

**Planning Commission  
MS Team Virtual Meeting  
Meeting Minutes  
October 5, 2021**

Approved:     *kmd*    



Chair Adam Yanasak called the meeting to order. Commissioners in attendance: Chris Holland, Christine Lavra, Michael Zelinski, Michael Finch, and Charles Adkins.

Commissioners Absent: Kathryn Beck, Carly McGinn, and Alex Lark  
Staff Present: Yorik Stevens-Wajda and Kathy Davis

Meeting Minutes

**Motion:** Commissioner Lavra made a motion to approve the September 7, 2021 meeting minutes. Commissioner Zelinski seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Adkins, yes; Commissioner Finch, abstain; Commissioner Lavra, yes; Commissioner Zelinski, yes; and Chair Yanasak; yes.

**Motion Carried.**

Commissioner Reports

None

Staff Comments

Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Planning Director, provided updates on past planning commission items including the rethink housing action plan, housing action plan implementation grant, and home occupation regulations. He also updated Commission on the countywide planning policies, buildable lands report, growth targets, and the City's comprehensive plan periodic update.

General Citizen Comments

None

**ITEM 5 – PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Item A: Comprehensive Plan designation amendment and rezone for 7500 Hardeson Road**

Mr. Stevens-Wajda, Planning Director, provided a brief overview of the 2021 package of comprehensive plan, which includes three items, then presented information on the first item: a property owner request for a future land use map redesignation and rezone at 7500 Hardeson Road.

Commission Discussion

None

Citizen Comments

None

**Motion:** Commissioner Finch made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Zelinski seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Adkins, yes; Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; Commissioner Zelinski, yes; Commissioner Holland, yes; and Chair Yanasak; yes.

**Motion Carried.**

**Item B: Smith Island Annexation Map Amendments**

Mr. Stevens-Wajda, Planning Director, presented information on the city-initiated Smith Island annexation map corrections.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zelinski would like more information on the history of the site and the 7-story maximum building height. Commissioner Lavra agreed.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that the 7 stories would accommodate a full-range of industrial uses that could locate on Smith Island such as an elevated conveyor belt or materials storage. Smith Island is in shoreline jurisdiction, so developments would need to comply with the City's shoreline policies and regulations. He added that he would research the history of the site and bring that information back to Commission at their next meeting on October 19.

Commissioner Lavra suggested a four-story height limit might be appropriate in that western portion because the site was a lower lying area with a log yard and was in the floodplain.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that the site might be filled out of the 100-year floodplain but either way is in shoreline jurisdiction; however, he would come back to Commission with more information in response to Commissioner comments at their next meeting on October 19.

Commissioner Holland asked that the two maps shown in the presentation be added to the resolution. Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that he would add the maps.

Citizen Comments

None

Chair Yanasak stated that the public hearing would remain open until October 19. Commissioners in agreement.

### **Item C: Comprehensive Plan Parks, Capital Facilities Elements and Parks Impact Fees**

Bob Leonard, Parks Director, introduced Lisa Grueter, Berk Consulting, who worked with the Parks Department on the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update, the Parks Element updates, and Parks Impact Fee information.

Lisa Grueter, Berk Consulting, presented information on the schedule, PROS Plan background, and the update to the Comprehensive Plan elements, proposed parks impact fee with a companion change for a fee in lieu program, and next steps.

#### Commission Discussion

Commissioner Finch asked if the impact fees would only be used for growth and not maintenance of existing parks. Ms. Grueter responded yes. The fees could be used for new parks, trails, or increasing the size of a facility such as adding a ballfield, expanding a playground, or other things that would add capacity for more people.

Commissioner Finch asked what the total fee was for all impact fees charged for one unit of new development. Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that the fees would depend on the development type. School district impact fees are assessed differently for each residential development type. Traffic impact fees are assessed on the number of trips estimated to be generated by the development. Commissioner Finch stated that from a developer's perspective, they would consider the total cost of all impact fees for their development. He requested more information on the total amount of impact fees.

Commissioner Finch asked if there were certain types of development that are exempt from impact fees. Ms. Grueter responded educational and government facilities. There is a reduced fee for low-income housing. Commissioner Finch suggested not reducing the impact fee for different housing income types.

