



## City of Cashmere

101 Woodring Street  
Cashmere, WA 98815  
Phone (509) 782-3513 Fax (509) 782-2840

CASHMERE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2021  
5:00 P.M., VIRTUAL

### AGENDA

**DUE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE GOVERNOR'S STAY AT HOME ORDER; PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS AND THE PUBLIC ARE REQUIRED TO CALL IN TO PARTICIPATE IN A VIRTUAL CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. PLEASE CALL IN 5 MINUTES PRIOR TO MEETING.**

To Join the Meeting Go To: <https://zoom.us>  
Meeting ID: 882 719 9871 Passcode: 788276  
Audio Only: PH# 1-(253)-215-8782

#### **CALL TO ORDER:**

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING SHORELINE MASTER PLAN:**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Approval of minutes from February 1 and March 1, 2021 meetings.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE:**

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATION:**

#### **BUSINESS ITEMS:**

1. Accessory Dwelling Unit
2. Short-term rentals
3. Parks Plan
4. Topics for next meeting

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL, PLEASE BE RECOGNIZED BY THE MAYOR AND STATE YOUR NAME WHEN YOU BEGIN YOUR COMMENTS  
**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations provided upon request (48-hour notice required)**

MINUTES OF THE CASHMERE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MONDAY FEBRUARY 1, 2021 5:00 PM VIA PHONE CONFERENCE

OPENING

The meeting began at 5:04 PM and Croci recorded the meeting minutes.

ATTENDANCE

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Board:	Kirk Esmond Charlie Cruickshank Maureen Lewison Paul Kinser	Paul Nelson Matthew Walgren

Staff: Director of Operations, Steve Croci  
Perteet Inc, Christina Wollman

PUBLIC HEARING – SHORELINE MASTER PLAN

A public hearing started at 5:05 PM. Wollman explained this was to be a joint meeting with Washington Department of Ecology. Ecology was not able to prepare and announce for this hearing and will not be in attendance. The rescheduled joint hearing will be March 1. Ecology did provide comments regarding docks and some basic changes to the critical areas that Wollman incorporated into the SMP. With no questions or comments from public the hearing was closed at 5:10 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the minutes from the November 4, December 7, 2020 and the January 4, 2021 meetings were motioned by Esmond, seconded by Cruickshank and approved by all 4-0.

CORRESPONDENCE Nothing new to report.

ANNOUNCEMENT & INFORMATION Paul Kinser was approved by City Council to be a member of the Planning Commission. Welcome Paul!

Some development may be happening on the Schmitts Orchard off Old Monitor Road next to Treetop and Bethlehem Construction (light industrial), in the orchard off Olive Street and near Kennedy Reservoir (single family residential), and on Pioneer Avenue near Cashmere Care Center (multifamily). The Chelan Douglas Port District also reported they have had a lot of interest in their property recently.

AGENDA ITEMS

- 1) Shoreline Master Plan – Joint hearing schedule for March 1 with Ecology.
- 2) Joint PC and Council meeting- Topics to discuss with City Council include Short term rentals and development standards for residential roads.
- 3) Accessory Dwelling Units – Esmond motioned, Maureen seconded and all approved (4-0) submitting ADU code changes to city council for consideration.

- 4) Short Term Rental – Lots of discussion around short term rentals (STR). PC would like to present the STR code as currently proposed at the joint meeting and get input from City Council. Extremely limited public input on the proposed STR code has been received. The proposed code only allows STR in business zones, not in residential zones. The PC sees some potential value in allowing STR in residential areas only if additional requirements can be met and enforced. Potential requirements include owner or designee being on premises during rental, quiet hours, business license which could be revoked if requirements are violated, adequate parking, occupancy limits to number of people per STR, limits to number of days rented per year, and/or controlling the total number of STR in residential areas. Exemptions with restrictions should be considered for existing STR in residential zones (grandfather clause). The goal is to protect affordable housing, maintain the existing “neighborhood feel” throughout Cashmere, allow for reasonable income-generating opportunities for property owners, and provide opportunity for visitors to experience Cashmere.
- 5) New members – The PC currently has one vacant position. PC members are encouraged to spread the word of the vacancy. Interested people should contact the Mayor.
- 6) Topics for next meeting – Shoreline Master Plan Public Hearing, addressing topics from joint hearing, short term rentals.

Meeting adjourned by 6:34 PM.

MINUTES OF THE CASHMERE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MONDAY MARCH 1, 2021 5:00 PM VIA PHONE CONFERENCE

OPENING

The meeting began at 5:05 PM and Croci recorded the meeting minutes.

ATTENDANCE

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Board:	Kirk Esmond Paul Kinser Charlie Cruickshank (late)	Paul Nelson Matthew Walgren Maureen Lewison

Staff: Director of Operations, Steve Croci  
Perteet Inc, Christina Wollman

PUBLIC HEARING – SHORELINE MASTER PLAN

A public hearing started at 5:16 PM. With no questions or comments from public the hearing was closed at 5:19 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the minutes from the February 1, 2021 meetings were discussed. No quorum and minutes were not approved.

CORRESPONDENCE Nothing new to report.

ANNOUNCEMENT & INFORMATION Nothing new to report.

AGENDA ITEMS

- 1) Joint PC and Council meeting recap – Council questioned some of the PC’s recommendations for accessory dwelling units (ADU) particularly regarding allowance in the single-family zone, sewer connections, and enforcement of violations. Some frustration was express by the PC because Council did not seem receptive of changes to the code even though Council requested the PC examine the existing code. PC agreed to send ordinance to City Council for consideration at the March 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Staff report and presentation should include the why the changes to the ADU code were recommended.

