

June 24, 2021

RE: Amendments to Home Occupation Regulations

To Dan Eernisse and City of Everett Planning Commission:

I have the following concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the home occupation regulations:

1. A resident across the street from me was in the tow truck business and was being dispatched out of his home. There was no activity occurring on the property other than him receiving phone calls or texts, but the tow truck was parked in the street and was very noisy when warming up or idling for long periods, including hours at a time. This occurred all times of the day and night, and woke us up multiple times at night. I'm sure it was great for the resident to be home for meals and to sleep in his own bed while waiting for callouts, but the noise from the truck truly disturbed our sleep/well-being.

When I submitted a complaint about this, there was a lot of discussion about whether it was a violation of the home occupation regulations because the only activity occurring on the property was receiving a phone call. The tow truck was idling/parked in the street. Please add text to the code that explicitly ensures this type of use is not permitted as a home occupation.

The code does state that "no noise.....shall be emitted other than is commonly associated with a residential use. That could be amended to include noise from activities that occur on the site or offsite in the general vicinity of the property, including in the public right-of-way. Or just to prohibit specific vehicles outright.

2. I'm concerned that you are opening up residential neighborhoods to uses that allow more employees and customer visits. Everett commercial zones are underutilized. Allowing commercial uses as home occupations takes away opportunities for commercial properties to prosper, and provides an unfair advantage to commercial uses operating from homes vs. commercial areas.
3. I have major concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of multiple changes that Everett is proposing. The Rethink Housing proposals provide for higher densities in residential areas within a quarter mile of transit **areas**, such as Broadway, and require less or no parking, such as for accessory dwelling units. Many of the old housing units in this area already have minimal parking and rely on on-street parking. Now you would allow commercial uses with more employees and clients in these zones as home occupations, with no additional parking required. The cumulative impacts of these actions on existing single family neighborhoods could be significant.

The proposed code states, "Parking of employee, student, customer, or client vehicles shall not create any hazard or congestion." How does/will the City define congestion? Will there be a parking analysis required for every home occupation? How will congestion from on-street parking from normal residential use, including proposed increased densities and no or reduced parking for some residential uses, be distinguished from congestion from a business's

employees and clients? If you are prioritizing increased housing in transit oriented areas, you shouldn't be allowing expansion of commercial uses into the areas without an analysis of the cumulative impacts of on-street parking availability.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Cunningham
1605 Oakes Ave
Everett, WA 98201
teamwebermc@gmail.com