applicable development standards. The existing lot width does not meet current standards; however, the parcel is a legally nonconforming lot created in 1903 and remains eligible for development.

Fairfield summarized the proposal's compliance with parking, building height, setbacks, and density requirements. They also discussed the proposed removal of one special tree (Oregon white oak) and one significant tree (cedar), explaining that staff determined the removals met the applicable tree removal criteria, subject to replacement requirements or payment of a fee-in-lieu if replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site.

Staff also reviewed the proposed stormwater management measures, recommending a condition requiring engineered stormwater plans approved by the City Engineer. Additional recommended conditions included underground utility installation, alley paving and driveway improvements, right-of-way permitting, and compliance with Public Works requirements for water and sewer connections.

Fairfield summarized agency and public comments received prior to the hearing. Agency comments included recommendations regarding tree mitigation and notification of existing utility infrastructure. Public comments primarily expressed concerns related to development density, parking, neighborhood compatibility, tree removal, affordability, and potential short-term rental use. Staff responded that the application had been evaluated based on the applicable approval criteria established in the Municipal Code and clarified that several concerns raised were outside the scope of the Commission's review.

Based on the findings presented in the staff report, staff recommended **approval with conditions**.

3. Applicant presentation

Applicant Juan Chaves thanked the Planning Commission and members of the public for their participation and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present the proposal. Chaves stated that the project was designed to comply with the City's adopted regulations and

development standards while providing additional housing opportunities within an established neighborhood.

Chaves explained that the proposal was intended to be a small-scale residential development that makes efficient use of existing infrastructure while maintaining the residential character of the area. They acknowledged the concerns raised by neighboring property owners and stated their intent was to develop the property responsibly in accordance with the City's long-term planning vision and applicable Municipal Code requirements.

4. Public testimony

Chair Carl Trabant opened the public testimony portion of the hearing, reviewed the hearing procedures, and invited testimony from those in support of, neutral to, or opposed to the proposal.

Peter Wright, White Salmon resident, spoke in support of the proposal. Wright stated that the application should be evaluated based on the standards established in the White Salmon Municipal Code and noted that many concerns raised by the public were policy issues rather than grounds for denial. Wright encouraged the Commission to provide clear findings regarding the classification of the proposed development, reconsider the recommended alley paving condition based on prior land use decisions, and evaluate whether parking could be relocated to preserve the existing cedar tree.

Ross Henry, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Henry expressed concerns regarding the proposed density on a legally nonconforming lot, compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for maintaining the community's small-town character. Henry also raised concerns about the removal of the cedar tree and its potential impact on the neighboring Douglas fir, the adequacy of the proposed parking, and the interpretation of parking within the required front yard. Henry suggested that additional code provisions addressing development on nonconforming lots would provide greater clarity for future projects.

Greg Hohensee, a White Salmon resident, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Hohensee stated that he opposed the previous amendments to the R2 zoning regulations and believed the current proposal demonstrated unintended consequences of those changes. He expressed concerns that the proposed development was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's goals of maintaining the City's small-town character and questioned whether the proposed use of the alley for vehicle access was consistent with the Municipal Code. Hohensee also raised concerns regarding parking impacts, pedestrian safety, potential effects on existing infrastructure, tree removal, and the long-term public costs associated with increased residential density.

Jonathan DeArmond, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the proposal. DeArmond expressed concerns regarding the interpretation of the required front and rear yard standards, stating that the proposed parking configuration would occupy the required yard areas and was inconsistent with the intent of the Municipal Code. They also raised concerns about the proposed removal of the Oregon white oak and cedar trees, the compatibility of the proposed development with the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the project would provide housing that meets the needs of local families. DeArmond encouraged the Commission to consider alternative site designs that would preserve the existing trees while still allowing residential development.

Brynion Berkey, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Berkey expressed concerns that the proposed development was inconsistent with the character of the community and objected to the proposed front yard parking configuration. Berkey also stated that they intended to retain the Douglas fir tree on their property and expressed concern that removal of the adjacent cedar tree could adversely affect its health.

