



## **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Based on input received as of October 14, 2020

[www.everettwa.gov/rethink](http://www.everettwa.gov/rethink)

October 15, 2020

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
<b>Oral comments received at City Council hearing on 10-14-20</b>			
Dave Koenig	10-14	Ordinances are extremely complicated and hard to follow. When expressed an opinion, citizen participation plan was referenced. In that plan, the expectation was that no consider no changes to existing single family zones. There is no lot size in the code as proposed. Changes to SEPA notices. In state law, encourage citizen involvement in SEPA decisions. Reject changes in SEPA. Hearing Examiner should continue to be decision-maker for shoreline permits. Concerned about notice for historic applications.	See response to written comments below.  Regarding the Public Participation Plan, the proposed code eliminates the cluster subdivision process that is used throughout the city, replacing it with a process now limited to multifamily zones – unit lot subdivision. The flexibility that currently exists would continue in a different process, but with public notice to adjacent property owners. The significant changes that the commenter thinks are in the code are not accurate.
<b>Written comments received through 10-14-20. See <a href="https://everettwa.gov/2510/How-to-Get-Involved">https://everettwa.gov/2510/How-to-Get-Involved</a></b>			
<a href="#">Soine, Mark</a>	10-6	Supports comments made by Cunningham and Koenig	Comments noted
<a href="#">Cunningham, Mary</a>	10-6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Hearing Examiner should continue to be the decision maker for larger shoreline permits.</li> <li>Public notice should be required for modifications to development standards. The proposed ordinance does not always require notice but allows modifications.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue was previously responded to. The example used reflects that staff responded to public input and would have made a specific decision were they the decision maker.</li> <li>Staff has identified the modifications that should require public notice based on a long history of land use reviews. Sending notice and posting sites for modification of minor design elements results in added costs (\$839) and time (2-4 months) for the applicant, increases staff workload in the time of staff reductions, and ends up with no changes in outcomes. The City will be unveiling a permit tracking map application in the next couple of months for people to view land use applications.</li> </ol>
<a href="#">Koenig, Dave</a>	10-5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19.06.080.B should be removed from proposed code. Section allows exceptions to all lot standards and affects single-family zones.</li> <li>19.06.110 – this allows for lots of any size so Table 6-1 is not the minimum lot size standard. Suggests 4,000 sf in a R-1 zone and 3,000 sf in a R-2 zone.</li> <li>There should be no ability to propose a different way of measuring building heights.</li> <li>The city should not be reducing notice of development. SEPA, shoreline, and historic</li> <li>Points out issues about private streets.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revised code eliminates the cluster subdivision process and substitutes it with a Unit Lot Subdivision, which is the section that the commenter proposes to be deleted. If deleted, a cluster land division would not be possible, allowing an applicant with critical areas to create lots outside the critical areas and their buffers. Any Unit Lot Subdivision is subject to public notice (mail and sign) and must meet the specific approval criteria. Also, any uses in a Unit Lot Subdivision would need to meet Ch. 19.05; for example, 3-4 unit townhomes are not permitted in single family zones.</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
			<p>2. This section applies only to attached (townhouse) and duplex housing, which might be developed on separate lots. A townhouse, for example, could be on a lot no larger than the unit itself. Thus, having the ability to reduce lot sizes (not density) is needed for that housing type and ownership form.</p> <p>3. The way heights can be measured is not a one-size fits all standard. For example, using the sidewalk as the place of measurement might not work on a large property with a slope. Allowing for a different approach, with public notice and a view analysis, avoids requiring a public hearing and variance process.</p> <p>4. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020. The comment that notice for Historical Commission actions is being eliminated is not accurate. First, all Historical Commission meetings are Open Public Meetings. People can sign up to get notice of any upcoming meeting. Second, the elimination of the 500 foot mailing notice and posting of signs is limited to addition of an ADU, alteration of a feature on an historic property and additions to a building. What is still subject to notice is shown in 15.02.070.B.5, including demolition, construction of new buildings with 3+ units, construction of a clinic, commercial building or place of worship, and deviation from any Historic Overlay Guidelines.</p> <p>5. Comments noted. The cost to maintain public streets for small subdivisions does not cover the revenues obtained.</p>
<a href="#">Hokanson, Tina</a>	9-30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rethink Zoning has occurred too quickly during a pandemic.</li> <li>2. The City's commitment to its Climate Action Plan should be included on the Rethink Zoning webpage, and by imbedding into documents.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments noted.</li> <li>2. The Rethink Zoning website was updated to include a link to the City's Climate Action Strategy webpage.</li> </ol>
