

**Planning Commission**

**Meeting Minutes**

**August 20, 2019**

**Approved:** KMD



6:30:19 PM

Chair Kathryn Beck called the meeting to order. Commissioners in attendance: Christine Lavra, Greg Tisdell, Chris Holland, Greg Tisdell, Michael Zelinski, Adam Yanasak, Carly McGinn, Alex Lark, and Michael Finch.

Commissioners Absent: Chris Holland

Voting Alternate: Alex Lark

Staff Present: Allan Giffen, David Stalheim, David Tyler, and Kathy Davis

Meeting Minutes

**Motion:** Commissioner Zelinski made a motion to approve the July 16, 2019 meeting minutes. Commissioner Tisdell seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Lark, yes; Commissioner McGinn, abstain; Commissioner Yanasak, abstain; Commissioner Zelinski, yes; Commissioner Tisdell, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Beck, yes.

**Motion Carried.**

Commissioner Reports

Commissioner Lark attended the Farmer's Market in downtown Everett.

Staff Comments

Allan Giffen stated the next Planning Commission meeting is on September 3, 2019 to discuss the Climate Action Plan and Vision 2050.

General Citizen Comments

None

**Item 2: Supportive Housing in Single-Family Zones**

Mr. Giffen presented information on the moratorium and background, City Council list of things to consider and staff responses, supportive housing proposals since 2016, types of supportive housing management models and requirements, and the existing zoning code requirements. A public workshop is scheduled on September 17 and a public hearing on October 15.

Commissioner Yanasak asked if there was a requirement that the public agency maintain ownership of the land, and if that same public agency would construct and manage the facility. Mr. Giffen responded

that the land is publicly owned property, it can remain publicly owned property, or the ownership can be transferred to a nonprofit housing provider. Commissioner Yanasak asked if ownership could be transferred to a private corporation. Mr. Giffen responded yes, if the intent was to build supportive housing. Commissioner Yanasak asked if the supportive housing use could be converted to a multiple family development. Mr. Giffen responded that a multiple family development would not be permitted in a single-family zone. He added that typically there is a long-term requirement for maintaining the supportive housing use at a location. Commissioner Yanasak asked how many areas would be available for supportive housing given the code criteria. Mr. Giffen stated that staff would prepare that information for the next meeting.

Commissioner Zelinski referred to the definition and asked about long-term stays. Mr. Giffen responded that the intent is for long-term stays.

Commissioner Lark asked about the Hearing Examiner process. Mr. Giffen responded that the management plan is a requirement for the application process. The Hearing Examiner reviews all the information and can require additional information, condition a project, or deny a project.

Commissioner Lavra asked about the requirement for 24-hour staffing support for any specific type. Mr. Giffen responded that is currently a requirement. Commissioner Lavra recommended that the requirement could provide more flexibility for the different types of support.

Commissioner Tisdell asked about the notification process. Mr. Giffen responded that the City doesn't have to be contacted regarding property sales and there is nothing in the Code that requires neighborhood contact before an application is made.

Commissioner Finch asked Mr. Giffen if he was aware of other cities in Snohomish County that had specific supportive housing requirements. Mr. Giffen responded that staff did research that in 2016, and most cities did not differentiate between supportive housing and multiple family housing.

Commissioner Yanasak was concerned about allowing supportive housing in single-family zones because the use is more in character with multiple family developments. Mr. Giffen responded that design standards would apply so that the supportive housing facility would fit into the character of the single-family neighborhood.

Commissioner Tisdell asked about parking. Mr. Giffen responded that the 1 for every 4 rooms requirement was an amendment made last year to account for on-site staff.

#### Citizen Comments

Christopher Andersson, 3211 Grand Avenue, stated that there is a homeless crisis now. The code requirements should not create barriers and make it more expensive to build homeless housing.

Kat Bartanen, 3702 Norton Avenue, stated that the project slated for Norton doesn't sound like it qualified for long-term stays. She stated that it will house students, and it is considered low barrier which means that there are no criteria for sobriety or drug use. She does not see how that meets the long-term stay criteria.

Earl Hall, 3425 Colby Avenue, stated that last year legislation passed that addressed using public property for a public benefit which included affordable housing as a statewide priority. He added that British Columbia has a best practice on community acceptance of affordable housing. The study they conducted showed that home values were not impacted. He supported supportive housing in the R-1 zones and the Hearing Examiner process to respond to neighborhood impacts.

Victor Harris, 3017 Lombard, was concerned about the notification process with regards to plans for publicly owned property. Supportive housing is not appropriate in single family zones. Supportive housing is appropriate in the City's designated development zones. He recommended parking spaces required at one space per unit with no exceptions.

Carol Jensen, 2522 Rucker Avenue, stated that she was the co-leader of Everett Faith and Action and they are supportive of housing for neighbors without homes. She supported the existing ordinances and code related supportive housing. She stated that the existing review process was adequate to address supportive housing in single family zones. Supportive housing projects that meet established standards will serve the well being of the entire city.

Elizabeth Koenig, 3516 Norton Avenue, asked why non-profit developers can build a multiple family development in a single-family area when profit developers are not allowed the same. Why do single family neighborhoods have to accept zoning changes to accommodate supportive housing when the City already decided density would occur in the Metro Everett area. What about neighborhoods in the historic overlays? Regarding the public notice process, there needs to be mandatory involvement with the community at the beginning of the process. She was concerned that building on surplus lands takes away open space. Developers must address the neighborhood impacts.

