



**White Salmon Planning Commission Meeting
A G E N D A
November 13, 2024 – 5:30 PM
119 NE Church Ave and Zoom Teleconference**

**Meeting ID: 867 8998 6369
Call in Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 US (Tacoma)**

Call to Order/Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

- [1.](#) Meeting Minutes - October 9, 2024
- [2.](#) Workshop Minutes - October 9, 2024
- [3.](#) Meeting Minutes - October 23, 2024

Public Hearing

A public hearing, with a virtual/telephonic attendance option, will be held during this Planning Commission meeting or as soon thereafter as possible. Any individual who wishes to testify in person or via teleconference will be allowed to do so.

- [4.](#) Unit Lot Subdivision Ordinance
 - a. Presentation
 - b. Public Testimony
 - c. Discussion
 - d. Action

- [5.](#) Commercial Form-Based Code Ordinance
 - a. Presentation
 - b. Public Testimony
 - c. Discussion
 - d. Action

Adjournment



File Attachments for Item:

1. Meeting Minutes - October 9, 2024



DRAFT

CITY OF WHITE SALMON
Planning Commission Meeting - Wednesday, October 9, 2024

COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT

Commission Members:

Greg Hohensee, Chair
Erika Price (5:32 PM)
Michael Morneault
Brendan Brown
Carl Trabant

Staff:

Erika Castro Guzman, Project Coordinator
Kelly Hickok, Legal Counsel

Planning Consultants:

Alex Capron, Consultant Planner

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chairman Greg Hohensee called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm. A quorum of planning commissioner members was present. There were 14 audience members in attendance in person and via teleconference.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Cherry Hill Estates Subdivision

The Planning Commission held the public hearing to review the Cherry Hill Estates Subdivision, involves subdividing a 7.93-acre parcel (Tax Parcel No. 03102475000400) located off NW Spring Street, between NW Cherry Hill Road and Champion Lane, into 35 residential lots.

Chair Greg Hohensee opened the public hearing at 5:32PM.

During the reading of the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine, Commissioner Carl Trabant disclosed that he resides within 300 ft, but was allowed to continue as there was no objection by any commissioner, audience member, or applicant.

A. STAFF PRESENTATION

Alex Capron, Senior Planner with Facet, provided an overview of the Cherry Hills Estates Preliminary Plat. He explained that his team has been assisting the City with on-call planning services for over a year, specifically focusing on development review and land use entitlement. The project being discussed tonight is the Cherry Hills Estates subdivision, located on a vacant piece of property near Northwest Spring Street and Main Street. This preliminary plat application is identified by file numbers W.S.-S.U.B.-2024-001 and SEPA Checklist and Threshold Determination.

The proposed development is a 36-lot residential subdivision on an approximately 8-acre site. One of the lots will be designated for a stormwater detention vault. The property is zoned R1 (Residential) and has been vacant for some time, previously used as an orchard. The development process has included coordination with the City's Public Works Department to ensure the project aligns with city code standards and addresses key concerns, including street and utility infrastructure, environmental impact, and public safety. The project's purpose is to ensure compliance with zoning regulations, engage with the public and agencies, and ultimately prepare for construction-level permitting.

The project follows a Type III Decision Process, which involves two public hearings: one at tonight’s meeting and another before the City Council, where the conditions of approval will be finalized. Staff from the City Planning Department have reviewed the project and recommended approval based on the conditions outlined in the staff report provided on September 25th. Following approval, the applicant will need to submit civil site plans, complete required infrastructure improvements, and either bond or construct necessary utilities and right-of-way improvements before final plat approval.

The site has been identified as a former orchard and is currently open land, though there are some easements that encumber portions of the lot. Access to the subdivision will be provided from Northwest Spring Street. This project is closely tied to another ongoing development project, the Four Oaks Development, which impacts access to the site. The City has established transportation standards under the White Salmon Municipal Code, including specific requirements for travel lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks. The applicant is required to comply with these standards, with a portion of the improvements along Spring Street contributing to the creation of a safe route to schools. A traffic impact analysis conducted by a third party concluded that the proposed development would not require any significant improvements to existing intersections. However, the development may be limited to 30 lots until the formal approval of access improvements is completed, particularly in relation to the Four Oaks development.

Utilities required for the project include fire hydrants, water, and sewer connections. A fire hydrant is required as per the International Fire Code, and coordination with the Four Oaks development may help accommodate this requirement. Additionally, the project will involve improvements to the water transmission main, a 14-inch steel line that connects the city reservoir to the public works operations facility. The city will also benefit from upgrades to water and sewer infrastructure, which must be connected or bonded before final plat approval. The applicant must demonstrate that low-impact development methods are infeasible for stormwater management before utilizing a retention vault, and geotechnical studies will inform this determination.

The site contains a regulated steep slope; however, the geotechnical report determined that the overall site is stable and suitable for development. The City required the applicant to demonstrate that the steep slope would be avoided during construction, and the applicant has complied by designing site access that avoids the critical area. A tree inventory was provided as part of the application, identifying one heritage tree that will be protected under a dedicated easement. Another tree inventory identified an existing gas pipeline easement on the west side of the property, but this does not impact the development. Furthermore, Ecology raised concerns about possible soil contamination due to the property's previous use as an orchard. The applicant conducted soil tests, which showed no contaminants were present on-site.

During the review process, several public comments were received. Public Works reviewed the applicant’s Traffic Impact Study and found no issues with the proposed traffic patterns or impact on nearby intersections. The study concluded that no additional intersection improvements would be necessary. However, the development will be restricted to 30 lots until the required access improvements are formally approved by the City. Ecology also requested that the applicant test for potential soil contamination, which was addressed by

the applicant's soil testing that confirmed no contaminants were found. These comments have been addressed in the conditions of approval.

Based on the findings and coordination with the Public Works Department, City Planning Staff is recommending approval of the Cherry Hills Estates Preliminary Plat with the conditions outlined in the staff report. A minor scrivener's error was noted in the reference to the RCW for Safe Routes to School, which should be RCW 47.04.300. Despite this, the project is otherwise in compliance with city code, and the staff has moved to recommend approval to the City Council.

Senior Planner Capron outlined that following the Planning Commission's recommendation, the project will move forward to the City Council for a final public hearing, where the conditions of approval will be set in stone. Once approved, the applicant will proceed with civil site improvements, utilities construction, and bonding for the necessary right-of-way improvements. Final plat approval will follow once all conditions are met, and lots will be recorded at the county.

B. APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Cameron Curtis, the owner of Curtis Homes and Legacy Development, addressed the Planning Commission. He began by thanking the Chair and the Planning Commission for their time and for reviewing the Cherry Hills Estates application. Mr. Curtis acknowledged that the staff had provided a thorough overview of the project, and he did not have an additional presentation prepared.

He expressed his excitement about the project, emphasizing that his family is committed to building a high-quality development in the area. Mr. Curtis stated that he believes the development presents a valuable opportunity to address the community's pressing need for more housing. He concluded by offering himself and his team as a resource for any questions the Commission may have and expressed hope for the project's approval.

C. PUBLIC TESTEMONY

Chair Greg Hohensee opened the public comment portion of the hearing at 5:52 pm.

Shelley Baxter, Inside City Resident

Shelley Baxter, a resident of White Salmon, expressed concerns about the traffic and safety on Spring Street due to the proposed Cherry Hills Estates development. She noted that while she had to design a bike path and sidewalk for her property development, she sees these improvements as incomplete, since they lead to "nowhere." She is particularly worried about traffic speed on Spring Street, citing a close call where she was nearly struck by a car while biking. Ms. Baxter recommended slowing down the development process until Spring Street is improved, possibly requiring some temporary traffic calming measures before the full road improvements are made. She emphasized that the additional traffic from the new development will have a major impact on the street and the character of the city. She concluded by urging the City to prioritize Spring Street improvements and to secure the necessary funding for upgrades as soon as possible.

Kevin Herman, Inside City Resident

Kevin Herman, a resident of 1001 Northwest Trail Road, expressed concerns regarding the Cherry Hills Estates development, focusing on drainage and construction impacts. He

emphasized the importance of proper drainage during construction and asked that code enforcement ensure compliance with standards. He also requested that his property line be clearly marked without any cost to him. Mr. Herman also expressed concerns about the sidewalk and bike path along Spring Street, particularly regarding access to his property. He requested that the sidewalk be maintained to allow for safe access to his land. Additionally, he questioned the feasibility of adding the bike path and sidewalk over the existing road, Spring Street, noting ongoing promises from the City about road improvements that have not been fulfilled. He concluded by stating that he supports the development, provided that these concerns are addressed.

Jordan Crisp, Inside City Resident

Jordan Crisp, a resident of 1050 Champion Lane, asked if the Planning Commission had received a copy of the written comments submitted for the meeting, which was confirmed. He then referenced RCW 47.04.300, which encourages safe and accessible routes for children walking to school. He expressed concern that the proposed frontage improvements on Spring Street would end at a blind hill, making it unsafe for pedestrians, especially children. Crisp urged the Commission to consider the Four Oaks access road as a stipulation for the development to help mitigate the impact of construction vehicles on the already deteriorating Spring Street.

Dan Crisp, Inside City Resident

Dan Crisp, a resident of 1035 Champion Lane, raised concerns about the safety of Spring Street, particularly for children. He walks the street daily and finds it dangerous, especially near Main Street. He fears the street will become more hazardous with the addition of 30+ homes. Crisp also highlighted the potential damage from construction traffic and suggested using the Four Oaks access road to avoid further erosion of Spring Street. He inquired about the gas line easement behind his property and its impact on the development, noting that wildlife such as deer frequently pass through the area. He concluded by urging the City to address safety issues on Spring Street before moving forward with the development.

Leslie Trabant, Inside City Resident

Leslie Trabant, a resident of 1070 Champion Lane, expressed concerns about Spring Street's condition and its ability to handle the increased traffic from the Cherry Hills Estates development. She suggested using the access road through Four Oaks for construction traffic, even if initially just as a gravel road, to prevent further damage to Spring Street. Trabant also raised concerns about the disruption to local wildlife, including deer and other animals, due to the proposed road through the area. She asked if a wildlife study had been done. Lastly, she emphasized the safety risks on Spring Street for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers, urging that improvements be made before adding more cars from the new development.

Peter Wright, Inside City Resident

Peter Wright, a White Salmon resident, expressed concerns about the City's authority to require street and frontage improvements for the Cherry Hills Estates subdivision. He referenced RCW 58.17.110, which grants the City authority to impose public safety standards, including streets, sidewalks, and other infrastructure, even if the local code doesn't specify every detail. Mr. Wright noted that for his own short plat application, he was required to complete 135 feet of frontage improvements, which seemed inconsistent with the approach taken for Cherry Hills Estates. He called for more consistency and attention to safety in planning decisions.

Chair Greg Hohensee added two written comments to the record before closing the public comment portion of the hearing at 6:11 pm.

D. STAFF REBUTTAL

Alex Capron, Senior Planner, responded to concerns raised about Spring Street improvements. He noted that while there was an active grant application for the improvement of Spring Street from Main to Camino, the grant was denied due to high costs. However, he explained that a phased approach to the improvements might have a better chance of success in the future.

Capron emphasized that for developments like the Cherry Hills Estates, even incremental improvements to the street are considered and were taken into account by both the Planning Department and Public Works during the review process of this application.

E. APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Cameron Curtis, the applicant, addressed the concerns raised by the public. He clarified that while this is not their first subdivision on Spring Street, it is their first project within the city limits of White Salmon. He emphasized that his team is committed to being good neighbors and working collaboratively with the community.

Curtis acknowledged the concerns of the residents, assuring them that they are operating within the applicable laws and regulations set by the city. He expressed a willingness to work with the community to address any concerns and meet the needs of the City of White Salmon.

F. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

During the meeting, Chair Greg Hohensee referenced Page 15 of the packet, which outlines the conditions for approval of the final plan, noting that the goal of the evening was to make a recommendation to the City Council, either with or without modifications to the listed conditions.

Commissioner Erika Price had no questions for either the staff or the applicant.

Commissioner Michael Morneault raised concerns about the Four Oaks Subdivision and its connection to the Cherry Hill project, specifically regarding how stormwater and utilities would be handled.