<a href="#">Weber, Ryan</a>	9-28	<p>The public does not have a clear idea on the changes. Concerned about Chestnut Street and E Marine View Dr, and changes in the Asarco Smelter area.</p>	<p>For summaries of the changes, go to <a href="#">Summary and Highlights of Proposal</a> or <a href="#">Summary of Code Chapters</a>. Staff is unclear what area is being referred to and recommend visiting the <a href="#">Maps</a> page and <a href="#">Ch. 19.05</a>. Belmonte Heights was part of a redevelopment site and had conditions of rezone approval that have been</p>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
			accomplished. The contract rezone is no longer applicable and is proposed for repeal. See report (Index #900) at this <a href="#">link</a> .
<a href="#">Forterra</a>	9-9	Process has been transparent and inclusive. Public participation and sharing of resources have been robust and commendable. Pleased to see green roofs allowed in 19.08.040.C.2.	Comments noted
<a href="#">Busteed, Kimberly</a>	9-9	Look at Arlington mixed use code for walkable, sustainable development	Comments noted
<a href="#">Everett School District</a>	9-8	Concerned about unintended impediments to development/redevelopment of schools (height, hardscape, setbacks).	There are not any changes in heights in single-family zones for schools or other uses than what is currently allowed. Schools can still apply for a variance from standards if a hardship exists and they can meet the variance criteria (hearing examiner decision). There are not any additional restrictions that would impact schools from current standards.
<a href="#">Mukilteo School District</a>	9-8	Common for schools to need height beyond that allowed within a residential zone. It appears that the method to address height, a variance, would not be permitted.	There are not any changes in heights in single-family zones for schools or other uses than what is currently allowed. Schools can still apply for a variance from standards if a hardship exists and they can meet the variance criteria (hearing examiner decision). There are not any additional restrictions that would impact schools from current standards.
<a href="#">Fox, Steve</a>	9-2	Should not permanently change public notice for historic commission meetings on development proposals.	All meetings of the Historical Commission are open public meetings. The current procedures require notice to people within 500 feet, plus additional application fees, for minor projects in historic overlays. The changes are to process and not to standards or decision-makers. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.
<a href="#">Wolken, Mark</a>	9-2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about outright ban on waste-to-energy and fertilizer manufacturing.</li> <li>2. No interpretation of unlisted uses</li> <li>3. Concerned about limits on vehicle and equipment sales and service</li> <li>4. Use table restricts sales to 80% of goods in LI and HI zones</li> <li>5. Why is commercial storage not allowed in HI zone</li> <li>6. Batch plants should not require the CUP scrutiny</li> <li>7. Compost facilities are not defined or listed</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ban exists currently in the M-1 and M-M zones. It has been removed from the list of prohibited uses as some of these uses might work in the HI zone.</li> <li>2. The standards come from existing code, but some criteria was dropped. It was added to 15.03.</li> <li>3. The standards for auto sales comes from existing restrictions in the city. This could be a good policy conversation in the future. Some restrictions inappropriately made its way into industrial zones for heavy vehicles, so modifications have been made.</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Solid Waste and Hazardous waste facilities should be a CUP.</li> <li>9. "Benson" property should be Heavy Industrial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. This is an existing code restriction most were unaware of. Staff agree that the standard doesn't seem to fit and have adjusted it to 25%.</li> <li>5. This has been amended to allow commercial storage as it is currently allowed.</li> <li>6. This is an existing requirement and the use can be a difficult land use to site.</li> <li>7. Amendments were made to require a CUP for compost facilities over 1 acre.</li> <li>8. Solid waste changed to CUP and hazardous waste over 1 acre added as CUP.</li> <li>9. See earlier response. The C-2 zone (current zoning of property) is a light industrial zone.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Hall, Patrick</a>	9-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about the city remaining eligible as a Certified Local Government (CLG).</li> <li>2. Concerned about changing the decision-making for demolition of Everett Register properties from City Council to planning director</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The city meets all the CLG requirements. The provision dropped said it was a duty of the commission or staff. The chapter is about the duties of the commission, and they are defined as required by CLG.</li> <li>2. This has been changed to return the decision-making to City Council for demolition of Everett Register properties.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Koenig, Dave</a>	9-1	The effort is much more than a zoning effort as it is titled. Summarizes previous comments in the record.	The revised code structure unifies development standards and is the result of many years of staff work to find a structure much easier to use than current code. Other comments noted and responded to.