5. Applicant Rebuttal

Applicant Juan Chaves responded to the public testimony by acknowledging the concerns expressed by neighboring property owners. Chaves stated that the proposal was intended to provide additional housing opportunities while complying with the City's adopted regulations and planning policies. Chaves thanked the Planning Commission and members of the public for their time and consideration.

6. Commission discussion

Following the close of public testimony, Fairfield responded to questions raised during the hearing. They clarified that the Municipal Code does not prohibit parking within required front yards, noted that residential landscaping is not required by code, and recommended an additional condition of approval requiring an arborist report to identify measures for protecting the neighboring Douglas fir during removal of the cedar tree. Fairfield also discussed the interpretation of the proposed breezeway, stating that staff believed it met the intent of the multiplex provisions, while acknowledging the Commission could interpret the code differently.

Commissioners discussed several aspects of the proposal, including stormwater management, the adequacy of the proposed drainage plan, public water and sewer capacity, parking within required yard areas, alley access, the recommended alley paving condition, development on a legally nonconforming lot, tree preservation, and whether the proposed breezeway satisfied the Municipal Code's multiplex standards. Commissioners also discussed the applicant's stated intent to occupy one unit and rent the remaining units as long-term rentals.

Following discussion, the Commission determined that additional time was needed to further evaluate the proposal, including interpretation of the multiplex provisions, stormwater review, and certain recommended conditions of approval.

7. Commission action

Commissioner Michael Morneault moved to continue the public hearing to the May 27, 2026, Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Brendan Brown seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0. No final action was taken on the application, and the public hearing was continued to the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

Carl Trabant, Chair

Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

File Attachments for Item:

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – June 24, 2026



DRAFT

White Salmon Planning Commission MEETING MINUTES

June 24, 2026 – 5:30 PM

119 NE Church Ave and Zoom Teleconference

COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT

Commission Members:

Carl Trabant, Chair
Michael Morneault
Brendan Brown
Erika Price
Nate Loker

Staff:

Rowan Fairfield, City Planner
Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chair Carl Trabant called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. A quorum of planning commissioner members was present.

Roll call was conducted by staff:

Chair Carl Trabant — Present

Commissioner Erika Price — Present (Online)

Commissioner Nate Loker — Present

Staff confirmed that a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public provided comment.

ACTION ITEM

Request for Reconsideration – Type II Site and Building Plan Review (WS-SPR-2026.002)

Chair Trabant opened consideration of the request for reconsideration of Planning File WS-SPR-2026.002, which the Planning Commission had previously approved with conditions on May 27, 2026. He reviewed the reconsideration procedures outlined in WSMC 19.10.260, noting that reconsideration is limited to instances where a legal error or overlooked material factual issue would change the previous decision.

Chair Trabant summarized the written request for reconsideration submitted by Juan Chaves, Janae Papazian, and Peter Wright. The request alleged three legal errors related to procedural requirements, interpretation of the municipal code, and approval of a condition of approval.

City Planner Rowan Fairfield stated that staff had reviewed the request with the City Attorney and concluded that no legal error had occurred.

Chair Trabant summarized the Commission's actions during the original public hearing process, stating that the Commission followed its standard procedures, including continuation of deliberations from May 13 to May 27 before approving the application.

Commissioner Loker moved to grant the request for reconsideration.

The motion failed due to the lack of a second.

As no motion to grant reconsideration was approved, the Planning Commission took no further action and the previous decision remained final.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Short-term Rentals in Commercial Zones

City Planner Fairfield introduced a discussion regarding short-term rentals in commercially zoned areas. They explained that staff had received multiple inquiries from owners and prospective buyers of existing single-family residences located within commercial zoning districts regarding eligibility for short-term rental permits.

Fairfield explained that current provisions in Title 17 prohibit short-term rentals on parcels containing only a single residential unit in commercial zones due to the 30% limitation, while Title 5 contains a table suggesting that one short-term rental is permitted on properties with up to five units. Staff noted the inconsistency between the two code sections and stated that, as Zoning Administrator, they have been administering the regulations based on Title 17.