In response, Cameron Curtis, the applicant, clarified that the Cherry Hill Subdivision would manage all its stormwater on Lot 18, and no runoff would be directed to Four Oaks. Utilities would be routed through a public right of way, linking both properties. Curtis explained that the stormwater pond designed for the Cherry Hill project meets city engineering standards and includes an overflow system for extreme weather events. He also confirmed that there is a signed agreement between him and Nancy White of the Four Oaks Subdivision, allowing for water and sewer connections between the two developments. While the agreement doesn't require one developer to proceed before the other, both projects are intended to proceed concurrently, with cooperation on access and infrastructure.

Commissioner Michael Morneault asked Senior Planner Alex Capron about the storm drainage calculations and how they align with the state manual. Senior Planner Capron clarified that stormwater management wasn't part of the preliminary plat review, as the city typically reviews construction-level documentation during the civil site design phase, post-preliminary approval. The applicant would need to demonstrate that the stormwater retention methods, such as a pond or low-impact development, are adequate for the site.

Commissioner Morneault then raised a point about the precedence of codes, asking whether the city code or the state manual for stormwater management took priority. Alex Capron responded that the city's code takes precedence, as the municipal code doesn't reference the Department of Ecology's stormwater manual.

Chair Greg Hohensee interjected, emphasizing that the focus of the meeting was on the approval of the preliminary plat and that the city's concern tonight wasn't about the specific construction details, which would be addressed later.

Commissioner Morneault further asked about the relationship between the final plan and the actual construction work. Senior Planner Capron explained that the final plat would include approved construction drawings for water, sewer, stormwater, sidewalks, and other site improvements. These improvements would be constructed after approval and would be reflected on the final plat.

Commissioner Morneault also expressed concern about emergency vehicle access if the Four Oaks Subdivision isn't constructed at the same time. Senior Planner Capron stated that it would be up to the applicant to demonstrate emergency vehicle access, which might include temporary gravel access through the Four Oaks development.

Commissioner Morneault suggested that the bio-swale (a type of stormwater management feature) should have been included in the cross-section for the development. He also commented that both subdivisions should ensure their designs are consistent and don't overlap in terms of drainage and infrastructure.

Commissioner Brendan Brown stated that he had no questions or clarifications for staff or the applicant.

Commissioner Carl Trabant raised a couple of points. First, he noted that the Four Oaks subdivision had green space included, which seemed large enough to accommodate additional lots. He asked why the Cherry Hill development didn't include green space. Senior Planner Alex Capron explained that including green space isn't required for a preliminary plat, distinguishing it from a Planned Unit Development (PUD), which allows smaller lot sizes in exchange for amenities like green space. However, he pointed out that the access road adjacent to the city's public works facility is dedicated to the city and may serve as open space in a way.

Next, Commissioner Trabant raised concerns about the gas line easement. He observed that the easement begins at Mr. Crisp's back fence and extends into the Cherry Hill development. He asked what homeowners could do with the 60-foot easement, as it appeared that they might not be able to build structures like fences or sheds in this area due to the potential need for the gas company to access the space.

Senior Planner Alex Capron confirmed that the easement is a no-build easement, meaning that no permanent structures can be placed there, and the area must remain undisturbed.

Cameron Curtis, the applicant, clarified that while permanent structures are not allowed, temporary structures are permitted. He explained that homeowners can landscape, install grass, put up fences with removable panels, or even place temporary sheds in the easement area, with the understanding that the gas company has access if needed. He further noted that if the gas company requires repairs, they will not replace any landscaping or grass that is disturbed during work, which presents a potential risk to homeowners who might choose to landscape or add temporary structures.

Chair Greg Hohensee raised a question regarding the city's authority to require improvements to a larger section of NW Spring Street than what is currently mapped out. He asked whether the city has the power to mandate improvements, such as a bike path or road, extending all the way to the high school.

Legal Counsel Kelly Hickok explained that the city does have the authority to require street improvements as part of the development process, but those improvements need to be tied to the effects of the development. The city's authority is based on how the proposed development impacts the surrounding infrastructure.

Chair Greg Hohensee then asked if there were ways to ensure that access to properties affected by street improvements, such as driveway cutouts or rollover curbs, is properly addressed in the project. He was concerned that improvements should not inadvertently block access to properties, especially where traditional access points have been used.

Senior Planner Alex Capron responded that if properties already have legal access, it would need to be addressed, but he would need to look into this further to provide more clarity.

Chair Greg Hohensee suggested that, given the applicant's track record of working well with communities, it would be ideal to formalize conditions that protect access to properties during the improvement process, ensuring that changes like a curb or sidewalk don't block or hinder traditional access routes.

Cameron Curtis, the applicant, clarified that while he could not speak for city staff, in other developments, it's typical for property owners affected by improvements to file for a right-of-way permit if they don't have permanent access already. The applicant would be happy to work with affected neighbors to ensure access requirements are met, with proper engineering approval.

Commissioner Michael Morneault raised a question about the existing electrical lines between properties and whether those would be required to be underground as part of the development.

Senior Planner Alex Capron confirmed that the city code mandates all new electrical connections to be underground. However, since the existing electrical connections are in place, the city defers to Klickitat PUD's discretion regarding whether to bury existing lines.

This would be a condition of approval, with the applicant needing to provide something in writing from Klickitat PUD outlining their decision.

Commissioner Erika Price shared her thoughts on the application, noting that while she agreed with the project, she was concerned about roadway improvements to the east to ensure safe routes to school down to N Main Street. However, she was unsure whether there was a way to enforce these improvements, given that the relevant property is private.

Chair Greg Hohensee responded by suggesting that if possible, the access to the subdivision should not solely go through NW Spring Street. He emphasized that NW Spring Street isn't the ideal access point, and that the plan for the Four Oaks PUD had envisioned a road through that development, so that traffic from future developments could go through there, minimizing the burden on NW Spring Street. He urged the commission to consider this issue and explore alternatives.

Commissioner Brendan Brown agreed, emphasizing the need for assurance that the right-of-way will exist for emergency access, particularly in light of the high fire risk in the community. He also proposed removing the "30" in condition of approval number 13, suggesting that improvements to the right-of-way be required before building permits are issued, particularly since White Salmon's population may be increased by 10%.

Commissioner Carl Trabant supported the idea but felt it should be done sooner, specifically during the construction phase. He cited a precedent in Hood River, where a developer was required to put down a gravel road through adjacent properties to accommodate construction traffic, rather than using existing residential streets. He argued that the same logic could be applied here, suggesting that the development could place gravel down for construction vehicles to use, rather than having them use NW Spring Street, which cannot handle the load.

In summary, commissioners raised concerns about roadway improvements especially regarding access routes, fire safety, and how to manage construction traffic. There was a consensus that NW Spring Street isn't ideal for handling the increased traffic from this and future developments, and the commissioners wanted to ensure the safety and accessibility of the area, including requiring right-of-way improvements before construction.

Commissioner Michael Morneault proposed that as a best practice, the first 50 to 100 feet of the road at the entrance to the subdivision should be paved or improved to help with sedimentation and make the area safer, particularly for kids walking to school. He emphasized that this would help control sediment runoff while also ensuring the safety of pedestrian routes, especially for children.

Chair Greg Hohensee raised a concern about the potential conflict between construction access and pedestrian access for children, as the same route might be used during construction. Commissioner Morneault clarified that the concern would be mostly after construction, when the residential phase is underway.

Chair Greg Hohensee then turned to Staff, asking about the timeline for when the Four Oaks roads would be deeded to the city. Senior Planner Alex Capron confirmed that the road

would be transferred to the city after construction is complete and approved by Public Works.

Chair Hohensee also shared a personal experience about construction traffic on a poorly built road, which caused significant damage, and expressed concern that Spring Street might suffer similar damage from the construction of this new subdivision. He highlighted that taxpayers often bear the costs of such damage through road repairs after the fact, and he wanted to avoid that situation. Hohensee asked whether it would be possible to require that construction access go through the Four Oaks development via a temporary easement to protect Spring Street from being damaged.

Cameron Curtis (the applicant) responded, saying that they had a good relationship with the Four Oaks developers and that they would be willing to cooperate. However, Curtis pointed out that there might be legal restrictions about requiring them to use private property for access, specifically access through the Four Oaks development, which could be complicated by property rights and easement issues. Curtis also mentioned that developments like Champion Circle had used Spring Street for construction access, and they were requesting a 125-foot street extension, which is larger than what is typically required for new developments.

Chair Greg Hohensee asked Legal Counsel Kelly Hickok if it would be possible to require construction access through the Four Oaks right-of-way as a condition of approval for the short plat.

Legal Counsel Kelly Hickok responded, confirming that requiring construction access through another private property (like Four Oaks Development) would likely not be possible, as the applicant has the right to use the public right-of-way (NW Spring Street) for access to their property. Requiring access through another private property (such as Four Oaks) could create legal challenges.

Commissioner Erika Price asked whether there are any weight or truck size limits for NW Spring Street, and if the city can require the developers to replace the road if construction damage occurs. She was concerned about the long-term condition of the road once the construction is complete.

Chair Greg Hohensee responded, acknowledging that there isn't currently any weight limits posted on the road. He raised the broader concern that NW Spring Street is not in great shape already, and if it were to be used for heavy construction traffic, it might further deteriorate. The big question, according to Hohensee, is how to ensure the city doesn't end up with a crumbling road while still supporting development. He acknowledged that requiring new road construction all the way to N Main Street as a condition of approval could be an excessive demand, but at the same time, the city has a responsibility to protect its infrastructure.

Senior Planner Alex Capron confirmed that the applicant is proposing to improve a portion of Spring Street as part of the development, but it would only be a half-street improvement and not the entire length of the road.

Chair Greg Hohensee agreed with the concerns raised and emphasized that the city should address the road's condition. However, he stressed that private developers are not responsible for fixing a road that has not been maintained by the city. The issue, according to him, is ultimately the city's responsibility to address.

Commissioner Michael Morneault followed up by suggesting that the city has an obligation to protect its property and should ensure that traffic does not worsen the state of NW Spring Street. He raised the question of how the city plans to protect its infrastructure when the development will bring increased traffic, particularly if the road is already in poor condition.

Chair Greg Hohensee agreed with Morneault and raised the question of funding. He questioned whether the city would need to fund the improvements to NW Spring Street, or if there are other solutions.

Commissioner Carl Trabant expressed his concerns not with the development itself, but with the condition of NW Spring Street. He stated that NW Spring Street is already narrow, with sections measuring 16-18 feet wide. He also pointed out that the road has very steep sections that make it difficult for delivery trucks to navigate. Currently, delivery trucks often use Cochran Lane to bypass the narrow and steep parts of NW Spring Street. He emphasized that if this road is to serve as the primary access for the development, it will likely lead to more traffic on a road that is already inadequate.

Commissioner Trabant proposed that while he is in favor of the development, the city needs to address the condition of the road before approving further development. He suggested that the city either needs to improve NW Spring Street before approving the project, or the access could be routed through an alternative route like Four Oaks Development to avoid further strain on NW Spring Street.

The Planning Commission discussed the next steps to address the concerns surrounding the proposed development, particularly NW Spring Street access, fire safety, and the road infrastructure.

Chair Hohensee asked if there were any other conditions or edits to the existing conditions for the development approval, aside from the discussion around eliminating 30 lots (which had already been proposed by Commissioner Brendan Brown). He also emphasized the importance of addressing the issue of access through NW Spring Street and the city's role in managing this access, given the current condition of the road.

Commissioner Michael Morneault raised a concern about Condition of Approval #3 in the staff report, which relates to meeting fire flow requirements for the fire hydrants. He wanted clarification on how this would be addressed, particularly whether the new water pipe would be compatible with the existing one or if they would be replacing it entirely.

Senior Planner Alex Capron explained that this condition would be reviewed during the civil site construction phase. At that time, the applicant would need to demonstrate that the water system meets the required fire flow standards. A third-party engineering consultant would review the technical aspects of this during construction.

Chair Hohensee suggested that the City’s Public Works Director should be invited to attend the meeting on October 23 to discuss how the city plans to manage the increased traffic on NW Spring Street. He expressed that the commission needed a clear understanding of how the city would handle the traffic and infrastructure concerns.