Council supported defining short term rentals and allowing them in business zones but not too supportive of allowing them in residential zones.

Roadway standards should remain the same, not asking PC to review or change it.

Council asked PC to continue work on ADU, STR, the shoreline master plan and the parks plan.

2) Short Term Rental –

Stacy Luckenmeyer shared some thoughts and views supporting STR. She has a house with extra bedrooms now that the kids are grown and feels STR with owner occupation would be less of an impact than that of a family with kids, their friend and their cars in the neighborhood. SRT put heads in beds and allows visitors to come to town and spend money. She suggests a “test or evaluation” type study to determine the impacts before permanent changes are made. She indicated downsizing her dwelling would likely be more expensive particularly in today’s economy. SRT would also provide convenient housing if neighbors need a place for visiting family to stay.

3) Roadway Standards – Based on discussions at the joint PC and Council meeting no action is needed at this time. Current standards should be maintained.

4) Parks Plan – This will be added to the projects for 2021.

5) Topics for next meeting – Short term rentals, Parks Plan

Meeting adjourned by 6:30 PM.

To: Steve Croci

From Jim Fletcher

RE: Comments to ADU Ordinance

With the understanding that once an ADU is constructed it becomes a permanent part of the property. Allowing ADU's will help the property owner and use of the structure may change over time. However, the neighbors and community must live with the results of the City's decision to permit the ADU. Therefore, What is the residential setting for neighborhoods the City is seeking to promote?

Section 3 Dist. Use Chart ADU's should not be permitted in SF

Section 4 If ADU's are not permitted in SF Zones then delete: "except accessory dwelling units within the single-family residential district shall be subject to a full administrative review."

Section 4 C

- What will a restrictive covenant really accomplish, how will it be enforced on future property purchaser?
- What "permit" is the city issuing and if revoked what is the enforcement and compliance on the property owner?

Section 4 H

- Detached ADU's shall be connected to utilities as required by CMC 13.15.020.
- Detached ADU's may be connected to the primary residence (master meter) and subject to duplex utility rates of residential customers.

Section 4 K While a design requirement is a good start it is a subjective description. Who is judging consistency to the primary structure? Additional policy and standard clarification will be necessary.

Other notes:

For Staff report to Council reference CMC 14.13.080 E Monetary fines. ( addresses Daniel's comment)

Legislative efforts regarding ADU's and emergency housing will be completed in the next few weeks. Passage of one of the bills that set Statewide limits of local land use regulation is very likely. Some provisions of the City's ADU code would probably change to comply with Statewide rules.

## Director of Operations

---

**From:** Daniel Scott  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 23, 2021 8:58 AM  
**To:** Director of Operations; Mayor  
**Subject:** Zoning Code - ADU

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Steve,

Last's night's council meeting was very informative and thought provoking. Christina and the entire Planning Commission has put significant thought and effort into this issue.

The residents of Cashmere continue to ask that development fit into the character of Cashmere. So the question becomes, how do ADUs fit into our character? And what is our character? I hear things like "family friendly" and "not Issaquah density/sprawl". Residents seem to want modest growth but not high density sprawl. The photos shown at the council meeting are very idealistic but not the reality in our town.

The Mayor has issue with a new set of rules for utility connections. One way to handle this is to separate attached ADU and detached ADU in the code. Detached ADU could then use existing codes for utility hook ups.

The council is apprehensive about having ADUs in Single Family residential zoning. In essence, duplexes would be allowed in SF zoning if ADUs area allowed. However, after yesterday's discussion, the council may be leaning towards allowing attached ADU in SF zoning but not detached ADU.

Approximately how many lots in SF zoning could accommodate a detached ADU and meet setbacks, parking requirements, and all other zoning regulations? Probably not too many.

What is the penalty and enforcement for homeowners that don't follow the rules? I propose a heavy monetary penalty, perhaps \$100/day increasing for each day of noncompliance. Why change the rules to if there is no real enforcement?

The presentation included a list of benefits of ADUs but did not list out the drawbacks of ADUs. Please provide a list of drawbacks. Also, the benefit list was from the AARP. That is a group that lobby's for retired people. What do groups oriented toward family's or minorities have to say on the subject?

The list of benefits centers around creating housing options that are less costly than the main residence. However, the opposite actually happens. Let's say a home sells for \$450k without an ADU. Then an ADU is built which pushes the price of the home to \$700k. Now, the house is no longer affordable next time it is up for sale. Relatively wealthy people or investors will be purchasing those homes. If a neighborhood is full of ADUs, wealthy people will not want to live there. If it is investors, then what incentive do they have to keep the neighborhood family friendly? An investor renting the main house for \$2,000 per month and the ADU for \$1,000 a month will ask a high sales price when he sells it which is not affordable. If homeowners want rental property, then buy another house or invents in a REIT.

Is there anything wrong with the current CUP process? A CUP allows neighbors and interested parties an opportunity to formally say how an ADU is impacting them. The proposed ordinance takes away neighbors opportunity to weigh in on the impacts to their property.

There was a discussion about an ADU not being bigger than 50% of the main house. I propose that the ADU not be bigger than 50% of the ground floor of the main house.

Are there other towns of our size that allow ADUs and have a high penetration of ADUs? It would be beneficial to hear from other towns that have already been down this road on how the experience has changed their town.

Single family neighborhoods should stay single family neighborhoods.

Thanks,  
Daniel