Commissioner Finch asked what triggered the pursuit of grant funding – having a park impact fee or the amount of the impact fee. Ms. Grueter responded that the Recreation Conservation Office requires a PROS Plan to be eligible for grants. Having the impact fee creates matching dollars so the City can apply for larger grant funds.

Commissioner Finch asked if there was a level of service comparison with other cities. Ms. Grueter stated that they did collect some benchmark data prior to completing the PROS Plan which generally revealed that Everett wasn't outperforming other communities similar in size. Mr. Leonard added that if

the City was looking at a strict acreage per 1000 residents, Everett would be at the lower end of the spectrum.

Commissioner Finch asked if there was park capacity in areas inventoried for future growth. Ms. Grueter responded that in terms of where the park assets are, some of them are in proximity to where growth is planned; however, there are 10-minute walk gap areas near the station areas, along Evergreen Way, and the Metro Everett area. Commissioner Finch stated the City should consider ways that those residents get a high level of service.

Commissioner Finch asked about fee-in-lieu. Ms. Grueter responded that multiple family developments currently require common/outdoor space. The existing regulations allow a fee in lieu if a developer prefers to maximize on-site units instead of providing open space. Commissioner Finch asked if the fee-in-lieu would fund only projects within the area of the new multiple-family development or be included in a general fund that could be used for parks citywide. Ms. Grueter responded that the collected fee goes into a general fund and would have to be spent within a specific time on projects listed in the capital facilities element.

Commissioner Finch stated that it would be interesting to see a comparison of the proposed impact fees as they relate to rents, and median home prices and values with other cities. Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that the City did review the impacts of the new fee on a couple example developments; however, there were other variables to consider when comparisons are made between cities such as tax rates and the market. The park impact fee helps maintain an asset that's important, both to the city's residents in terms of quality of life, but also to the city's competitiveness and ability to attract residential and commercial development, while making sure Everett is in line with competing cities.

Commissioner Zelinski supported the impact fee proposal as written.

#### Citizen Comments

Dylan Sluder, Master Builders Association Snohomish County manager, stated that he previously provided written comments on the issue. He suggested a longer timeline for phasing in the new impact fee. Regarding the growth percentages and levels of service, he wanted assurance that the new park impact fee was a reasonable rate and one that would address the capacity needs. Research from the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) estimated that when an impact fee was imposed, total developer and builder costs increased by 137% of the fee. NAHB's annual priced out data estimated that for every \$1000.00 increase in the price of a home in Washington, approximately 2500 households were priced out. Additional fees matter when it comes to housing affordability.

Laura McMurray, 2501 Baker Avenue, stated that she was very grateful that the City was considering a park impact fee. She was in favor of maximizing the funds for expanding City parks. Expanding the City's green spaces was a very important component of dealing with climate change. She added that she was supportive of affordable housing; however, sometimes affordable housing changes to market

rate housing over time. Because of that, she felt that there shouldn't be a reduction in impact fees for affordable housing.

Chair Yanasak asked if the 50% reduction in the impact fee as proposed by staff was adequate to keep up with the level of service if there was a lack of additional funding sources. Ms. Grueter responded if there were no other funding sources beyond what the city already contributed plus the impact fee there probably would need to be some adjustment to the level of service; however, by phasing the level of service and completing the PROS Plan, that should allow enough room to seek other funding sources. Built into the impact fee process was a 5-year review to see if any adjustments were needed. Mr. Leonard added that it was hard to say whether the City's actual level of service would keep pace with the proposed level of service, but there were some strategies to make that happen. From his perspective, the 50% impact fee would help.

Chair Yanasak appreciated the simplified presentation and the work that went into the new proposal. He commented that it might be more helpful for developers to have a longer phase in period for those projects that were farther along in their development process.

**Motion:** Chair Yanasak made a motion to continue the public hearings on 5B and 5C to October 19, 2021. Commissioner Lavra seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Adkins, yes; Commissioner Finch, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; Commissioner Zelinski, yes; Commissioner Holland, yes; and Chair Yanasak; yes.

**Motion Carried.**

**ADJOURNED 8:20 PM**

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

11/3/21  
Date

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

10-19-2021  
Date