<a href="#">Cunningham, Mary</a>	8-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments on "park model" definition, "the entry of manufactured homes", where tiny homes are permitted, mobile home parks and tiny houses.</li> <li>2. Current code says the number of boarding rooms shall not exceed the number of dwelling units allowed by zoning density.</li> <li>3. Special regulations for food or beverage should include a footnote to allow tasting rooms in AG zones.</li> <li>4. Would special regulation 8 on heavy auto and truck service prohibit Motor Trucks International?</li> <li>5. Where are the standards for espresso stands?</li> <li>6. How do several specific uses fit within office, retail sales and service categories under draft code?</li> <li>7. Heliports should be added back as a CUP for Providence Colby campus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The definition of park model is referenced to RCW 59.20.030. "the entry of manufactured homes comes from RCW 35.21.684. Tiny house communities, now defined in state law, are not proposed to be allowed. Mobile home parks are not permitted anymore in the city, and the existing ones are nonconforming. Tiny houses are now part of the building codes and can be considered a dwelling if meeting standards.</li> <li>2. Added a density limit on rooming houses tied to comprehensive plan density since some zones have no specific density limit.</li> <li>3. The definition of micro alcohol production includes a tasting room, so no change is needed.</li> <li>4. Deleted Footnote 8 off of heavy vehicles and added the word "light" into the footnote. Also, dropped</li> </ul>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Aggregates extraction and composting should be listed as CUP.</li> <li>9. Major above ground utilities should be a CUP in residential and NB zones.</li> <li>10. Schools should be a CUP in all residential and NB zones.</li> <li>11. Community center and assembly should be a CUP in single family zones.</li> <li>12. Clubs, lodges and similar uses are not currently permitted in residential zones but would be allowed as a CUP in residential zones.</li> <li>13. Marinas are not an appropriate use in the B and AG zones, and shoreline permits require SEPA, making it a REV II decision.</li> <li>14. Shoreline permits that have 1 acre or more should be a CUP (REV III).</li> </ol>	<p>the requirement for multi-tenant building in the LI zones.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. See the draft EMC 19.13.095</li> <li>6. The code moves away from trying to distinguish the difference between a printer from a retail sale or service. The distinctions provided no obvious planning benefit and caused many issues with interpretations and change of use, parking requirements.</li> <li>7. Heliports in the Use Table are for Primary Uses, not accessory. The Providence campus is subject to the Institutional Overlay requirements.</li> <li>8. Aggregate extraction is a prohibited use (EMC 19.05.050). Added composting facilities over one acre require a CUP.</li> <li>9. The definition includes any utility that provides service to more than one lot. Some facilities have little impact and requiring a public hearing and potential 5-month delay in permitted is not warranted. For major facilities, the planning director is authorized to bump the use up to a CUP (REV III).</li> <li>10. If needed, the planning director is authorized to bump the use up to a CUP (REV III).</li> <li>11. If needed, the planning director is authorized to bump the use up to a CUP (REV III).</li> <li>12. Removed this use as a permitted use from single-family detached zones and amended the use to better fit the definition of private club or lodge.</li> <li>13. The B zone could expand to areas where marinas are allowed. A marina should not be permitted in the AG zone, and has been removed from the Use Table. A Use with an "A" classification must meet different criteria than Permitted. These uses are best reviewed under the city's Shoreline Master Program (SMP).</li> <li>14. See previous response and <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> </ol>
