

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
September 6, 2016
Approved: KMD



Vice Chair Greg Tisdell called the meeting to order. Commissioners in attendance: Loren Sand, Chris Adams, Richard Jordison, Kathryn Beck, Michael Zelinski, Megan Dunn, and Alex Lark.

Commissioner Absent: Chair Chris Holland

Staff Present: Allan Giffen, David Stalheim, Karen Stewart, Niels Tygesen, Mettie Brasel, and Kathy Davis

Meeting Minutes

Motion: Commissioner Zelinski made a motion to approve the July 19, 2016 minutes. Commissioner Sand seconded the motion.

Vote: Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner Dunn, abstain; Commissioner Beck, abstain; Commissioner Jordison, yes; Commissioner Adams, yes; Commissioner Sand, yes; and Vice Chair Tisdell, yes.

Motion Carried.

Commissioner Reports

None

Staff Comments

Allan Giffen, Planning Director, stated that a meeting is scheduled for September 20th to discuss the definition of family and related code amendments, and Metro Everett.

General Citizen Comments

None

Item #1: Energy Map and Carbon Wedge Analysis

Karen Stewart, Planning Department, introduced Eileen Quigley who is the City's lead consultant from Climate Solutions and Derik Broekhoff from Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) who helped with the technical analysis.

Eileen Quigley, Climate Solutions, gave a presentation on the work that has been done for the City of Everett. Her presentation included information about Climate Solutions, the new energy cities program,

the Everett Energy Map, and the Everett Carbon Wedge Analysis. The key data sources they used were from the Puget Sound Regional Council, Snohomish PUD, Puget Sound Energy, and the City of Everett. She discussed potential first actions to reduce carbon emissions such as forming partnerships, enhancing commute trip reduction (CTR) programs, joining regional code collaboration ventures, and adopting stretch energy codes and energy benchmarking requirements.

Commissioner Sand appreciated the graphs and asked if other cities had adopted the 50% reduction below 2014 level by 2030. Ms. Quigley responded that the goal setting was a moving target; however, most of the earlier cities had adopted an 80% reduction by 2050 which was the original goal seven years ago. Commissioner Sand asked if the slope of the target base line was the same for all the cities. Ms. Quigley responded that the slope from the baseline is just a measuring point. Their current work with regards to the energy flow map and carbon wedge is modelled after work that was started at Princeton University.

Commissioner Lark asked about the direction to focus on transportation efforts with 25% of that effort in rideshare opportunities. Ms. Quigley responded that they try to model a wide range of solutions. Ridesharing is one solution that they are very interested in studying further in regards to all the new entrants into the market. She stated that one of the things that they had learned is that the streets in most cities are now flooded with Uber cars, which is creating more congestion and more carbon emissions. Mr. Broekhoff added that most of the research that they have done shows that the real pathway to reduce congestion is through public transit, dedicated bus lanes, and bus rapid transit.

Commissioner Beck asked if Climate Solutions had been tracking the progress of early adopters. Ms. Quigley responded that tracking was one of the challenges they met early on in the program. There are a lot of different complexities involved in figuring out how a city is doing. The City of Bellevue works with a consultant called Scope 5 to monitor their progress and they have compiled some data. King County has done some consumption based inventories. The City of Seattle works with SEI. Ms. Quigley stated that it takes a couple years sometimes from the time that cities have an energy map and carbon wedge analysis to the point that they adopt the climate action plan. There are other firms that are helping cities track; however, that isn't work that Climate Solutions does.

Commissioner Beck asked if Climate Solutions was working on a strategy for the City of Everett. Ms. Quigley responded that what they were asked to do was to provide the carbon map tools and prepare a memo regarding the strategies and options to present to City Council. Commissioner Beck asked if the presentation to City Council would include a discussion on potential partners that might be interested in the effort. Ms. Quigley responded yes, and that there are opportunities in Everett to work with the Snohomish County PUD and Snohomish County who have both done a lot of work on climate change.

Commissioner Dunn stated that the City just completed a charter review process and in that process there were comments around the need to form a committee around climate change but the focus was to be more on what individuals could do. She asked if the Climate Solutions report to City Council could

include suggestions regarding individual behavior changes or suggestions for financing such as Everett's CHIP program to include efficiency upgrades. Ms. Quigley responded that Climate Solutions is in strategic planning right now and haven't considered that in the past but will be discussing individual behavior strategies in terms of whether or not Climate Solutions needs to get more engaged in that. She does know of other Cities who have done that work.

Commissioner Jordison stated that he supported the effort and added that there were benefits locally; however, climate change has a global impact and the people who are going to benefit the most from this region's leadership are other countries. Ms. Quigley responded that the northwest region is looked to for leadership in this area. What Climate Solutions is trying to build is a west coast climate campaign or a block of climate action joining California to the south and BC to the north. That regional area comprises the world's fifth largest economy. Achieving the climate action goals in this area furthers carbon reduction efforts throughout the country. Climate Solutions works very closely with other regional climate groups and they watch us very carefully.