Cameron Curtis, the applicant, asked for clarification on the specific question that needed to be answered. Chair Hohensee reiterated that the key concern was how the city would manage the increased traffic on NW Spring Street, which is currently in poor condition and cannot easily handle the additional vehicle access from the new development.

Commissioner Brendan Brown raised a fire safety concern. He pointed out that the proposed hammerhead design (a type of dead-end road used for fire trucks) might not be sufficient for the 10% increase in population that the development would bring. He questioned whether a design like this would allow for adequate fire safety, particularly in an area with high fire risk.

Chair Hohensee proposed continuing the meeting to October 23 to allow the Public Works Director to give a detailed testimony about the access issue and how the city plans to manage it. He also confirmed that this public hearing continuation would not include new public comment. The commissioners would reconvene to make a more informed decision.

Cameron Curtis, the applicant, agreed to continuing the meeting.

Chair Hohensee concluded that no decision would be made until the Public Works Director’s input was heard, and they would revisit the issue at the continued meeting on October 23.

G. ACTION

MOTION CARRIES 5-0

Motion for the continuation of the Cherry Hill Estates Subdivision public hearing to the October 23, 2024, meeting.

Concerns to be Addressed at the Next Meeting:

- Traffic Impact and Infrastructure: The commissioners want clear answers from the city about how it plans to manage the additional traffic and infrastructure needs related to Spring Street, especially given its current condition.
- Fire Safety: There are concerns about the hammerhead design and whether it provides adequate access for fire trucks in the case of emergencies, especially considering the increased population in the development.

The commissioners will reconvene on October 23 after hearing from the Public Works Director to finalize their decision on the development application.

Chair Greg Hohensee tabled the public hearing at 7:00 PM.

DISCUSSION ITEM

2. Draft Parking Ordinance

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy began by clarifying that this was not a formal workshop, but rather a continuation of the discussion that began in the previous meeting. He noted that the draft ordinance being presented tonight is an updated version that reflects public feedback and

previous discussions. The goal is to address parking issues, particularly in light of changing car ownership patterns and state mandates.

Mehaffy emphasized that there has been broad public support for reducing off-street parking requirements, with no public opposition noted so far on this front. The draft is part of a broader housing implementation plan that reflects the evolving nature of transportation, especially in the city core (Malcolm and Corps). He pointed out that ecological benefits are one of the motivations for this change, citing the fact that parking demand has decreased due to services like car-sharing, ride-sharing, and public transportation.

Mehaffy also referred to a new state mandate (Senate Bill 60-15), which requires cities to reduce the size of parking stalls but does not reduce the number of parking spaces required for developments. This aligns with research indicating that there are five parking spaces for every car in the U.S., and over 80% of parking spaces are often empty. The goal is to reduce car dependency, lower parking costs, and make housing more affordable.

A key point in the discussion was whether parking standards from the 1960s are still relevant in today's context. Mehaffy highlighted that parking demand has changed, especially for smaller households, and the draft ordinance reflects these updated realities. The draft also introduces provisions for offsite and shared parking, and reduced requirements for accessory dwelling units (ADUs). However, the primary challenge remains updating parking standards in residential zones (R1 and R2), particularly for one-bedroom or smaller units.

In the draft, the size of parking spaces is adjusted to 9 feet by 18 feet (down from the previous 10 feet by 20 feet), which Mehaffy noted is a key change. He also noted a reference to one parking space per dwelling unit, including the mandate for at least one off-street parking space to be permanently maintained as part of the main building.

Mehaffy concluded by explaining that the draft ordinance also includes new language to better define room sizes and parking requirements in residential developments. The intention is to provide flexibility while addressing both current needs and long-term sustainability. He opened the floor to questions, inviting further input or concerns about the proposed changes.

Key Changes:

- Reduction in parking space dimensions: Parking spaces are now proposed to be 9 feet wide by 18 feet long, down from 10 feet by 20 feet.
- Revised parking requirements: The ordinance suggests that at least one off-street parking space be maintained per dwelling unit as part of the main building.
- Clarification of parking space terminology: The draft includes provisions to define “rooms” in residential units, preventing confusion over room usage that could affect parking requirements.
- State Mandate Compliance: The draft incorporates the changes required by Senate Bill 60-15, which reduces the size of parking stalls but keeps the number of spaces required.

Commissioners discussed the key changes to the proposed parking ordinance, focusing on adjusting parking requirements based on square footage rather than the number of bedrooms. This shift aims to simplify the ordinance and reduce complexity for both staff and property owners, while addressing parking concerns more effectively.

Commissioner Carl Trabant stated that, for him, a bedroom should be defined as a space with both a closet and a smoke detector. This aligns with common building code definitions.

Commissioner Erika Price agreed with the importance of aligning the definition of a bedroom with building code standards, particularly in terms of egress windows and closet requirements. However, she expressed concern about using the number of bedrooms as the sole criteria for parking, arguing that it could be difficult to control how developers classify rooms in a building to circumvent parking requirements.

Chair Greg Hohensee suggested simplifying the parking requirements further by eliminating the need for a specific bedroom definition and instead using square footage. He proposed that all units under 800 square feet would be required to provide one parking space, and those over 800 square feet would require two parking spaces. This approach would eliminate potential issues with misclassifying rooms as bedrooms and offer a more straightforward, objective metric.

Commissioner Erika Price raised concerns that apartments with multiple small bedrooms (e.g., three bedrooms in a 900-square-foot unit) could be under-parked if the ordinance only considers the number of bedrooms. She suggested that the proposed 800-square-foot threshold would better address this issue.

Consultant Michael Mehaffy agreed that using square footage across the board could prevent gaming the system. He pointed out that parking standards for R1 and R2 zones could be simplified to align with this new approach, while R3 zones (which tend to have smaller units) might need to retain more specific parking requirements.

Other Key Points:

- **Parking Space Dimensions:** The draft ordinance currently specifies 9 x 20 feet for parking spaces. However, due to a new state mandate, the city must ensure that parking spaces are not larger than 8 x 18 feet. This change could potentially affect the draft ordinance, with the city needing to adjust parking space dimensions to 8 x 18 feet to come into compliance.
- **Parking for Multi-Family Buildings:** There was discussion about the potential parking challenges for multi-family buildings with small units. Chair Hohensee and others acknowledged that while reducing parking requirements could help with affordability, it could also lead to parking congestion in areas with narrow streets or limited space.
- **Concern Over Recreation Vehicles:** Commissioner Trabant raised an issue about the growing trend of residents using garages for storage (or "toys") instead of parking their cars. This complicates parking in neighborhoods, even when off-street parking is available.
- **Off-Street Parking Requirements for ADUs:** As part of the ongoing revisions, there were suggestions to update parking requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), with at least one space per unit.
- **Road Width Consideration:** Chair Hohensee emphasized that when considering reductions in parking requirements, road width should also be taken into account. He referenced the challenges of reducing parking on narrow streets, like NW Spring Street, compared to wider streets like N Main Street. This would ensure that parking reductions do not lead to issues with congestion and accessibility.

Key Suggestions:

- Updated Draft Parking Ordinance: Prepare a revised version of the ordinance that uses square footage (under 800 sq ft for one parking space, over 800 sq ft for two spaces) rather than the number of bedrooms.
- Change parking space dimensions to 9 x 18 feet, in line with current mandates, with potential adjustments to comply with new state requirements (possibly 8 x 18 feet).
- Removes the reference to parking spaces for ADUs and clarifies parking requirements for R1 and R2 zones.
- Deletes the first line of the table on page 354 as per discussions.
- Monitor State Mandates: Investigate the exact timeline and implementation details of the statewide parking size mandate (8 x 18 feet), which affects all cities, and adjust local codes accordingly.
- Further Discussion on Road Width: As the ordinance moves forward, consider how road widths might impact the feasibility of reduced parking requirements in specific neighborhoods.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:27 pm.

Greg Hohensee, Chairman

Erika Castro Guzman, City Project Coordinator

File Attachments for Item:

2. Workshop Minutes - October 9, 2024



DRAFT

CITY OF WHITE SALMON
Planning Commission Workshop - Wednesday, October 9, 2024

COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT

Commission Members:

Greg Hohensee, Chair
Erika Price
Michael Morneault
Brendan Brown
Carl Trabant

Staff:

Erika Castro Guzman, Project Coordinator

Planning Consultants:

Michael Mehaffy, Housing Consultant

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chairman Greg Hohensee called the workshop to order at 7:00 pm. A quorum of planning commissioner members was present. There were five audience members in attendance via teleconference.

WORKSHOP ITEM

1. **Proposed Zoning Code Updates: Commercial Code, Unit Lot Subdivision, and Barrier Removal**
The Planning Commission held a workshop with Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy to discuss proposed zoning code updates related to the Commercial Code, Unit Lot Subdivision, and Barrier Removal. These updates aim to streamline development processes, create more pedestrian-friendly and mixed-use spaces, and make housing projects more feasible.

The first focus of the discussion was the Commercial Code update. This code applies to several key areas in the city, including Jewett Street, Main Street, and the Riverfront District, which is transitioning into a commercial zone. The goal is to shift away from outdated models where parking is located in front of buildings and instead encourage a more traditional "main street" style, where parking is placed behind buildings. This approach is seen as more walkable and conducive to community interaction. The idea is to enhance the streetscape by bringing buildings closer to the street, with parking located in the rear, aligning with the desire for a traditional small-town character. Mehaffy referenced successful examples from other cities in Washington, like the Lincoln Station development, which also adopted this approach. The feedback from the community has been supportive of these changes, especially regarding the importance of preserving walkability and the traditional town feel.

One of the key elements of the proposed commercial zoning updates is the introduction of Form-Based Code provisions. These would regulate building orientation and the placement of entrances, requiring buildings to face the street rather than being set back behind parking lots. It also includes guidelines for required building articulation, glazing, canopies, awnings, and signage that creates a more pedestrian-friendly environment. These elements are designed to ensure that new developments contribute positively to the streetscape, maintain aesthetic appeal, and create spaces that invite foot traffic. Mehaffy emphasized that parking should be located at the rear of buildings, with side parking allowed in limited cases, to maintain a pedestrian-scale environment at the street level.

In addition to the commercial code updates, the workshop also covered Unit Lot Subdivision, which is a process that allows the creation of smaller, separately sellable lots within a larger parent lot. This concept has gained traction in other jurisdictions and is seen as a practical solution for creating affordable housing options, such as cottage clusters or ADUs, without requiring full subdivision processes. Mehaffy explained that unit lot subdivision could be applied to various residential scenarios, such as detached cottages or duplexes, where each unit is placed on its own "unit lot." This approach allows for shared common areas, like driveways or shared yards, while maintaining individual ownership of each unit. The model simplifies the development process and provides more flexibility for developers, potentially increasing the feasibility of smaller housing projects.

The Barrier Removal component of the zoning updates was also discussed, focusing on the need to streamline processes and reduce red tape for developers. Mehaffy pointed out that existing codes and regulations sometimes create barriers to development, particularly when they impose excessive requirements or ambiguity in interpretation. The workshop explored the possibility of standardizing certain approvals, such as pre-approved plans or foundation designs, to reduce costs and time for developers. Additionally, some building uses could be moved from conditional to permitted, simplifying the process for developers. Mehaffy also mentioned the importance of considering flexibility in infrastructure upgrades, where in some cases, it might be more reasonable to negotiate with developers rather than require full infrastructure improvements upfront. This approach could make projects more financially viable.

Shared Rules concepts were additionally discussed, which would allow for greater flexibility in interpreting zoning regulations. Mehaffy highlighted situations where properties with unusual lot configurations, like those that face alleys instead of streets, could be treated more equitably. In these cases, it may make sense to allow shared access or frontage across alleys, ensuring that properties aren't penalized by zoning rules that don't fit their unique circumstances.

The Unit Lot Subdivision and related proposals were highlighted as a way to facilitate housing development in a simpler, more flexible manner. Mehaffy illustrated this with an example where duplexes could be subdivided into separate "unit lots" that could be individually sold or financed, with a shared common area for things like driveways or shared spaces. This system would allow for more affordable housing options, especially in urban and suburban areas where land prices are high. The goal is to create a more efficient and cost-effective development process, particularly for smaller housing types, without requiring developers to go through a full subdivision process.