<a href="#">Mohammad, Ismael</a>	8-29	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reductions in parking – replace car sharing with electric vehicle charging or van pool</li> <li>2. Permitting process – city should consider MyBuildingPermit program</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Electric vehicles do not reduce demand for parking. A van pool might be considered the same as a car sharing program.</li> <li>2. Comment noted</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Open space – allow private balconies as small as 18 sq. ft. to count for open space</li> <li>4. Expedited permitting should be considered for affordable housing</li> <li>5. Micro units – changes are against the purpose of having micro units</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Small private balconies provide an amenity, but do not satisfy open space needs. The standards are from Metro Everett (19.20.253) and are based on the Core Residential Area standards adopted in 2008 (<a href="#">Ord 3072-08</a>). Metro Everett standards increased the dimension in any one direction from 4 feet to 6 feet.</li> <li>4. Comments noted</li> <li>5. The definition of micro housing was amended to be in a multifamily building of no less 24 units. This was done because larger buildings have the ability to flex and share parking, whereas smaller buildings would likely see bigger impacts.</li> </ol>
<a href="#">Port of Everett</a>	8-24	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the landscape requirement on interior lot lines between HI and HI zoned properties or include a caveat for Port facilities.</li> <li>2. Parking areas within the Port’s terminal areas, whether leased or not, should also not be subject to landscaping requirements.</li> <li>3. Trees should not be required when screening or other landscaping is adjacent to a Port security fence (climbing).</li> </ol>	These comments were addressed directly with the Port of Everett.
<a href="#">Di Filippo, Angela</a>	8-24	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sees these zoning changes as a sign of hope that we are making efforts for the future of the community.</li> <li>2. We can solve our housing crisis by evidence-based practices. If the last time zoning was updated was in 1989, then we have to assume it might be another 31 years before we update it again.</li> <li>3. Did not see any issue with building heights and the increase in density in historic overlays. The changes in the land-use change report made sense. These changes are a step in the direction of preparing for a future of higher density in our city, which we know is inevitable.</li> <li>4. Unclear why group housing (Category 2) is not permitted in R-2 and R-2A zones. This housing (7-16) individuals in a shared unit, seems appropriate for these zones, possibly even more restricted-density zones.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments noted.</li> <li>2. Comments noted.</li> <li>3. Comments noted. However, there is not any increased height or density proposed in historic overlays.</li> <li>4. Although the classification for group housing is changed in Rethink Zoning, Class I.B and higher Group Homes are not allowed in any single-family zones in the current code. That is why we have not put the Category 2 Group Homes into R-2 or R-2A. The comments raise good questions for discussion.</li> <li>5. Some amendments for this use are proposed. State law has specific exemptions for religious facilities that host temporary encampments. Otherwise, the code provisions are similar to existing allowances.</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
		5. Unclear why temporary shelters are, for the most part, only permitted with the administration's discretion.	
<a href="#">Shepherd, Madeline</a>	8-17	Allowing higher density housing in neighborhoods like Northwest would be a grave mistake. Even duplexes detract from the feel and stand out as eyesores.	No additional density is added to single family neighborhoods. An amendment is proposed to restore the current lot merger requirements in EMC 19.38.
<a href="#">Shepherd, Keil</a>	8-17	This all seems rushed. Provision of affordable housing is laudable but not at the cost of the history and fabric of the city.	The process for reviewing and simplifying the land use code started five years ago and has had extensive engagement over the past two. Other comments noted.