Vice Chair Tisdell stated that energy efficiency solutions for new construction is much easier to implement than in existing homes and businesses. He asked if Climate Solutions had any recommendations regarding energy efficiency solutions for pre-80's homes and business. Ms. Quigley responded that commercial and industrial uses have generally penciled out much better than residential. Climate Solutions has done a fair amount of work in helping cities understand what the challenges and opportunities are. She stated that information would be a significant part of their report because conservation and energy efficiency is critically important and the less we use the less we have to create.

Commissioner Lark asked what strategies Climate Solutions is considering in terms of future buildings. He added that Commission is considering a proposed code amendment for detached accessory dwelling units and asked if she had any information on efficiency benefits for those types of units. Ms. Quigley stated that the government did provide some stimulus funding as a pilot program for loan loss reserve funds to derisk the bank loaning to customers and to people who were willing to have their houses retrofitted. A key piece of that effort was measurement verification that the energy efficiency was actually achieved. In terms of future building, create a toolbox of energy efficiency measures as incentives so that energy efficiency becomes something that contractors find profitable to pursue.

Paul Roberts, Council Member and Chair of Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, provided the Commissioners with his written testimony. He presented a globe that was 16 inches in diameter to represent the earth. He stated that the troposphere is where all weather exists and it is a very thin layer of atmosphere around the earth. Mr. Roberts brought a dime to represent the troposphere which is twice the thickness of the troposphere. He stated that into that layer, 35 billion tons a year of carbon dioxide are put in. He added that the heat trapping process is accelerating, and so the need to respond is urgent. The quicker that we can start to reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere the quicker we can move things in a different direction.

Mr. Roberts stated that the City has been working since 2006 to begin laying a foundation to deal with this work. Good work has been done but more needs to be done. The issue before the City is dealing with mitigation, adaptation, and economic development. The mitigation process looks at the carbon footprint and how that can be reduced. The adaptation process was very well documented in the Comprehensive Plan Climate Change and Sustainability Background Report. The adaptation and mitigation piece also needs to be combined with an economic development piece. He is working on a proposal with the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) about building a green economy here.

Citizen Comments

Slawek Porowski, architect, spoke about progressive building permit costs and the size of single family residential homes.

Item #2: Metro Everett

David Stalheim, introduced Mettie Brasel, student intern.

Ms. Brasel presented information on a land capacity analysis for Metro Everett. She used the geographic information systems to assess the land capacity within Metro Everett to provide a more reliable inventory of developable parcels within Metro Everett. The process included the formation of economic units. She presented a graphic of an economic unit and explained that the Snohomish County Assessor places all improvement value on one parcel of a multi-parcel facility which creates the impression that the other joint parcels are available for redevelopment. She stated that the formation of an economic unit spans the value across all those parcels.

Ms. Brasel presented a graphic to show land status in Metro Everett. The results of the land status show that approximately 50% of the parcels in Metro Everett have redevelopment potential. The results of the land capacity analysis found that 182 acres are available for redevelopment. She presented some calculations on housing units and population under the assumption that all the available parcels will be redeveloped.

Commissioner Zelinski stated that the buildable lands report takes into account market availability, and asked if the end result of her work reflects market availability. Ms. Brasel responded that wasn't taken into account and that her results were the theoretical absolute maximum.

Commissioner Sand asked if there was a similar analysis done for the rest of the City. Mr. Giffen responded yes, but that hadn't been done for this specific subarea.

Citizen Comments

Ryan Countryman, 6618 SE 4th Place, Renton, stated that he was a property owner in Metro Everett. He stated that one of the challenges in the B-3 zone is that there are targets that don't match the allowed height limits. Parts of downtown Everett do allow heights in excess of 15 stories but there are other

areas in the Metro Center such as the area by Providence Hospital that has a 45 foot height limit. He stated that If Everett is to achieve the higher growth targets there needs to be some flexibility provided to property owners who intend to do a more ambitious construction. He would like to see changes in heights corresponding to the types of assumptions that are in place. Other things that would be helpful are steps to prevent underbuilding of sites. The Zoning Code should require land assembly to allow higher density or simply use code enforcement to maintain the buildings they have until somebody else can come along and assemble a larger site. The more the City allows underbuilding, the harder it is to assemble the sites and redevelop. He suggested that the Zoning Code be amended so that you can't under build these properties unless everything around you has been redeveloped already.

Item #3: Detached Accessory Dwelling Units

Allan Giffen, Planning Director, explained what a detached accessory dwelling unit (DADU) was and reviewed the 2010 draft regulations and design standards that were considered by Planning Commission and City Council in 2010. He presented a map that showed over 1900 lots zoned R-2 and a map that showed over 590 lots in the R-1 zone that qualified for a DADU. Mr. Giffen stated that his memo to Commission outlines the questions that Planning Commission could consider and a spreadsheet that compared 15 other City DADU regulations. Out of all the comparisons, the City's proposed 2010 regulations were much more restrictive and had a lot more requirements than any of the other existing regulations that are currently in effect in other communities.

Commissioner Sand asked about the maps in the packet. Mr. Giffen reviewed the maps with Commission. Commissioner Sand asked Mr. Giffen for a list of existing DADU addresses. Mr. Giffen responded yes.