The next steps will involve further refining these proposals based on community feedback and moving forward with code changes that reflect these updates. A hearing is scheduled for later in the fall to discuss the initial code revisions and gather more input from stakeholders.

The workshop concluded with an invitation for feedback from the commissioners and community members to ensure that the proposed changes reflect the needs and priorities of White Salmon residents.

Commissioner Michael Morneault expressed his agreement with previous commissioners' concerns about the need for a more organized approach to writing zoning codes. He pointed out that over the past six years, the city's efforts had been piecemeal, tackling one issue at a time

rather than addressing the broader structure of the codes. He referenced past discussions on short-term leases and other issues, emphasizing the need for a more comprehensive update.

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy responded by explaining the rationale behind the current approach. He noted that instead of overhauling the entire code, they had added a new section to address specific issues without discarding existing frameworks. He emphasized the importance of balancing the current code with the need for improvements.

Chair Greg Hohensee acknowledged Mehaffy’s point and expressed his appreciation for the return to discussions on form-based codes and the commercial zone.

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy clarified that they had aimed to keep the updates simple but understood that some might find the approach too minimal. He highlighted that some of the codes they worked on in the past included graphical examples, which helped clarify the concepts.

Chair Greg Hohensee responded, saying that he would prefer to see a draft of the user guide alongside the ordinance text. This would help the Planning Commission and developers better understand the visual elements of the zoning code.

Planning Commission Suggestion:

- Develop draft user guide with visual examples for zoning code updates, including unit lot subdivision. The user guide will be easy to understand and will be available both at City Hall and online. The language in the code should reference the guide to ensure clarity and accessibility for developers.

2. **Update on the View Shed Ordinance**

Chair Greg Hohensee provided an update on the view shed ordinance, noting that it had been presented to the City Council, but the council ultimately decided to table the item. No specific date has been set for its return to the Council for further discussion.

Chair Hohensee went on to explain that there had been discussions about the possibility of a joint workshop between the City Council and the Planning Commission to further review the ordinance. However, after further discussion, the city’s legal team stated that the process is to either remand the view shed ordinance back to the commission or table it, which is what they chose to do.

Commissioner Erika Price asked if there were any specific concerns raised by the City Council that might need to be addressed before the ordinance returns. Chair Hohensee replied that while the City Council had not provided detailed feedback, the tabling was a way for them to step back and reconsider the ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 pm.

Greg Hohensee, Chairman

Erika Castro Guzman, City Project Coordinator

File Attachments for Item:

3. Meeting Minutes - October 23, 2024



DRAFT

CITY OF WHITE SALMON
Planning Commission Meeting - Wednesday, October 23, 2024

COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT

Commission Members:

Greg Hohensee, Chair
Michael Morneault
Brendan Brown
Carl Trabant

Excused Absent:

Erika Price

Staff:

Stephanie Porter, Clerk-Treasurer
Kelly Hickok, Legal Counsel

Planning Consultants:

Alex Capron, Planner
Michael Mehaffy, Housing

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

Chairman Greg Hohensee called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm. A quorum of planning commissioner members was present. Commissioners voted to excuse the absence of Erika Price. There were 7 audience members in attendance in person and via teleconference.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **Meeting Minutes – September 11, 2024**
2. **Meeting Minutes – September 25, 2024**
3. **Workshop Minutes – September 25, 2024**

Moved by Carl Trabant. Seconded by Michael Morneault.

Motion to approve meeting minutes of September 11 and September 25, 2024, and the workshop minutes of September 25, 2024, as written.

MOTION CARRIED 4–0.

Morneault – Aye, Brown– Aye, Trabant – Aye, Hohensee – Aye.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. **Cherry Hill Estates Subdivision (Continued)**
The Planning Commission continued the public hearing to review the Cherry Hill Estates Subdivision, involves subdividing a 7.93-acre parcel (Tax Parcel No. 03102475000400) located off NW Spring Street, between NW Cherry Hill Road and Champion Lane, into 35 residential lots.

Chair Greg Hohensee opened the public hearing at 5:35PM.

A. Planning Commission Discussion

Chair Greg Hohensee opened the discussion by summarizing the two key issues raised by Mr. Capron in response to public testimony, which were addressed by staff:

1. Animal Habitat Concerns: It was determined that concerns regarding potential animal habitats do not need to be addressed at this stage. These will be handled later when specific building permits are considered.
2. Traffic Impacts on Northwest Spring Street: Public Works Director Andrew Dirks emphasized the need for the applicant to provide additional information from their traffic engineer regarding the impacts of the proposed development on NW Spring Street, particularly given that access to the development would be limited to NW Spring Street.

Public Works Director Andrew Dirks also noted the importance of assessing traffic impacts, considering the future reconstruction and improvements planned for NW Spring Street, which would affect traffic flow.

Chair Hohensee clarified that staff, including Mr. Dirks and Mr. Capron, are recommending that the Planning Commission send the project back to the applicant. The applicant would be required to provide a more detailed traffic study that addresses the current conditions on NW Spring Street and the projected impacts of the development with only one access point from NW Spring Street.

Public Works Director Dirks summarized the city's expectations for the traffic study, explaining that the applicant's traffic engineer needs to reassess the impacts, taking into account the limited access and potential disruptions due to other planned infrastructure projects.

Commissioner Michael Morneault raised concerns about the construction of NW Spring Street, particularly regarding the right-of-way acquisition and how road conditions could affect the overall development plan. Dirks acknowledged that the issue of right-of-way acquisition would need to be addressed in the future, especially regarding a small section of land owned by the county.

Chair Hohensee then asked the Commission if they were ready to approve the project with conditions or if they preferred to wait for the updated traffic study from the applicant. He suggested tabling the decision until the applicant could return with the necessary information.

Commissioner Morneault also asked if the applicant would need to construct the road to full width as part of the development. Dirks confirmed that the road would need to be constructed to full width, in line with the city's requirements for road improvements.

Chair Hohensee confirmed that the Commission had two options: approve the project with conditions as it stands, or table the item and wait for the updated traffic study and more information regarding the planned improvements to NW Spring Street.

Applicant Zach Gustin, a representative of the Cherry Hill NW Subdivision, then addressed the Commission, expressing a desire for an up-or-down vote on the project. He acknowledged the need for the updated traffic memo from their engineer but raised concerns about the timing of the traffic study. Gustin noted that their traffic engineer was unable to provide a full assessment of the project's impacts due to uncertainties regarding the size and frequency of vehicles that would be used for construction. He also pointed out that the condition of NW

Spring Street could change over time, which would make it difficult for a traffic engineer to assess future impacts accurately.

Gustin also addressed the issue raised by Public Works Director Dirks regarding the improvements to NW Spring Street. He explained that while they understood the need for the upgrades, the timeline for securing funding and completing the project was uncertain. Gustin emphasized that requiring an applicant to wait for these improvements to happen before moving forward with the subdivision would delay their project unnecessarily.

Legal Counsel Kelly Hickok clarified that the Commission did not need to vote on anything at this point unless they were prepared to approve or deny the project. Chair Hohensee then confirmed that the matter would be tabled until the applicant could provide the necessary updates.

Chair Greg Hohensee emphasized that while the applicant may not be able to predict the exact number or type of dump trucks that would be used during construction, they are aware that the development will involve concrete trucks, which are expected to travel along NW Spring Street. He explained that this is a key concern for the Planning Commission, especially in relation to the effect that construction traffic — including concrete trucks — will have on the road surface. Hohensee further clarified that the Commission's primary concern is not necessarily the traffic at the four-way stop but the increased traffic on Spring Street itself, particularly concerning pedestrian safety and the condition of the roadbed.

According to Public Works Director Andrew Dirks, the existing Spring Street is essentially just a blacktop over native soil, which is not designed to withstand the weight of heavy construction vehicles. Hohensee expressed the Commission's concern that the developer may not adequately account for the long-term wear and tear on the city's infrastructure. He formally called for a request of an updated traffic study for the Cherry Hill NW Subdivision that addresses pedestrian safety during construction, the post-construction traffic impact on NW Spring Street, and the impact of construction equipment on the road surface.

Applicant Zach Gustin responded by acknowledging the concerns and emphasizing that the construction of the subdivision and the building of homes will not happen simultaneously. He explained that during the initial construction phase, there will likely only be a limited number of trips per day, primarily related to the delivery of concrete trucks for roadwork, curb and gutter installation, and asphalt paving. Gustin clarified that the development would proceed in phases, with 3-5 homes being built each year over the course of 3-7 years, rather than all 30 homes being built at once. Therefore, he stated, the full impact of traffic would not be felt immediately, but would instead accumulate gradually as the project progresses.

Chair Hohensee understood Gustin's point but reiterated that the Planning Commission was seeking more detailed information on how the construction traffic would affect the road and its infrastructure. He emphasized that the Commission needs to understand the potential cumulative impact on the roadbed, particularly during the first five years of construction. The focus was on how the weight and frequency of construction vehicles, including concrete trucks, would affect the road's durability. The goal is to ensure that the city and its residents do not bear the financial burden of road degradation caused by the development.

Public Works Director Andrew Dirks clarified that the reference to potential funding for future improvements to Spring Street was not meant to hold up the development project but was intended to provide context for future infrastructure upgrades. He explained that the city is working to secure funding for improvements to Spring Street, including water line upgrades, and that this may be relevant to future conversations about the road's capacity to handle increased traffic. Dirks confirmed that the city expects to know whether funding will be available for these improvements by early 2025, but these improvements would not directly affect the applicant's timeline.

Commissioner Michal Morneault raised a question regarding the current condition of NW Spring Street and whether the city has an accurate understanding of the thickness of the asphalt. Dirks responded that the city has only excavated certain areas of the street and does not know the full extent of the asphalt's thickness, but he acknowledged that it is not very thick. Morneault expressed concern that the weight of construction vehicles, such as semi-trucks with tire pressures of 100-120 pounds per square inch, could cause significant damage to a road that lacks structural reinforcement.

Legal Counsel Kelly Hickok explained that when considering land use permits and the associated conditions, any conditions imposed must be directly related to the development (the "nexus") and proportional to the impact of the development. In other words, the city can impose conditions on the developer if the conditions are tied to the development's impact and are reasonable given the scope of that impact. For example, in the case of a mall development, the city could require the developer to mitigate the negative effects of increased traffic on the surrounding roads, provided that the mitigation is proportionate to the level of impact caused by the mall's traffic.

Chair Hohensee asked for further clarification from Hickok regarding proportionality and the nexus between the development's impact and any conditions that might be imposed. Hickok affirmed that any conditions related to road use or infrastructure improvements must be directly connected to the development and proportionate to the level of impact. In the case of the Cherry Hill subdivision, this could include addressing the impact of heavy construction vehicles on NW Spring Street and requiring the developer to contribute to road repairs or improvements that are proportional to the level of impact.

Commissioner Carl Trabant, who lives near NW Spring Street, expressed concerns about the narrowness of the road, particularly during construction. He pointed out that large construction vehicles, such as flatbed trucks with bulldozers, may take up significant portions of the road when unloading, further narrowing the already constrained street. He noted that if such vehicles were left on the road for extended periods, it could create even more dangerous conditions for pedestrians and other drivers.

Chair Hohensee confirmed that the city does have a permitting process for road closures and that this could be used during construction to manage any temporary disruptions to traffic flow on NW Spring Street. He reiterated that the Commission is looking for a clear understanding of the overall impact of the development on NW Spring Street's infrastructure and how the applicant plans to mitigate those impacts. Specifically, he emphasized that the Commission is concerned about both pedestrian safety and the long-term deterioration of the roadbed due to the weight of construction vehicles.

In summary, the Planning Commission agreed that the updated traffic study should address the following key points:

1. Pedestrian Safety: How pedestrian traffic will be maintained during construction, as well as after the development is completed.
2. Road Surface Impact: A more detailed assessment of how construction traffic, particularly heavy vehicles like concrete trucks, will affect the road surface and what mitigation measures will be put in place.
3. Post-Construction Traffic: An evaluation of the increased number of trips and the impact of additional traffic on the road's condition over time.