<a href="#">Soine, Mark</a>	8-15	Concern about lot merger and height restrictions	An amendment is proposed to restore the current lot merger requirements in EMC 19.38. No changes in the ability to modify how heights are measured are proposed, as each request must meet criteria in EMC 15.03 and requires notice to adjacent owners.
<a href="#">Cunningham, Mary</a>	8-14	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lot merger clause – could allow skinny houses in neighborhoods</li> <li>2. SEPA exemption levels – opposed to increased exemptions</li> <li>3. Shoreline permits decision-maker – wants to keep the independent Hearing Examiner for large shoreline projects</li> <li>4. Elimination of Notice for Historic Commission Meetings – wants to keep notice for projects</li> <li>5. Definitions of Housing types – definition of multiple-family doesn't make sense</li> <li>6. Building Height Measurement Modifications – concerned with views and neighborhood character</li> <li>7. Residential standards in 19.08 – supports standards but the modification process should require notice</li> <li>8. 19.06 standards – concerned about ability to modify standards</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The amendments are recommended to be repealed, returning to current standards. This subject should be brought forth in future looks at infill and single-family neighborhoods.</li> <li>2. Staff does not agree with comments. SEPA provides little, or no additional benefits in infill areas. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> <li>3. Staff does not agree with comments. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> <li>4. Staff does not agree with comments. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> <li>5. Comments noted. A change in the definition of dwelling, multiple-family is proposed.</li> <li>6. Comments noted. Adding a view analysis is a good recommendation and is proposed to be added in EMC 19.22.100.</li> <li>7. Staff agrees that modification of most standards should require public notice. A change in both 19.08 and 15.02 are proposed.</li> <li>8. The ability to modify lot standards in 19.06 is limited to alternative land division processes: binding site plans and unit lot subdivisions. This allows projects, such as townhouses, to be built on individual lots. Perimeter setbacks and density requirements cannot be modified. All unit lot subdivisions are proposed as REV II, requiring public notice (see EMC 15.02.070. Some changes are proposed to require</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
			notice (REV II) for lot depth reductions or where exceptions are granted where more than one house exists on one lot.
<a href="#">Koenig, Dave</a>	8-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Changes to public notice requirements should not be approved and rejected</li> <li>2. Staff should be directed to not include changes in who makes decisions from current code.</li> <li>3. Opposed to exceptions to lot area, etc. in 19.06.080</li> <li>4. Changes needed to 19.06.110, density and lot size.</li> <li>5. There should be no ability to propose a different way to measure building heights.</li> <li>6. Reject the changes to the merger clause.</li> <li>7. Reject proposal to eliminate requirements to make all projects which exceed SEPA thresholds for categorical exemptions subject to Review Process II.</li> <li>8. Private street construction – points out private access drives allowed</li> <li>9. Clarify where tiny house communities are allowed.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments noted. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> <li>2. Comments noted. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> <li>3. The exceptions are limited to alternative land division processes: binding site plans and unit lot subdivisions, lot depth and where more than one single family dwelling exists on an existing lot. These are existing standards: see <a href="#">EMC 19.15A.020</a>. Amendments are proposed to require public notice (REV II) for these modifications.</li> <li>4. There was an editing error that the commenter identified. Amendments are proposed, but the minimum lot sizes are not included as suggested. In some situations, an attached housing project might have a lot that is no larger than the dwelling’s footprint. The land or open space might be in a tract and under common ownership. Flexibility is warranted provided that overall density requirements are met.</li> <li>5. In general, staff would agree with this comment. However, there is no way to ensure that there are not valid situations to provide for alternatives without having to go to public hearing through a variance process. There are criteria that must be met for modification (see <a href="#">EMC 15.03.060</a>). An amendment is proposed for EMC 19.22 to require a view analysis if needed.</li> <li>6. Staff agrees that the merger clause should not be changed in this process. Amendments are proposed to retain existing standards.</li> <li>7. If a project is exempt from SEPA, it is not required to provide public notice under state law. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.</li> <li>8. Comments noted. The cost to maintain public streets for small subdivisions does not cover the revenues obtained.</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
			9. Tiny home communities are identified as a use in EMC 19.05. These communities would not be allowed anywhere in the city as drafted in that chapter. However, pursuant to state law, tiny homes can be allowed in an approved manufactured housing community. Amendments are being forwarded regarding temporary shelters, which could include tiny homes as a temporary option.