The Commission discussed whether existing single-family homes located in commercial zones should be eligible for short-term rentals. Commissioners noted that allowing short-term rentals in commercial zones appeared reasonable for existing residential properties but also discussed maintaining the City's vision for active commercial storefronts along designated commercial streets.

Commissioners also discussed additional code provisions prohibiting new short-term rentals occupying ground-floor space with commercial street frontage and recognized that any amendment would need to carefully distinguish existing residential properties from future commercial development. Commissioner Loker asked about the process for amending the municipal code. Fairfield explained that amendments would require preparation of an ordinance, Planning Commission review through a public hearing, and final consideration by the City Council.

The Commission agreed to review the applicable code sections independently and develop potential amendment language for discussion at a future workshop meeting. Staff suggested postponing further discussion until the second meeting in July due to the upcoming public hearing agenda. City Planner Fairfield also informed the Commission that City Council had postponed action on commissioner reappointments pending review of the submitted applications and noted that staff would prepare a proclamation recognizing Commissioner Michael Morneault's eight years of service.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Carl Trabant, Chair

Miryan Manjarrez-Hurtado, Associate Planner

File Attachments for Item:

3. Short-term rentals in Commercial zones



CITY OF WHITE SALMON

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

Date: 6/22/2026
From: Rowan Fairfield, City Planner
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Short Term Rentals in Commercial Zone (C)

From the 2026 Planning Commission Workplan:

Activity 2: Short-term rentals in Commercial Zones

The Code limits STRs to be 30% of the dwellings on a single parcel in the C zone. This effectively prohibits all single-family homes in the C zone from being used as a STR (except for legacy/grandfathered cases). Should this be revisited?

Please see the attached sections of the White Salmon Municipal Code:

5.02.030 - Permitting and renewal procedures.

17.57.050 - Additional use restrictions—Commercial zones (C).

For properties such as 186 and 196 W Jewett to be eligible for Short-Term Rental permits, subsections A and B would need to be amended, because they face a “commercial street” as defined in Title 17.

17.08.145 - Commercial street.

“Commercial street” means a street dominated by commercial uses. Specifically, commercial streets include Jewett Boulevard between Northwest Garfield Avenue and Northeast Pioneer Place or Southeast 5th Avenue; North Main Avenue from West Jewett Boulevard to NW Lincoln Street; NE Church Avenue from West Jewett Boulevard to NE Lincoln Street; NE Estes Avenue from East Jewett Boulevard to NE Tohomish Street; NE Wauna Avenue from East Jewett Street to NE Tohomish Street.

“The 30% rule”

Units on Parcel	1	2	3	4	5
Units x 30%	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5
Max Number after Rounding	0	1	1	1	1

5.02.030 - Permitting and renewal procedures.

A short-term rental permit shall be obtained and/or renewed as required in this section. This permit is in addition to the city business license required under WSMC Ch. 5.04, and the supplemental zoning regulations under WSMC Ch. 17.57. The ability to operate a short-term rental in the city of White Salmon shall be discontinued in the event the owner fails to obtain or renew a permit to operate as provided in this chapter.