Chair Greg Hohensee began by asking if the applicant, Zach Gustin, understood what the Planning Commission was looking for in terms of additional clarification to his proposal. Gustin responded affirmatively, but he wanted to clarify some aspects of the project. He explained that the applicant proposes to improve approximately 220 linear feet of road, which would include an additional 6-foot bike lane, an 11-foot travel lane, and a 5-foot sidewalk. This improvement, he argued, would significantly enhance pedestrian safety for those traveling along that stretch of road. Gustin expressed that the Planning Commission's concern about pedestrian safety and cross-traffic was understandable, but he suggested that building the improvements along the 220 linear feet sooner rather than waiting for future funding would make the area safer more quickly. He also pointed out that while the road's condition was not ideal, the construction would improve a portion of the road, and he felt that this constitutes a fair proportional improvement.

Gustin further asked Public Works Director Andrew Dirks if the city had considered a temporary solution like a "grind and repave" to improve the road condition in the short term while waiting for funding for more extensive upgrades.

Public Works Director Andrew Dirks replied that such a temporary fix would not be feasible at this time due to budget constraints. He noted that while the city could improve the road in some ways, it would not have the long-term durability that a full reconstruction would offer. Dirks emphasized that without addressing the underlying structure, any temporary solution would not offer lasting benefits.

Chair Hohensee summarized the Planning Commission's concerns, stating that, while they understood the applicant's proposal to improve a portion of the road, they felt it wasn't enough to address the broader issues regarding pedestrian safety and the potential long-term degradation of the road. Hohensee acknowledged that improvements would eventually be made due to other infrastructure projects and potential grant funding, but he emphasized that the Planning Commission needed a more detailed traffic study that could account for the impacts of construction traffic, particularly during the development phase. He also reiterated that the Commission wasn't asking for the entire road to be rebuilt but wanted to ensure that the improvements proposed were proportional to the level of damage caused by construction traffic over the course of the development. The main focus was on ensuring safe pedestrian routes and preserving the road surface during and after construction.

Applicant Zach Gustin responded that he understood the Planning Commission's concerns and was willing to continue improving the traffic study to address those needs. However, he raised a point about the construction process of a nearby subdivision (the Champion Lane

Subdivision) and asked if the Planning Commission had any information about the level of road degradation that occurred during its construction. He suggested that the situation with his development would be similar to what happened at Champion Lane, where the road condition had not been as significantly impacted despite the construction.

Commissioner Carl Trabant pointed out that the Champion Lane Subdivision was much smaller, with only 10-15 houses and a relatively short stretch of road. He noted that this situation was very different from the Cherry Hill subdivision, which would involve building 30 homes and a much longer stretch of road. Chair Hohensee agreed, highlighting that there had already been visible degradation of NW Spring Street over the last few years due to increasing traffic. He stated that while the Planning Commission wasn't responsible for the decisions made regarding the Champion Lane Subdivision, they needed to be more cautious moving forward to ensure that the infrastructure issues in NW Spring Street were properly addressed.

Hohensee emphasized that the Planning Commission's role was to ensure that the proposed development would not negatively affect the quality of life for residents, particularly those who use the road for pedestrian traffic. The Commission wants to find a solution that would balance the need for new housing with the preservation of public infrastructure. He suggested that while the applicant might not be responsible for fixing all the road issues, it was important to find an equitable way to ensure that the Cherry Hill NW Subdivision didn't exacerbate the existing problems on NW Spring Street.

Applicant Zach Gustin said he appreciated the Commission's concerns and would be happy to address any additional questions or make further revisions to the traffic study. He acknowledged the complexity of the issue but indicated that he didn't want to hold up the process unnecessarily.

Chair Hohensee thanked the applicant for his time and efforts to address the concerns. He expressed appreciation for the applicant's willingness to work with the Planning Commission to find a solution and acknowledged the complexity of the situation.

In conclusion, the Planning Commission agreed to table the matter until the applicant could return with the updated traffic study and more information regarding the NW Spring Street improvements.

B. Action

Moved by Brendan Brown. Seconded by Michael Morneault.

Motion to continue the public hearing on the Cherry Hill NW Subdivision until further information is received regarding the updated traffic study and any additional information regarding NW Spring Street improvements.

MOTION CARRIED 4–0.

Morneault – Aye, Brown– Aye, Trabant – Aye, Hohensee – Aye.

5. Proposed Parking Ordinance

The Planning Commission held a public hearing to review Title 17, focusing on proposed amendments to various chapters (17.23, 17.24, 17.28, 17.48, 17.72, 17.73, and 17.74) aimed at updating parking provisions.

Chair Greg Hohensee opened the public hearing at 6:13 PM.

A. Presentation

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy began his presentation, acknowledging that this was a follow-up to their previous discussion, which had been a work session. He emphasized that the proposed amendments were part of an effort to address the barriers to housing affordability identified in the city's Housing Action Plan, which highlighted several factors, including changes in car ownership trends and the potential ecological benefits of reducing parking requirements.

Mehaffy explained that the amendments were designed to reflect changing trends in parking demand, which had been found to be lower than expected in many areas. He pointed out that the state had implemented mandates aimed at reducing parking requirements, though the city had been exempted from certain statewide mandates, such as the "8 by 18" parking space requirement. He further clarified that the city had been proactive in enacting zoning changes to address these issues and had engaged in extensive outreach, including meetings with developers, to better understand the barriers to implementing smaller, infill housing projects.

The proposed zoning amendments were part of a broader effort to reduce the costs of housing development, which could be impacted by the need to provide excessive parking. Mehaffy emphasized that this was not just a local issue, but a statewide and even nationwide trend. He cited the example of organizations like Strong Towns, which advocated for parking reductions to avoid the fiscal burden of overbuilding parking infrastructure. Additionally, Mehaffy noted that research showed that parking demand could often be reduced more than originally expected, and that overbuilding parking spaces for every possible car could lead to inefficient use of land and unnecessary costs.

Housing Consultant Mehaffy then walked the commission through some specific changes to the zoning provisions:

1. **Cottage Code Update:** The amendments included a change to the parking requirements for cottages. For cottages with a living area of 800 square feet or less, the proposed parking requirements would be reduced. This aligned with the intent discussed in the prior meeting, which was to eliminate unnecessary parking mandates for smaller units.
2. **Residential Structure Changes:** Mehaffy pointed out that the Planning Commission had requested the removal of a redundant provision concerning residential structures, and this had been implemented in the proposed amendments.
3. **Other Amendments:** Several additional changes were made throughout the ordinance, such as the introduction of a new definition for "exterior walls" and adjustments to parking space dimensions in certain zones. Some redundant sections had been removed or revised to align with updated zoning goals, including eliminating references to "residential structures" as these were already covered in other parts of the ordinance.

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy acknowledged that the Planning Commission had requested a few additional revisions, including adjustments for smaller residential units and clarification of certain provisions, which had been incorporated into the draft.

B. Public Testimony

Chair Greg Hohensee opened the public testimony portion of the public hearing at 6:24 PM.

Shelley Baxter, Inside City Resident

Shelley Baxter shared her experience with NW Spring Street, where an elderly friend was hit by a truck due to the narrow road. She supported reducing parking requirements, as it would create more green space and improve safety, especially for cyclists. While acknowledging the need for balance, she praised the proposal, saying it would help reduce car clutter and improve the area overall.

Stephen Wolpert, Inside City Resident

Stephen Wolpert, a resident of Champion Lane, expressed support for exploring alternatives to car use, such as cycling. He acknowledged that reducing parking requirements could be beneficial, but emphasized the importance of looking at how other cities are addressing the issue. He also pointed out that improving infrastructure for safer biking could encourage more people to use bikes, reducing the overall need for parking. He hoped the city would consider both parking reduction and creating safer transportation alternatives to reduce car dependency.

Chair Greg Hohensee closed the public testimony portion of the public hearing at 6:28 PM.

C. Discussion

Commissioner Carl Trabant opened the discussion by referencing a previous conversation about a potential state mandate for 8-foot wide parking spaces. He noted that this requirement has not yet been reflected in the plans but, if implemented, could necessitate changes to the current proposal. He mentioned that there was some discussion on whether the city should preemptively adopt the 8-foot standard, but it appears that no such adjustment has been made.

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy responded, explaining that he had checked with state officials and confirmed that the city is exempt from the upcoming mandate for 8-foot parking spaces. He clarified that because the city is below the size threshold for the mandate, it is not required to implement the 8-foot standard. The proposal currently includes 9-foot spaces.

Commissioner Carl Trabant then mentioned his concern about NW Spring Street, noting that it is less than 18 feet in length, which may affect the parking arrangements.

Commissioner Brendan Brown raised a question about parking needs, particularly in relation to SUVs, and whether homeowners would be able or willing to accommodate tenant parking needs. He inquired about the percentage of homeowners versus renters in the area and whether homeowners would adjust to tenant needs regarding larger vehicles.

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy replied that he did not have specific data on the homeowner-to-renter ratio but emphasized that, in general, parking decisions should

consider the needs of tenants as well. He acknowledged that some renters may drive larger vehicles, such as SUVs, but it would be difficult to mandate adjustments based on vehicle size alone.

Chair Greg Hohensee responded by emphasizing that renters make up a significant portion of the population in the town and that parking decisions should take tenant needs into account. He suggested that landlords may need to consider providing adequate parking for tenants, especially in areas with a high percentage of renters.

Commissioner Michal Morneault brought up a question regarding square footage definitions in the housing code, specifically related to interior walls. He asked for clarification on how the city defines the square footage of homes, including whether it includes spaces like garages.

Housing Consultant Michael Mehaffy clarified that square footage is typically measured from the exterior walls and that garages are not generally included in the calculation of living area. He suggested that the planning commission could add a clearer definition of living area to the code, which may help avoid confusion in the future.

Legal Counsel Kelly Hickok explained that it would be up to the planning commission to decide whether to add this clarification to the housing code. She pointed out that the existing code refers to living area as measured from exterior walls, which would exclude non-living spaces like garages. She did not have a strong opinion on whether the change should be made but noted that the existing language seems clear enough.

Chair Greg Hohensee asked Clerk-Treasurer Stephanie Porter whether the current code would be easy for staff to administer as is, or if further clarification was needed. Clerk-Treasurer Porter responded that she would interpret the code as it currently stands, but suggested that further input from planners or the building department might be helpful.

Chair Greg Hohensee concluded that it might be worth adding a clarifying definition when the proposal is brought before the City Council, and suggested that staff could review the issue and provide feedback at that time.

Commissioner Carl Trabant began by discussing the issue of 9-foot-wide parking spaces, referencing NW Spring Street, which in some areas is only 16 feet wide. He pointed out that with 9-foot-wide parking spaces, it's difficult for two cars to park on NW Spring Street without obstructing each other.

Commissioner Brendan Brown then expressed his concern about the goal of the proposed changes. He noted that parking is already disallowed on the narrow section of NW Spring Street, particularly on the south side, and questioned whether the goal of moving cars off the street would be accomplished. He raised the issue that, with the current trend toward larger vehicles like SUVs, it might be difficult for homeowners to accommodate the parking needs of tenants who drive larger vehicles. He questioned whether the parking changes would be effective for the 35% of renters in the town, particularly if they own larger vehicles.

Chair Greg Hohensee clarified that the purpose of the proposed changes was not to reduce the number of cars on the street but rather to make minor adjustments to parking requirements to stimulate housing development. He explained that the goal of the changes

was to reduce the burden on development and encourage the construction of more housing, not to address parking issues directly.

Commissioner Brendan Brown responded that while the goal was not to remove cars from the street, the change would likely result in more cars being pushed onto the street due to the narrower parking spaces. He emphasized that the requirement to provide parking spaces was intended to accommodate vehicles, and that shrinking the size of the spaces could potentially lead to hardscaped areas that don't actually accommodate the cars, especially if the spaces are too narrow for larger vehicles.

Chair Greg Hohensee acknowledged that the concern was valid but emphasized that the total number of required parking spaces was not being reduced. He referred to earlier discussions in which the commission rejected the idea of eliminating parking spaces near transit areas, citing that it would not work well for White Salmon, where the current transit system does not sufficiently support such a move. He clarified that the intention of this edit was to make small adjustments to the parking space requirements while still maintaining the overall number of parking spaces needed for the expected number of residents.