<a href="#">Taylor, David</a>	8-12	The "Benson Property", currently zoned C-2, is inappropriately shown now as Heavy Industrial.	The current C-2 zone is a heavy commercial/light industrial zoning classification. The underlying land use designation is Industrial. A Light Industrial zoning designation was used in all other circumstances where C-2 zoning is currently in place. The three lots that Mr. Taylor mentions that are currently zoned C-2 should have received a Light Industrial 1 designation. An amendment is proposed to the zoning map.
<a href="#">Choi, Angela &amp; Lee, Justin</a>	8-5	We purchased the empty land next to our 4-plex at 1413 E. Marine View Drive. Would like for the land they purchased to be the same zoning as 1413 (now C-1)	The land that was purchased is currently zoned R-2 and is proposed to remain as R-2. Their 4-plex is proposed to change the Land Use Designation from Commercial to Multifamily because development in that area is residential. A follow-up inquiry was sent asking if they wanted a Neighborhood Business zone, but no response has been received.
<a href="#">Raval, Nehal</a>	7-31	Disagree with the shift from R3 to R2 for the lots they own at 1830 & 1810 Hollow Dale. Wants the zoning to be UR4.	An amendment is proposed to keep the Land Use Designation as multifamily (no change from current) and a zoning designation of UR3. (This is as requested for Land Use, but a slightly less standard for zoning.)  This property includes streams and wetlands that reduce the ability to develop, and a significant part of the neighborhood is characterized by single-family.
<a href="#">Lindstrom, Gordy</a>	7-29	The 33 single-family homes on West Mall Drive are placed in the UR3 Multifamily zone. Every home would become a nonconforming use.	This is an area where the Land Use Designation is proposed to change from multifamily to single-family. See ID#20 in the Land Use Change Report. <a href="https://everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/23602/Land-Use-Change-Report-6-08-20?bidId=">https://everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/23602/Land-Use-Change-Report-6-08-20?bidId=</a>
<a href="#">Chan, Jack</a>	7-28	It is unclear what the duplex restriction is regarding square footage outlined in <a href="#">EMC 19.08.030</a> in the R-2 zone.	EMC 19.08.030 points to <a href="#">EMC 19.06</a> for minimum lot area and density requirements. The minimum lot area for a two-unit dwelling is 7,500 square feet and the maximum density is 1 unit per 3,750 square feet.

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
<a href="#">Shockey, Reid</a>	7-22	Solomon School at 9506 7 <sup>th</sup> Avenue SE is zoned R2A and will be zoned R2A, which currently allows private schools. Will private schools not be allowed in the revised R2A?	Private schools are allowed in R-2A. A previous draft of the Use Tables did not have many uses identified in this zone but was corrected prior to public hearing. See <a href="#">EMC 19.05.110</a> .
<a href="#">Bailey, Todd</a>	7-17	Why, in 2020, are we using lumber and wood based products when steel beams and concrete siding would prevent major fires?	This is primarily a building and fire code issue.
<a href="#">Wolken, Mark</a>	7-15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The definition of railway is odd and does not work well within the Use Table.</li> <li>2. Recycling and composting are ignored.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amendments are proposed in both the Use Table and the definitions to address this concern. The intent was to require a Conditional Use for a rail storage yard, such as the Delta Yard, but not for accessory railway facilities.</li> <li>2. Comments noted. The code has standards for nuisance characteristics in <a href="#">EMC 19.39.060</a>.</li> </ol>
<a href="#">Benson, Greg</a>	7-7	Everett Planning does not adequately inform those most affected by Rethink Zoning.	Comments noted. The city widely distributed a <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a> .