Commissioner Beck stated that you can't talk about affordable housing without talking about infill dwelling units. She stated that HUD had done a case study in 2009 and one of the things they mentioned in the case study was that many of the programs were not very successful because they lacked flexibility and scope. She felt that the 2010 proposed regulations were too restrictive. She was in support of continuing the discussion. She offered to get the HUD report to staff and Commission.

Commissioner Zelinski supported moving forward and asked Mr. Giffen whether he had any insights into the Council's inaction on the earlier proposal. Mr. Giffen responded that Council had concerns with neighborhood compatibility, bulk and scale, comments about alley access proliferation of DADU's, 2025 growth targets were lower and there was existing land capacity to reach those goals, and they were concerned about reducing the housing market in the downtown area.

Commissioner Beck mentioned that the city of Santa Cruz created a guidance document to help alleviate citizen concerns about detached accessory dwelling units.

Commissioner Lark stated that he supported moving forward with the code amendment. He stated that infill development would invigorate and enhance downtown development.

Commissioner Jordison stated that he would support allowing for more flexibility in terms of architectural treatment of the accessory dwelling units, allowing for a design that would complement the principal dwelling and not imitate the architectural treatment of the principle dwelling. He asked why the previous regulations restricted the uses to alley access. Mr. Giffen responded that the thought at that time was that the accessory dwelling units would have less of an impact on the neighborhood if the DADU was located off the alley.

Commissioner Dunn recalled the discussion at the 2010 City Council meeting and it appeared to her that there wasn't a sense of urgency at the time. She added that it didn't seem fair to limit the use to alley access lots only because it disproportionately impacts property owners in South Everett. She supported moving forward with the code amendment but would strike the language on the alley access requirement. She also stated that the city should also have plan to contact any amnesty eligible units.

Commissioner Sand stated that the 2010 proposal was a good place to start. He recalled that the reason for the alley access requirement was to maintain the appearance of a single family neighborhood from the streetscape. He felt that was a key component to make the accessory dwelling unit more compatible with existing neighborhoods.

Commissioner Lark agreed with Commissioner Dunn regarding the disparity of requiring the alley access. The alley access requirement restricts most of the residential neighborhoods in south Everett and would block a possible revenue source for those property owners. He also suggested removing the parking requirement which could help market transit throughout the City. He would like feedback from staff on the purpose for the requirements addressed in the 2010 regulations and whether or not those earlier requirements would preclude an accessory dwelling unit being constructed. Mr. Giffen would like to do a little more research to address that question.

Commissioner Beck stated that she felt that the alley requirement was overly restrictive because it does eliminate opportunities in terms of other housing stock in other areas of the City.

Commissioner Zelinski asked if the City could seek some input from a Realtor on whether or not infill development is a competing market with residential development in the downtown.

Commissioner Adams asked if the City considered infill development in neighborhoods as part of the land capacity analysis. Mr. Giffen responded that the City did make some assumptions for neighborhoods with alleys and that was built into the capacity assumptions. Commissioner Adams asked about the survey responses. Mr. Giffen would research that.

Vice Chair Tisdell added that he would like more information on the changing demographics.

Citizen Comments

Kent Peverly, 312 Pecks Drive, stated that he was in support of the 2010 proposal but was concerned about the earlier provision of alley access. He stated that there was nothing wrong with the requirement if a home has alley access; however, provide another option if a home doesn't have alley access. He agreed with Commissioner Beck that it is difficult to regulate standards that would apply for every situation.

Erick Alder, 2024 1/2 Rucker Avenue, ECC geology student, stated that the City needs to get the most of the space that we have. He suggested that these new accessory dwelling units should include some seismic improvements to the structure.

John Dimas, 2126 Wetmore, stated that he was familiar with the city of Santa Cruz regulations and would appreciate similar regulations in Everett. He gave a powerpoint presentation to show his property and possible concept plans for a detached accessory dwelling unit on his property. He stated that he intends to construct something that is compatible with his house and the neighborhood. Four generations live in his home and he needs to add space. It was also important to maintain his yard space.

Commissioner Sand asked Mr. Giffen why Mr. Dimas wasn't permitted to build the DADU. Mr. Giffen responded that his home isn't located in the historic overlay zone where DADUs are permitted. Commissioner Adams asked if the request would have been permitted under the 2010 proposed code amendment. Mr. Giffen responded yes.

Commissioner Beck suggested that staff could get information from the city of Seattle on their experience with detached accessory dwelling unit regulations.

Commissioner Sand stated that it appeared that there were three options to consider: 1) No change to the 2010 proposal, 2) Modify the 2010 proposal, or 3) expand the current DADU regulations that are in the historic overlay zones to all zones.

Commissioner Zelinski stated that the regulations could include a tool box of design parameters in response to neighborhood compatibility that would offer some design flexibility for the architect.

ADJOURNED 8:55:50 PM



Planning Commission Secretary

9-21-16

Date



Kathy Davis, Administrative Assistant

9-21-16

Date