Commissioner Brendan Brown questioned if the change would result in narrow parking spaces that might be unusable due to the design, such as when a sidewalk cut blocks a parking space. He raised the possibility that this could make parking less effective, leaving spaces unused without actually addressing the need for more parking.

Chair Greg Hohensee agreed that it was a legitimate concern and pointed out that, as currently proposed, the edit would reduce parking space dimensions from 10 feet to 9 feet. He mentioned that, in his own case, even with larger vehicles, 9 feet should still provide adequate space for parking. He noted that Dr. Mehaffey's preference for 9 feet over 8 feet was to ensure that parking spaces remained functional for larger vehicles.

Commissioner Michal Morneault expressed support for the proposed changes, stating that he didn't have any major concerns with the proposal as presented. However, he acknowledged the challenges that could arise in the future when the commission considers more detailed updates, such as form-based codes. He emphasized that White Salmon's streets have irregular widths, and the effects of parking on these streets will need to be carefully considered. Specifically, he pointed out areas near N Main and NW Spring Streets, where it can be difficult for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles to coexist, particularly when cars are parked along the road. He stressed that any future parking code updates should take into account the city's varying street widths and the space needed for pedestrians and cyclists, especially near schools and other areas with heavy foot traffic.

Chair Greg Hohensee agreed with Commissioner Morneault's points about the need for future consideration of street widths and the impact on parking, but emphasized that this particular edit did not directly address those broader issues. He expressed his support for the current proposal and thanked everyone for their input.

D. Action

Moved by Carl Trabant. Seconded by Brendan Brown.

Motion to recommend amending the proposed code, as modified.

Brendan Brown withdrew his second. Carl Trabant withdrew his motion.

Moved by Brendan Brown. Seconded by Carl Trabant.

Motion to recommend amending Title 17, by revising chapters 17.23, 17.24, 17.28, 17.48, 17.72, 17.73, and 17.74, to update their zoning parking provisions, as is, for eventual approval by the City Council.

MOTION CARRIED 4–0.

Morneault – Aye, Brown– Aye, Trabant – Aye, Hohensee – Aye.

Chair Greg Hohensee closed the public hearing at 6:47 PM.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:48 pm.

Greg Hohensee, Chairman

Erika Castro Guzman, City Project Coordinator

File Attachments for Item:

4. Unit Lot Subdivision Ordinance

**CITY OF WHITE SALMON
ORDINANCE NO. _____**

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WHITE SALMON, WASHINGTON, AMENDING TITLE 16
TO ADD CHAPTER 16.66; SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE**

WHEREAS, the City of White Salmon (“City”) acknowledges the need to provide legal mechanisms to implement its Housing Action Plan, to provide more infill housing opportunities, and to accommodate more diverse and affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the current barriers to infill development, including the current limitations of its subdivision procedures; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the State of Washington RCW 58.17.060 requires that “All cities, towns, and counties shall include in their short plat regulations procedures for unit lot subdivisions allowing division of a parent lot into separately owned unit lots;” and

WHEREAS, the unit lot subdivision process is well-established in a number of other Washington cities, offering effective models for implementation in White Salmon; and

WHEREAS, the City has conducted extensive public outreach and gathered extensive public comments in accordance with the City’s Public Participation Plan, sufficient to establish regulations in accordance with RCW 36.70A;

**NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WHITE SALMON DOES
ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

That the following amendments be made to White Salmon Municipal Code Title 16:

**SECTION 1. Amendment to Title 16, adding Chapter 16.66, “Unit Lot
Subdivisions.”**

Key: Underlined = added language
 ~~Strikethrough~~ = deleted language

Chapter 16.66 UNIT LOT SUBDIVISIONS

Sections:

- 16.66.010 Purpose.**
- 16.66.015 Scope.**
- 16.66.020 Application.**
- 16.66.030 Preliminary unit lot plat – Preparation.**
- 16.66.040 Preliminary unit lot plat – Contents.**
- 16.66.050 Approval criteria.**
- 16.66.060 Unit lot plat review process.**
- 16.66.070 Preliminary approval.**
- 16.66.080 Modifications to an approved preliminary unit lot plat.**
- 16.66.090 Improvement method report.**
- 16.66.100 Public works director’s certificate of improvements.**
- 16.66.110 Preparation of final unit lot plat.**
- 16.66.120 Accompanying documents – Final unit lot plat.**
- 16.66.130 Final unit lot plat application.**
- 16.66.140 Time limitation on final unit lot plat submittal.**
- 16.66.150 Effect of an approved final unit lot plat – Valid land use.**
- 16.66.160 Distribution of copies and filing of final unit lot plat.**
- 16.66.170 Transfer of ownership following final unit lot plat approval.**
- 16.66.180 Building and occupancy permits – Issuance after final unit lot plat approval.**

16.66.010 Purpose.

This chapter is established to provide an alternative to the traditional method of land division for creating sellable lots for rowhouse communities and cottage housing developments. The unit lot subdivision (ULS) process provides opportunities for fee-simple

ownership of land. Unit lot subdivisions allow development on individual unit lots to avoid complying with typical dimensional standards if the parent lot conforms to all such development standards.

16.66.015 Scope.

A. The provisions of this chapter apply exclusively to the unit lot subdivision of land for rowhouses, small houses, or cottage housing community developments in zones where such uses are allowed.

B. As allowed by this chapter, development on individual unit lots within the unit lot subdivision need not conform to the minimum lot area or dimensional standards of WSMC Title 17, Zoning; provided, that overall development of the parent parcel meets the development and design standards of the underlying zone and the requirements of this chapter. There shall be no minimum required lot area for individual lots within a unit lot subdivision; provided, that the area of the unit lot shall be large enough to contain the dwelling unit and any accessory structures, decks, fences, garages, driveways, private yard areas, parking, landscaping or other improvements that are accessory to the dwelling unit; provided further, so long as conforming to the approved site development plan, such accessory improvements may encroach upon or be located in an adjoining unit lot or common area pursuant to an appropriate easement.

C. Overall development of the parent lot shall meet the development and design standards of the underlying land use district.

D. Access easements, joint use and maintenance agreements, and covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) identifying the rights and responsibilities of property owners and/or the homeowners' association must be executed for use and maintenance of common garage, parking and vehicle access areas, underground utilities, stormwater treatment and/or detention facilities, common open space, exterior building facades and roofs, and other similar features, and must be recorded with the Klickitat County auditor.

E. Within the parent lot, required parking for a dwelling unit may be provided on a different unit lot than the lot with the dwelling unit, as long as the right to use the parking is formalized by an easement recorded with the Klickitat County auditor.

16.66.020 Application.

To be considered complete, the application for a unit lot subdivision shall include the following:

A. The application for approval of a unit lot subdivision shall be submitted on forms to be provided by the department along with the appropriate fees;

B. A completed land use permit application form, including all materials required pursuant to WSMC 19.10;

C. The area and dimensions of each proposed lot or parcel;

D. Five paper copies of a preliminary unit lot plat meeting the standards and requirements of WSMC 16.30;

E. The applicant shall submit a stormwater drainage plan in conformance with the requirements of Chapter 13.01.050 WSMC, including any soil test information as may be deemed necessary by the public works director; and

F. The applicant shall state the estimated quantities of any fill to be exported from the site

and imported to the site.

16.66.030 Preliminary unit lot plat – Preparation.

The preliminary unit lot plat shall be prepared in accordance with the following requirements:

A. The preliminary unit lot plat shall be prepared by a Washington State licensed engineer or land surveyor registered or licensed by the state of Washington. The preparer shall certify on the plat that it is a true and correct representation of the lands actually surveyed. The preparation of the plat shall comply with the Survey Recording Act, Chapter [58.09](#) RCW, and Chapter [332-130](#) WAC as now adopted or hereafter amended. Upon surveying the property, the surveyor shall place temporary stakes on the property to enable the city to locate and appraise features of the unit lot plat in the field.

B. All geographic information portrayed by the preliminary unit lot plat shall be accurate, legible and drawn to a horizontal scale of 50 feet or fewer to the inch, except that the location sketch and typical street cross-sections may be drawn to any other appropriate scale.

C. A preliminary unit lot plat shall be 18 inches by 24 inches in size, allowing one-half-inch borders, and if more than one sheet is needed, each sheet shall be numbered consecutively and an index sheet showing the entire property and orienting the other sheets, at any appropriate scale, shall be provided. In addition to other map submittals, the applicant shall submit one copy of each sheet reduced to eight and one-half inches by 11.5 inches in size. If more than one sheet is required, an index sheet showing the entire subdivision with street and highway names and block numbers (if any) shall be provided. Each sheet, including the index sheet, shall be of the above specified size.

D. The area of each proposed lot or parcel depicted on the preliminary unit lot plat map shall accurately show the location and dimension of each proposed lot or parcel

16.66.040 Preliminary unit lot plat – Contents.

A. A preliminary unit lot plat shall be submitted on one or more sheets and shall provide the following information. All specifications for public improvements shall conform with the engineering design standards:

1. The name of the proposed unit lot subdivision together with the words "Preliminary Unit Lot Plat";
2. The name and address of the applicant;
3. The name, address, stamp and signature of the professional engineer or professional land surveyor who prepared the preliminary unit lot plat;
4. Numeric scale (50 feet or fewer to the inch), graphic scale, true north point, and date of preparation;
5. Identification of all land, trees, and tree canopy intended to be cleared; the trees or tree canopy intended to be preserved per WSMC 18.35 City Tree Ordinance, and 18.40 Special Provisions – Heritage Trees; and the location of the proposed access to the site for clearing and grading during site development and construction; and
6. A form for the endorsement of the planning administrator, as follows:

APPROVED BY CITY OF WHITE SALMON

Administrator for Planning

Date

B. The preliminary unit lot plat shall contain a vicinity sketch sufficient to define the location and boundaries of the proposed subdivision with respect to surrounding property, streets, and other major manmade and natural features.

C. Except as otherwise specified in this chapter, the preliminary unit lot plat shall contain the following existing geographic features, drawn lightly in relation to proposed geographic features:

1. The boundaries of the property to be subdivided, and the boundaries of any adjacent property under the same ownership as the land to be subdivided, to be indicated by bold lines;
2. The names of all adjoining property owners, or names of adjoining developers;
3. All existing property lines lying within the proposed unit lot subdivision, including lot lines for lots of record which are to be vacated, and all existing property lines for any property lying within 200 feet of the subject property which is under the same ownership as the property to be subdivided shall be shown in broken lines;
4. The location, right-of-way widths, pavement widths and names of all existing or platted streets, whether public or private, and other public ways within 200 feet of the property to be subdivided;
5. The location, widths and purposes of any existing easements lying within or adjacent to the proposed unit lot subdivision;
6. The location, size and invert elevations of sanitary sewer lines and stormwater management facilities lying within or adjacent to the proposed unit lot subdivision or those which will be connected to as part of the proposed unit lot subdivision;
7. The location and size of existing water system facilities, including all fire hydrants lying within or adjacent to the proposed subdivision or those which will be connected to as part of the proposed unit lot subdivision;
8. The location, size and description of any other underground and overhead facilities lying within or adjacent to the proposed unit lot subdivision;
9. The location of any environmentally sensitive areas as described in Chapter [19.05](#) WSMC, including all floodplains, lying within or adjacent to the proposed unit lot subdivision;
10. The location, size and description of all significant trees as defined in WSMC [18.04.060](#) lying within existing public rights-of-way to be improved within or adjacent to the proposed unit lot subdivision;
11. The location of existing sections and municipal corporation boundary lines lying within or adjacent to the proposed unit lot subdivision;
12. The location of any well existing within the proposed unit lot subdivision;

13. Existing contour lines at intervals of five feet for average slopes exceeding five percent, or at intervals of two feet for average slopes not exceeding five percent. Existing contour lines shall be labeled at intervals not to exceed 20 feet. If applicable, indicate slopes equal to or greater than 15 to 25 percent, equal to or greater than 26 to 39 percent, and equal to or greater than 40 percent, by shading or color;

14. The location of any existing structures lying within the proposed unit lot subdivision. Existing structures to be removed shall be indicated by broken lines, and existing structures not to be removed shall be indicated by solid lines.