<a href="#">Di Filippo, Angela</a>	7-6	Many individuals living in single-family zones have the time and resources to engage in this sort of public process, whereas other individuals living outside do not. Clinging to old ideas of what a neighborhood looks like or sequestering a significant population to higher-density and mixed-use housing will not help us. We are maintaining a knowingly racist system as zoning has been a tool wielded against communities of color.	Comments noted. The amendments to single-family neighborhoods have been put on hold, but not lost. The City will likely pick up this conversation over the next year.
<a href="#">Ferrell, Tye</a>	7-1	There are increased flood risks from climate change, with substantial increased risk in the areas designated for heavy industrial and light industrial use.	Comments noted.
<a href="#">Port of Everett</a>	6-15	Provided additional comments on Chapter 19.17 regarding Port Compatibility.	These comments were received prior to the July 13 <sup>th</sup> draft and have mostly been incorporated. See <a href="#">EMC 19.17</a> .
<a href="#">Hokanson, Tina</a>	6-16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sidewalks along Evergreen Way and busy arterials in south Everett should be wider.</li> <li>2. Trees should be planted along Evergreen Way between travel lanes and sidewalks.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sidewalk widths are based on street designations. In <a href="#">EMC 19.33</a>, Evergreen Way is designated as either a Pedestrian or Connector Street, which requires a landscape frontage zone and 6-8 feet of sidewalk clear zone, plus 2-6 feet of frontage zone. This provides between 12' and 16' from traffic.</li> <li>2. See above</li> </ol>
<a href="#">Koenig, Elizabeth</a>	6-16	Do not make decisions when the public cannot attend meetings. Specifically concerned about procedure changes because state law allows it.	Comments noted. The city widely distributed a <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a> . See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020 regarding procedure and process issues.

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
<a href="#">Bartanen, Kat</a>	6-16	Rethink Zoning has proceeded without input from the public.	Comments noted. The city widely distributed a <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a> .
<a href="#">Naval Station Everett</a>	6-15	Supports the changes to Chapter 19.17 regarding Naval Station Everett. One edit to 19.17.120 is recommended.	The suggested edits were incorporated into the 7-13 draft that went to public hearing. See <a href="#">EMC 19.17.120</a> .
<a href="#">Harker, Jamie</a>	6-9	Should focus zoning issues on poorer residents and people of color.	Comments noted. The City will likely pick up the conversation about single-family zones over the next year.
<a href="#">Pevery, Kent</a>	6-3	Not in favor of eliminating public notice or posting of sites for land division. Most people do not constantly monitor the city website to keep abreast of things happening in their neighborhood.	Comments noted. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020 regarding procedure and process issues.
<a href="#">Ries, Ken</a>	6-3	The City should temporarily stop the Rethink Zoning project.	Comments noted.
<a href="#">Satti-Hewat, Jean</a>	6-3	Concerned about the process and timeline.	Comments noted.
<a href="#">Mohammad, Ismail</a>	6-2	Provided links to Seattle changes for DAD and AADU.	Comments noted
<a href="#">Tucker, Andrea</a>	6-2	Slow down changes to Rethink Zoning in the midst of a global pandemic, economic meltdown and national unrest.	Comments noted. The city widely distributed a <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a> .
<a href="#">Koenig, Dave</a>	5-31	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The City Council needs to develop direction on what Council actions you are willing to review and act on in the COVID-19 remote system</li> <li>2. Rethink Zoning is complicated and city council needs to understand the proposed changes.</li> <li>3. Supportive of pause on single-family and transit overlay. Subdivision changes and historic overlay changes should also be paused.</li> <li>4. What is happening to contract rezones</li> <li>5. What happens to Riverfront, Waterfront Center and other custom zones.</li> <li>6. All property owners should receive a notice</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff has provided city council with updates on Rethink Zoning on <a href="#">June 10<sup>th</sup></a> and on <a href="#">July 29<sup>th</sup></a>.</li> <li>2. See above, particularly the summary of changes provided to city council on <a href="#">July 29<sup>th</sup></a>.</li> <li>3. Comments noted. Land division changes are warranted to create a Unified Development Code and remove provisions unrelated to land division (post-development), which also create conflicts. No substantive changes are proposed to historic overlay. See <a href="#">summary</a> for historic overlay.</li> <li>4. Contract rezones being repealed can be found <a href="#">here</a> and contract rezones being retained found <a href="#">here</a>. All property owners in the areas proposed for repeal have been notified, and no comments have been received.</li> <li>5. See response above.</li> <li>6. All property owners with comprehensive plan land use changes or who's contract rezone is proposed to be repealed were provided notice. Several inquiries and some requests came through due to those notices.</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
<a href="#">Fingarson, Bruce</a>	3-11	Concerned about heights of buildings at the west end of Pacific Ave to Bond Ave, bordering Federal Ave.	The heights in Rethink are not changed from current ordinance. They were increased, however, in the Metro Everett actions in 2018.