Ted Masshardt, 112 Clinton Place, stated that zoning should address the needs of the people. He was concerned about management of sites with homeless teens.

Fred Safstrom, 717 Grand Avenue, stated that the existing ordinance can be improved to address a wide range of supportive housing projects. The service requirements are entirely different for the different types of supportive projects. The nature of the residence and parking requirements are entirely different. The existing ordinance provides almost no guidance to differentiate one type of supportive housing project from another. He supports the Hearing Examiner process. Supportive housing project are difficult to create, which is the reason the state legislature adopted legislation that specifically permitted the donation of public land for supportive housing. Land donations serve a very valuable public purpose. He stated that placing a supportive housing project, multiple family project, or low-income residence in a single-family neighborhood does not destroy a neighborhood.

Mark Smith, 2827 Rockefeller, Executive Director of Housing Consortium, encouraged the City to amend the current ordinance. Making publicly owned surplus land available to non-profit affordable housing providers is a public policy statement. It is a statement that says everybody deserves to live in a safe, stable and affordable home. One of the best uses of public land is affordable housing. Land makes up 20-30% of the cost of an affordable housing project. At the lowest income levels, the private market can't build affordable housing. It falls to a non-profit affordable housing sector to build those with public support. He encouraged Commission to lift the moratorium and amend the current ordinance.

Andera Tucker, 3330 Wetmore, stated that there are different populations for supportive housing. The current ordinance was written for one project and not for all supportive housing types. She understood that the British Columbia study concluded that there was no change in home values, but as a realtor, she knew that supportive housing facility in a single-family neighborhood would affect the buying decision.

Gregg Williams, 3529 Norton, stated that he was concerned that he couldn't address the Norton proposal specifically. He did not want to see his neighborhood change. He agreed with the need; however, higher density projects do not belong in historic neighborhoods. He commented that there are many vacant buildings available near the transit corridors.

Karrie Williams, 3529 Norton, stated that she would encourage Commissioners who have been involved with any supportive housing projects recuse themselves from the process.

Paula Townsell, 6115 Capri Place, stated that the Berkshire project is a good example of supportive housing located in a single-family area. The conditional use process would provide for a variety of planning best practices to ensure compatibility. She encouraged siting of the supportive housing near transit routes. She would like to know where the opportunities are for supportive housing and the need to have a transparent conversation with citizens about the available sites.

Susan Masshardt, 112 Clinton Place, asked Commission to consider the historic nature of Everett's neighborhoods in their deliberations.

Mitchell Cowlick, 3520 Norton avenue, stated that different degrees of supportive housing may require different parking standards.

#### Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zelinski would like to review a map with all the publicly owned properties shown. He suggested that staff could consider non-publicly owned land for supportive housing if adjacent to a commercial, industrial or multi-family zone. That might open additional sites that would compensate for eliminating sites that are in the lower density single family zones.

Commissioner Lark would like information on the British Columbia study.

Commissioner Yanasak would like information on the state statute. He would like more information on standards and how the review process would work. He asked if there was an appeal process on the Hearing Examiner decision. Mr. Giffen responded that the decision is appealable to Superior Court. Mr. Giffen offered to get information back to Commission on state laws concerning appeals.

Commissioner Finch would also like to see a map which shows the availability of non-single-family sites that are publicly owned.

Commissioner Tisdell would like to see a map of available properties and would also like to see an overlay of the Transit zones.

Chair Beck would like to see the map. She would also like to know how many single unit residential properties in the City would be impacted by the conditional use process.

**Item 1: ReThink Zoning – commercial and industrial zones**

David Tyler, Planning staff, presented information on the commercial and industrial zones consolidation proposal.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Beck asked staff to consider auto dealerships that are multi-story.

Commissioner Lark asked about the business and urban mixed zones. Mr. Tyler responded that dealerships, drive-thru businesses, big box stores, and auto related retail isn't allowed in the UM zone. The level of design is different between business zones and UM zones. Mr. Giffen responded that the changes proposed in the UM zone are not any different from what is currently allowed in the mixed-use overlay along Evergreen Way.

Commissioner Lark asked if staff had done any outreach to the business community about the development standards for neighborhood businesses. Mr. Tyler responded that outreach is planned in a couple months. Mr. Giffen added that there will be a lot of changes in the use of commercially zoned properties because the nature of retail is changing. Most of the commercial zoning does allow for mixed use development which includes housing. Commissioner Lark stated that the corner market serves a valuable function to a community.

Commissioner Lark asked about the inclusion of residential in the light industrial zones. Mr. Giffen responded that the City has a very strong policy to preserve industrial land for industrial uses. That policy is also reinforced through the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2050 Policy Plan. Mr. Tyler added that residential would be allowed in areas currently designated ULI which are changing to LI1.

Commissioner Tisdell stated that nuances should be considered with regards to compatibility of residential and noise in the industrial areas. Mr. Tyler responded there is a higher ambient level of noise in the industrial zone.

Commissioner Zelinski recommended that the City do some outreach to commercial realtors. Commissioner Finch also recommended a review of the proposed design standards with the City's economic development division. Mr. Tyler stated that outreach is planned in a couple months.

Commissioner McGinn stated yes to design standards, yes to street trees and wider sidewalks, and yes to housing wherever it is appropriate.

**ADJOURNED** 9:00:06 PM

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Secretary

9-4-19  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrative Assistant

9-3-19  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date