D. The preliminary unit lot plat shall show the following proposed geographic features:

1. The boundaries in bold solid lines of all proposed lots, the area and dimensions of each proposed lot, and the proposed identifying number or letter to be assigned to each lot and/or block;

2. The right-of-way location and width, the proposed name of each street, alley, or other public way to be created and the estimated tentative grades of such streets. Where roadways may exceed the maximum allowable grade or alignment, the public works director may require sufficient data, including centerline profiles and cross-sections if necessary, to determine the feasibility of said roadway;

3. The location, width and purpose of each easement to be created;

4. The boundaries, dimensions and area of public and common park and open space areas;

5. Identification of all areas proposed to be dedicated for public use, together with the purpose and any condition of dedication;

6. Proposed final contour lines at intervals of five feet for average slopes exceeding five percent, or at intervals of two feet for average slopes not exceeding five percent. Final contours shall be indicated by solid lines. Contour lines shall be labeled in intervals not to exceed 20 feet;

7. The building envelopes shall be indicated for each lot;

8. Proposed monumentation;

9. Proposed location and description of all water system improvements, including all proposed fire hydrants;

10. Proposed location and description of all sewer system improvements, including profiles, and, if needed, all pump stations and their connections to the existing system;

11. Proposed location and description of all stormwater management system improvements;

12. Proposed street cross-sections, showing proposed bicycle and pedestrian pathways and sidewalks (if applicable);

13. Proposed type and location of street lighting (if applicable);

14. Proposed type and location of landscaping (if applicable);

15. Proposed location and typical cross-section of trails (if applicable);
16. Proposed location and description of transit stops and shelters (if applicable);
17. Proposed restrictions or conditions on development (if applicable).

E. Upon review of an application, the director and/or public works director may require additional pertinent information as needed to satisfy any regulatory requirements.

16.66.050 Approval criteria.

In addition to the review criteria provided in Title 16 WSMC, the following criteria are the minimum measures by which each proposed unit lot subdivision will be considered:

A. Unit lot subdivisions shall be given preliminary approval, including preliminary approval subject to conditions, upon finding by the city that all the following have been satisfied:

1. The proposed unit lot subdivision conforms to all applicable city, state and federal zoning, land use, environmental and health regulations and plans, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. White Salmon comprehensive plan;
 - b. White Salmon zoning code;
 - c. Engineering design standards;
 - d. Critical areas ordinance (Chapter 18.10 WSMC);
2. Utilities and other public services necessary to serve the needs of the proposed unit lot subdivision shall be made available, including open spaces, drainage ways, streets, alleys, other public ways, potable water, transit facilities, sanitary sewers, parks, playgrounds, schools, sidewalks and other improvements that assure safe walking conditions for students who walk to and from school;
3. Conservation of existing trees, and/or the planting of new trees, shall be provided consistent with Chapter 18.35 – City Tree Ordinance, and Chapter 18.40 – Special Provisions – Heritage Trees;
4. The probable significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed unit lot subdivision, together with any practical means of mitigating adverse impacts, have been considered such that the proposal will not have an unacceptable adverse effect upon the quality of the environment, in accordance with Title 18 WSMC and Chapter [43.21C](#) RCW;
5. Approving the proposed unit lot subdivision will serve the public use and interest and adequate provision has been made for the public health, safety, and general welfare.

B. Notwithstanding approval criteria set forth in subsection A of this section, in accordance with RCW [58.17.120](#), as now adopted and hereafter amended, a proposed unit lot subdivision may be denied because of flood, inundation or swamp conditions. Where any portion of the proposed unit lot subdivision lies within both a flood control zone, as specified by Title 18 WSMC and Chapter [86.16](#) RCW, and either the one percent flood hazard area or the regulatory floodway, the city shall not approve the preliminary unit lot plat unless it imposes a condition requiring the applicant to comply with Title 18 WSMC and any written recommendations of the Washington Department of Ecology. In such cases, no development permit associated with the proposed unit lot subdivision shall be issued by the city until flood control problems have been resolved.

16.66.060 Unit lot plat review process.

A. An application for a unit lot subdivision smaller than one acre in area shall be processed according to the procedures for Type II land use decisions established in Chapter [19.10](#) WSMC, Land Development Administrative Procedures. An application for a unit lot subdivision of one acre or greater shall be processed according to the Type III procedures.

B. The director shall solicit comments from the public works director, fire chief or designee, local utility providers, police chief, building official, school district, adjacent jurisdictions if the proposal is within one mile of another city or jurisdiction, Washington State Department of Transportation if the proposal is adjacent to a state highway, and any other state, local or federal officials as may be necessary.

C. Based on comments from city departments and applicable agencies and other information, the city shall review the application subject to the criteria of WSMC [16.45](#), unless superseded by provisions herein.

D. An applicant for a unit lot subdivision may request that certain requirements established or referenced by this chapter be modified. Such requests shall be processed according to the procedures for variances in Chapter [16.65.080](#) WSMC.

16.66.070 Preliminary approval.

A. The director or hearing examiner, as appropriate, shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the preliminary unit lot subdivision within the applicable time requirements. This preliminary decision shall be in writing and shall set forth findings of fact supporting the decision.

B. Preliminary approval or approval with conditions shall authorize the applicant to proceed with preparation of the final unit lot subdivision.

16.66.080 Modifications to an approved preliminary unit lot plat.

A. Minor modifications to a previously approved preliminary unit lot plat, not involving the location or relocation of a lot, tract or parcel lot line and not involving the location or relocation of a street, may be requested by the applicant and approved by the director subject to the provisions for Type I decisions in Chapter 19.10 WSMC. Before approving such amendment, the director shall make written findings and conclusions that the following exist:

1. The modification will not be inconsistent or cause the subdivision to be inconsistent with the findings, conclusions, and decision of the city approving the subdivision;
2. The modification will not cause the subdivision to violate any applicable city policy or regulation;
3. A subdivision may be modified only if the intent of its original conditions is not altered.

B. Modifications which exceed the criteria above shall be processed as a new preliminary unit lot plat application.

16.66.090 Improvement method report.

Following preliminary unit lot plat approval and approval of all plans and prior to submission of a final plat for the director's approval, the applicant shall submit to the director three copies of a report describing the method by which the applicant proposes to carry out the minimum improvements required and the time within which such improvements will be completed. The applicant shall submit all design and construction drawings required in conformance with the engineering design standards. This improvement method report shall be signed by the applicant and be accompanied by any applicable proposed performance guarantees. The director shall transmit two copies of the improvement method report with all drawings and other submittals to the public works director.

Improvements may be made or guaranteed by either of the following methods, subject to the discretion and approval of the director:

A. By actual installation and approval of all improvements in accordance with the preliminary plat, city engineering design standards, and approved construction drawings;

B. By the formation of a local improvement district consistent with the provisions of applicable requirements of the city and the state and by requiring the imposition of covenants as a condition of final plat approval requiring that purchasers of any lots waive any protest to the formation and implementation of a local improvement district;

C. By actually installing the minimum improvements as provided by the local improvement district laws of the state and the city, and in accordance with city standards and specifications and under the supervision of the public works director;

D. By furnishing to the city a plat or subdivision bond or cash deposit in escrow for the full cost of the improvements, or other security satisfactory to the director, in which assurance is given the city that the installation of the minimum improvements will be carried out as provided by plans submitted and approved and in accordance with city engineering design standards, and under the supervision of the public works director. The amount of the performance bond or other security shall be 120 percent of the estimated cost for the city to contract for construction of the improvements as determined by the public works director, and shall be of a duration in accordance with the engineering design standards. If the phased installation of improvements is proposed, the improvement method report shall describe the proposed phasing, the timing for construction, and proposed methods of guaranteeing and assuring the city that adequate installation of improvements will occur in conformance with the phasing schedule; or

E. By a combination of these methods.

16.66.100 Public works director's certificate of improvements.

No permit for the construction of improvements within an approved unit lot subdivision shall be issued by the city until the improvement method report, all construction drawings, proposed performance guarantees, and other submittals in conformance with the engineering design standards have been received and approved by the public works director. All construction of improvements shall be inspected and approved in conformance with the engineering design standards. After completion of all required improvements or the guarantee of the construction of all required improvements, the public works director shall submit a certificate in triplicate to the director stating the required improvements or guarantees are in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, the preliminary unit lot plat, including the city's decision approving the plat, and in accordance with city's

engineering design standards. The director shall transmit one copy of the certification to the subdivider, together with a notice advising the subdivider to prepare a final unit lot plat for the proposed subdivision. One copy of the certificate shall be retained by the director.

16.66.110 Preparation of final unit lot plat.

The final unit lot plat shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of WSMC [16.45](#).

16.66.120 Accompanying documents – Final unit lot plat.

A. In cases where any deed covenants or restrictions, including any CC&Rs, will apply to lots or parcels within a subdivision, a typewritten copy of such covenants bearing all necessary signatures shall be submitted along with the final unit lot plat.

B. The final unit lot plat shall be accompanied by a complete survey of the section or sections in which the plat or replat is located, or as much thereof as may be necessary to properly orient the plat within such section or sections. The plat and section survey shall be submitted with complete field and computation notes, showing the original or reestablished corners, with the descriptions of the same, and the actual traverse showing error of closure and method of balancing. A sketch showing all distances, angles and calculations required to determine corners and distances of the plat shall accompany this data. The allowable error of closure shall not exceed one foot in 10,000 feet.

C. The final plat shall be accompanied by a current (within 30 days) title company certification of:

1. The legal description of the total parcel sought to be subdivided;
2. Those individuals or corporations holding an ownership interest or any other encumbrances affecting the title of said parcel. Such individuals or corporations shall sign and approve the final plat prior to final approval;
3. Any lands to be dedicated shall be confirmed as being owned in fee title by the owner(s) signing the dedication certificate;
4. Any easements or restrictions affecting the property to be subdivided with a description of purpose and referenced by the auditor's file number and/or recording number; and
5. If lands are to be dedicated or conveyed to the city as part of the subdivision, an A.L.T.A. title policy may be required by the public works director.

D. The applicant shall provide the public works director with a computer disk containing a complete set of the final plat maps and as-built drawings on CADD© or other GIS-compatible software as acceptable to the public works director.

E. All documents submitted under this section shall contain the name of the subdivision and the name and address of the subdivider.

F. All maintenance, performance and guarantee bonds or other guarantees as may be required by the public works director in accordance with WSMC Titles [12](#) and [13](#) and the improvement method report to guarantee the acceptability and/or performance of all public improvements. For all improvements constructed after final plat approval, reproducible as-built drawings and CADD© files shall be submitted within 15 days of completion of construction.

16.66.130 Final unit lot plat application.

Application for a final unit lot plat shall be prepared and processed in accordance with WSMC [16.35.010](#).

16.66.140 Time limitation on final unit lot plat submittal.

Time limitations on final unit lot plats shall be in accordance with WSMC 16.30.020.

16.66.150 Effect of an approved final unit lot plat – Valid land use.

Any lots in a final unit lot plat filed for record shall be a valid land use notwithstanding any change in zoning laws for a period of seven years from the date of filing. A unit lot subdivision shall be governed by the terms of approval of the final plat, and the statutes, ordinances and regulations in effect on the date of preliminary unit lot plat approval for a period of seven years after final unit lot plat approval unless the city council finds that a change in conditions creates a serious threat to the public health or safety of residents within or outside the unit lot subdivision.

16.66.160 Distribution of copies and filing of final unit lot plat.

The director shall distribute the original and copies of the approved plat in accordance with WSMC 16.35.010.

16.66.170 Transfer of ownership following final unit lot plat approval.

Whenever any parcel of land lying within the city is divided under the provisions of this chapter, no person, firm, or corporation shall sell or transfer, or offer or advertise for sale or transfer, any such lot, tract or parcel without having first had an approved final plat for such subdivision filed for record. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that a final plat is fully certified and filed for record with the Klickitat County auditor prior to transferring ownership of any land.