<a href="#">Koenig, Dave</a>	1-17	Building heights	These comments address several issues no longer part of the Rethink Zoning package of code amendments. The one item regarding height modifications is similar to comments made by Mr. Koenig on 8-12 and answered above.
<a href="#">Shockey, Reid</a>	1-2	Curious if owner-occupancy of ADUs will be addressed	The current draft of code amendments do not change the requirements for owner-occupancy of ADUs. An earlier version modified those requirements, but it has since been removed.
<a href="#">Koenig, Dave</a>	8-26-19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Historic Overlay Zones should remain in place and continued.</li> <li>2. Rucker Hill and Federal Ave south of Rucker Hill should be UR1</li> <li>3. Lowell Neighborhood should be UR1</li> <li>4. Adding single family attached and cottage housing to all residential zones is a concern without seeing what is proposed for standards.</li> <li>5. Have not found the reason or goal for changing building heights. Suggests changing building heights in UR1 zone to 25 feet.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Historic Overlay Zones remain in place.</li> <li>2. No changes to single family zoning are proposed at this time.</li> <li>3. No changes to single family zoning are proposed at this time.</li> <li>4. Single family attached and cottage housing standards are found in <a href="#">EMC 19.08</a>.</li> <li>5. Comments noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Oral comments received at Planning Commission public hearing 8-18-20</b>			
Koenig, Dave	8-18	Comments covered topics addressed in written comments dated 8-12	See response to written comments
Satti-Hewat, Jean	8-18	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Commented that there is an upzone for R-3 zones, including density and reduced lot sizes.</li> <li>2. Historic Overlay has no protection because it is subject to staff decision.</li> <li>3. Proposal eliminates the requirement for a demolition waiver.</li> <li>4. Concerned about modification of how building heights are measured.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the historic overlays, the density is limited to what is currently allowed in the R-3 zone: 29 units per acre. See <a href="#">EMC 19.06.100.D</a>. Outside of historic overlays, there is no density limit on R-3 zones. However, experience shows that what limits density is market conditions, off-street parking, building heights, required open space, lot coverage and setbacks.</li> <li>2. The Planning Director has always been the person who receives recommendations from the Historical Commission. Most recommendations have been upheld.</li> <li>3. The draft changes the review authority for demolition of an Everett Historic Register Property</li> </ol>

Commenter	Date	Comments	Response
			from City Council to Planning Director. An amendment is proposed. 4. See response to other written comments regarding height modifications
Mohammad, Ismail	8-18	Noted that some changes regarding micro housing are proposed that could affect projects being planned. Also mentioned tandem parking and parking for zip cars	Comments noted. The definition for micro-housing has changed to require the units to be in a multifamily building of no less than 24 units. This was done due to concerns that conversion of smaller buildings could result in under parking. An amendment could be considered.
Casey, Glynis (NSE)	8-18	Appreciate the work and support what is within Chapter 19.17. SEPA can be a positive public engagement tool that can be used.	Comments noted
Tucker, Andrea	8-18	Giving public notice in the historic districts is helpful. Concerned about the way heights are measured.	Comments noted. See <a href="#">memo</a> dated August 28, 2020.