- A. Application and Renewal Process. A person engaging in operation of a short-term rental who has not yet obtained a permit, or who is required to renew an existing operating permit, shall do so as follows:
1. Time for Application.
 - a. New Permits. For new short-term rental permits, it is the responsibility of the owner or contact person to apply for and receive a permit prior to operation of a short-term rental. Short-term rental permits shall be processed as a short-term rental use permit. Applications for short-term rental uses shall be processed administratively by the city administrator or designee.
 - b. Existing Short-term Rentals. A completed permit renewal application and renewal fee is due for all existing short-term rentals annually by January 31.
 2. Notice. Prior to the January 31 annual due date, the city shall send notice of the need for a permit or expiration of a permit to the owner of any property for which an application is due as follows:
 - a. For the first permit required for any short-term rental in the city, it is the owner's obligation and responsibility to apply for a permit.
 - b. For permit renewal, notice will be sent to the mailing and email addresses of the owner and contact person as provided to the city on the application.
- B. Exemption for Existing "Legacy" Homeshares and Vacation Homes with the RL, R1, R2, and R3 Zones. For the purposes of this section, an existing "legacy" homeshare or vacation home is one which meets all the standards and criteria in WSMC Ch. 5.02 that were in place prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2022-02-1093 on February 16, 2022 and which is capable of demonstrating by a preponderance of credible evidence that all the elements of a nonconforming hosted homeshare or vacation home rental were extant prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2022-02-193 on February 16, 2022 as outline in WSMC 17.57.60 Legacy Permits. Applicants shall be subject to the most current fees in place for yearly permit renewal.
- C. Exemption for Existing "Legacy" Short-Term Rentals within the Commercial Zones. For the purposes of this section, an existing "legacy" short-term rental is one which meets the standards and criteria of WSMC Ch. 5.02 in effect prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2022-02-

1093 on February 16, 2022. The extent of the nonconformity and exemption shall be limited to compliance with the standards that were in effect in WSMC Ch. 5.02 prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2022-02-1093 on February 16, 2022 and shall remain exempt from new regulations provided the use is vested. The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of credible evidence that all the elements of a nonconforming short-term rental in the commercial zone were extant and vested under RCW 19.27.095 prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2022-02-1093 on February 16, 2022.

D. Quantity of Permits by Location and Owner.

1. Maximum Number of Permits Per Owner.

- a. A maximum of one hosted homeshare or vacation home rental permit shall be issued per owner-occupied property in the RL, R1, R2 and R3 zones.
- b. There is no limit on the number of short-term rental permits a property owner may obtain in the Commercial zones.

2. Cap on Permits in the RL, R1, R2 and R3 Zones. The city shall limit the total amount of hosted homeshare and vacation home rental permits issued in the RL, R1, R2, and R3 zones to a maximum of ten percent of housing units within the city and shall be adjusted annually by the city administrator or designee based upon the most recent housing data reported by the City of the White Salmon to the Washington Office of Financial Management prior to issuance of new permits.

3. Commercial Zones. There is no cap on the number of short-term rental permits in the commercial zones. No more than thirty percent of residential units on any given parcel in the commercial zoning district may be used as short-term rentals. This number shall be rounded to the nearest integer, with a half integer rounded down, depending on the number of existing or proposed units.

For example:

Units on Parcel	Maximum Number of Short-term Rentals
Up to 5 units	1
6 to 8 units	2
9 to 11 units	3
12 to 14 units	4
15 to 18 units	5

19 to 21 units	6
22 to 25 units	7

- E. Queue. In the event the maximum number of permits issued by the city within any given year reaches the ten percent threshold, the city administrator or their designee shall accept and tentatively approve conforming hosted homeshare and vacation home rentals on a first come first serve basis with the condition that a license will not be issued until such time that a permit becomes available. The queue list shall be administered and updated as needed to monitor the cap on permits for hosted homeshares and vacation home rentals by the city administrator or their designee and be made available on the city website.
- F. Permit Expiration. For renewals, upon expiration of a thirty-day late period commencing January 31 of each year, the ability to operate shall be conclusively presumed to be discontinued and the city will commence revocation of the permit pursuant to the procedures in WSMC 5.02.045.

(Ord. No. 2019-12-1052, § 1, 12-4-2019; Ord. No. 2022-02-1093, § 1, 2-16-2022)

17.57.050 - Additional use restrictions—Commercial zones (C).

- A. Short-term rentals are permitted only when no more than thirty percent of residential units on a parcel in the commercial zoning district are for the purpose of short-term rental. This number shall be rounded to the nearest integer, with a half integer rounded down, depending on the number of existing or proposed units.
- B. Apart from existing short-term rentals in the commercial zones which meet the requirements of WSMC 17.57.060, no new short-term rental shall be permitted to occupy a ground floor space with commercial street frontage.

(Ord. No. 2022-02-1097, § 1, 2-16-2022)