16.66.180 Building and occupancy permits – Issuance after final unit lot plat approval.

A. No building permit for a structure other than a temporary contractor's office or temporary storage building shall be issued for a lot or parcel within an approved subdivision prior to a determination by the fire chief or designee that adequate fire protection and access for construction needs exists.

B. No building permit for a structure other than a temporary contractor's office or temporary storage building shall be issued for a lot or parcel within an approved subdivision until the applicant complies with the improvement method report, all requirements of the public works department's certificate of improvements, and all requirements of the final plat approval.

C. No occupancy permit for a structure other than a temporary contractor's office or other approved temporary building shall be issued for a structure on a lot or parcel within an approved subdivision prior to final inspection and approval of all required improvements which will serve such lot or parcel, to the satisfaction of the public works director and city building official.

SECTION 2. Severability / Validity. The provisions of this ordinance are declared separate and severable. If any section, paragraph, subsection, clause or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this ordinance.

SECTION 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force five (5) days after its approval, passage and publication as required by law.

SECTION 4: Transmittal to the State. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106, a complete and accurate copy of this ordinance shall be transmitted to the Department of Commerce within ten (10) days of adoption.

PASSED this ___ day of _____ by the City Council of the City of White Salmon, Washington, and signed in authentication of its passage.

Marla Keethler, Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk/Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney

File Attachments for Item:

5. Commercial Form-Based Code Ordinance

**CITY OF WHITE SALMON
ORDINANCE NO. ____**

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WHITE SALMON, WASHINGTON, AMENDING TITLE 17 BY REVISING CHAPTERS 17.48.060 and 17.40.075 TO UPDATE THEIR ZONING PROVISIONS, INCLUDING SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

WHEREAS, the City of White Salmon (“City”) acknowledges the need to update its commercial zoning regulations to better reflect the current needs of citizens, and the demand for more walkable, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and building frontages; and

WHEREAS, the City seeks to implement the vision, goals and policies stated in the Comprehensive Plan, including “The built environment in White Salmon is integrated with the beauty of its setting,” “Visual interest provided by streetscapes with strong design standards supports walkable and pedestrian-friendly environments,” and “Urban and architectural design standards for development may have an important role in setting character-defining qualities of a town, and most commonly use themes such as massing and scale;”

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the economic and cultural benefits of aesthetic quality in the buildings of its commercial district; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that market trends and professional standards have shifted away from use-based zoning and toward form-based zoning that focuses upon building character rather than the specific uses that occur there; and

WHEREAS, the City has conducted extensive public outreach and gathered extensive public comments in accordance with the City’s Public Participation Plan, sufficient to establish regulations in accordance with RCW 36.70A;

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WHITE SALMON DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

That the following amendments be made to White Salmon Municipal Code Title 17:

SECTION 1. Amendment to Title 17, Chapters 17.48.060 and 17.48.075. The City hereby repeals WSMC Title 17 Chapters 17.48.060 and 17.48.075 in their entirety, and adopts the following to be codified as WSMC Title 17 Chapters 17.48.060 and 17.48.075.

Key: Underlined = added language
 ~~Strikethrough~~ = deleted language

Chapter 17.48 - C GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

White Salmon Municipal Code

17.48.060 Density provisions.

Density provisions for the C district are as follows:

- A. Maximum building height: thirty-five feet;
- B. Minimum lot: none;
- C. Minimum front yard depth: none required;
- D. Maximum front yard depth: fifteen feet, with exceptions for courtyards and pedestrian spaces no greater than 50 feet in frontage length;
- E. Minimum side yard, interior lot: none required;
- F. Minimum side yard, corner lot: none required;
- G. Minimum side yard, zone transition lot: same as requirement of adjoining more-restrictive district;
- H. Minimum rear yard: none; except when abutting an R district, twenty feet.

(Ord. No. 2012-12-910, 12-19-2012; Ord. No. 2023-12-1155, § 1, 12-20-2023)

17.48.075 Development and design standards.

- A. Property development standards—All new development shall conform to Chapter 17.81, Site and Building Plan Review, and to any and all architectural and design standards which may be adopted by the city.
- B. Roof standards/surfacing:
 - 1. Finished roof material shall meet Class "C" roof standards. Dark and non-reflective roofing material shall be used for all visible roof surfaces.
- C. Roof standards/mechanical equipment and venting:
 - 1. All mechanical equipment located on roof surfaces such as, but not limited to, air conditioners, heat pumps, fans, ventilator shafts, duct work, or related devices or support work, shall be screened from view when possible and visible equipment shall be of a matte and/or non-reflective finish, unless reviewed and determined by the planning commission to be compatible with or a positive addition to the design and character of the commercial area. This restriction shall not apply to radio/television antennas or dishes (see Chapter 17.78).
 - 2. All exposed metal flashing, roof jacks and plumbing vents shall be matte finishes/non-reflective.
- D. Drainage—All stormwater concentrated by the structure and related impervious surfaces must be handled on site. Concentration of roof drainage shall not be shed by drip or overflow at points that cross pedestrian walkways or paths. A plan of the roof and surface drainage shall insure that pedestrian walkways and paths remain free from concentrated water shedding. Such plans shall be included in the proposed site drainage plan required for site and building plan review in Chapter 17.81.
- E. Exterior walls/siding—Acceptable siding shall be of lap, plank, shingle, board and batten style. Siding with brushed, sanded or rough sawn texture may be permitted, if approved by the planning commission. Siding shall be finished in natural or earth-tone colors. Other colors or styles may be permitted if approved by the planning commission. All other composition materials shall be carefully reviewed for visual compatibility by the planning commission.

-
- F. Exterior walls/masonry—Masonry walls or walls with masonry veneer may be native or cultured stone or standard-sized brick of natural or earth-tone colors. Ceramic tile, manufactured concrete block or slabs may be permitted, but shall be subject to review by the planning commission to insure use of earth-tone colors, matte finish, and compatible relationship to native materials.
 - G. Exterior walls/metal—Metal walls, panels, partitions, facing or surfacing of any type is subject to review by the planning commission and must be found to be compatibly designed and intentionally applied rather than relied on solely as a less expensive option. Window panel fillers, exterior metal doors, door casings and windows shall be allowed.
 - H. Windows and doors—All window and door frames shall be dark or earth-tone in color. Doors may be painted graphic colors as a part of the ten percent graphic color and signing limitation.
 - I. Garbage and refuse areas—Building plans shall include provisions for the storage of garbage containers. Garbage containers shall be fully enclosed and covered. Disposal and storage of hazardous or toxic substances in garbage or refuse receptacles is strictly prohibited. On-site hazardous waste treatment and storage facilities shall conform to State Siting Criteria, RCW 70.105.210.
 - J. Orientation of entry and display space—Entry and window display area shall be oriented toward the city street. Parking may and will often be provided behind and/or under the rear or side portion of a new commercial structure. In this case additional entry may be oriented toward the parking area but such additional entry area will be in addition to rather than in place of window display and entry area addressing the street and sidewalk.
 - K. Utilities—All electrical, telephone, and other utilities shall be brought underground into the site and to the buildings.
 - L. Loading—All loading must be on-site and no on-street loading is permitted. All truck loading aprons and other loading areas shall be paved with concrete or asphalt, be well-drained and of strength adequate for the truck traffic expected.
 - M. Parking—All vehicles must be parked on the site unless otherwise provided for in accordance with [Chapter] 17.72. No on-street parking is permitted. Minimum parking stall width should be eight feet, six inches and length nineteen feet. All parking areas shall be paved with concrete or asphalt and shall conform to all regulations hereinafter in effect.
 - N. Outside storage—All storage and refuse shall be visually screened by landscaping barriers, walls or coverings and be included in plans and specifications. Such barriers, walls or coverings shall not restrict access to emergency exits.
 - O. Noxious effects:
 - 1. No vibration other than that caused by highway vehicles or trains shall be permitted which is discernible at the property line of the use concerned.
 - 2. Except for exterior lighting, operations producing heat or glare shall be conducted entirely within an enclosed building. Exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjacent properties.
 - 3. All materials, including wastes, shall be stored and all grounds shall be maintained in a manner which will not attract or aid the propagation of insects or rodents or create a hazard.
 - P. **Form-Based Code Requirements:**
 - 1. **Building Orientation and Entrances**
 - 1.1 **Street Orientation – All buildings within the district must be oriented toward the street, with at least one primary entrance directly facing the street. This entrance must be fully accessible from the public sidewalk or pedestrian way. The entrance may be on a building corner.**

1.2 Entrance Design – Primary entrances must be visible from the street, with signage indicating the businesses therein.

2. Parking Location and Configuration

2.1 Off-Street Parking Location – All off-street parking shall be located at the rear of the building. Parking may also be located at the side of the building, but such parking areas shall not exceed a width of sixty (60) feet along the street frontage.

2.2 Parking Lot Access – Access to rear or side parking must be provided with a curb cut along the street of no more than twenty-four (24) feet of width.

3. Building Articulation

3.1 Wall Articulation Requirements – All building walls, except those enclosing screened loading areas, must be articulated with pilasters, piers, or other vertical elements at intervals of no less than every twenty (20) feet.

4. Glazing Requirements

4.1 Front Façade Glazing – At least 40% of the ground-floor façade facing the street must be comprised of transparent glazing (windows, display cases, etc.) to promote visual interaction between the building interior and the street.

4.2 Side and Rear Façade Glazing – At least 20% of each remaining building façade (side and rear) must consist of transparent glazing.

5. Canopies, Awnings, and Trim

5.1 Window and Door Treatment – All windows and doors must be equipped with canopies, awnings, or decorative trim to provide weather protection for pedestrians.

6. Signage Restrictions

6.1 Permitted Sign Types – Surface-mounted signs are allowed up to five (5) feet of height and twenty (20) feet of length. Signs mounted on perpendicular sign boards (“blades”) are allowed, up to three (3) feet in width and six (6) feet in height. No internally illuminated box signs are permitted.

6.2 Pylon Sign Restrictions – Pylon signs, where permitted, shall not exceed a maximum height of ten (10) feet and a maximum width of five (5) feet.

7. Screening of Utilities and Service Areas

7.1 Screening Requirements – All mechanical equipment, utility pedestals, trash enclosures, and loading docks must be fully screened from public view using fencing, walls, or dense vegetation.

8. Parking Lot Landscaping

8.1 Tree Requirements – In all parking areas, one (1) shade tree shall be planted for every twelve (12) parking stalls. Each tree must be planted in a dedicated planter of no less than five (5) feet by five (5) feet to ensure adequate root space.

8.2 Landscape Buffer – A landscape buffer of no less than four (4) feet in width is required along the outer edges of all parking lots, including those adjacent to the street or public rights-of-way, to provide screening and soften the visual impact of parked vehicles.

17.48.XXX Deviations from design standards

An application that includes a deviation from any of the guidelines of this chapter shall be subject to review.

An applicant’s request for a deviation from the design standards shall only be granted upon findings setting forth and showing that all of the following circumstances exist:

-
- A. Special conditions or circumstances exist which render a specific requirement of the design standards unreasonable, given the location and intended use of the proposed development;
 - B. The special conditions and circumstances are characteristic of the proposed general use of the site, and not of a specific tenant;
 - C. The specific conditions and circumstances are not representative of typical development which may be allowed within the zoning district;
 - D. The requested deviation is based upon functional consideration rather than economic hardship, personal convenience or personal design preferences;
 - E. Variation from a guideline(s) has sufficiently been compensated by other site amenities; and
 - F. The requested deviation will not result in a project that is inconsistent with the intent and general scope of the design principles.

(Ord. No. 2012-12-910, 12-19-2012; Ord. No. 2016-10-995, § 1, 11-16-2016; xxx)

SECTION 2. Severability / Validity. The provisions of this ordinance are declared separate and severable. If any section, paragraph, subsection, clause or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this ordinance.

SECTION 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force five (5) days after its approval, passage and publication as required by law.

SECTION 4: Transmittal to the State. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106, a complete and accurate copy of this ordinance shall be transmitted to the Department of Commerce within ten (10) days of adoption.

PASSED this ___ day of _____ by the City Council of the City of White Salmon, Washington, and signed in authentication of its passage.

Marla Keethler, Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk/Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney