

**Planning Commission  
MS Team Virtual Meeting  
Meeting Minutes  
September 7, 2021**

Approved: *Jand*



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

Commissioners Absent at Roll Call: Chris Holland, Kathryn Beck, Carly McGinn, Michael Finch and Alex Lark

Staff Present: Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Rebecca McCrary, and Kathy Davis

Meeting Minutes

**Motion:** Commissioner Zelinski made a motion to approve the August 17, 2021 meeting minutes. Commissioner Lavra seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Adkins, yes; 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 the upcoming home occupation regulations before City Council, Housing Action Plan before City Council, the countywide planning policies, and census 2020 information.

**Commissioner Kathryn Beck joined the meeting.**

General Citizen Comments

Ismail Mohammed, 3102 Rucker Avenue, asked staff if there were more permit applications and increased construction this year than last year due to the pandemic. Mr. Yorik Stevens-Wajda responded that staff had experienced high volumes of permit applications and there wasn't much of a break from those levels at any point during the pandemic.

**Item 1: Comprehensive Plan Parks Element and Parks Impact Fees Briefing**

Bob Leonard, Parks Department Director, introduced the consultant team working on the Parks Element and Parks Impact Fees.

Lisa Grueter, Berk Consulting, presented information on the overall Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update, background on the information and engagement process, the Parks Element updates, and Parks Impact Fee information. John Hennessy, Berk Consulting, presented more detailed information on the draft parks impact fees. Ms. Grueter presented information on the next steps.

#### Commission Discussion

Chair Yanasak asked about the schedule. Ms. Grueter responded that as part of the docket, the matter would come back to Commission as a public hearing. Chair Yanasak asked if Commissioners were being asked whether the City should implement a parks impact fee or asked to make a recommendation regarding the various options. Ms. McCrary responded that the matter before Planning Commission is part of the docket under consideration. Planning Commission recommendation on the Ordinance would go to City Council.

Commissioner Zelinski stated that given the amount of information to review and the September 21 public hearing already scheduled, he asked that the commission's action on the resolution be moved to the meeting in October. Chair Yanasak agreed.

Commissioner Beck stated that she would like more background information on the policies and commitments that were implemented in the previous parks plan. She commented that two weeks was too short of time to make a recommendation with all the information that needed to be reviewed.

Commissioner Lavra asked about the list of projects and the hard surface preservation program. Ms. Grueter responded that the list of projects included the City's current capital improvements list and potential projects that were not already listed. Average costs were reviewed based on example projects both in the city and in the region. Mr. Leonard added that projects within the next year or two were further along than projects that were ten years out. The hardscape preservation program included parking lots, sidewalks, and pathways in and around the parks system.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda suggested that Planning Commission could hold the public hearing on September 21<sup>st</sup> and make a recommendation at the following meeting in October. As to the specific options, the City would like feedback on the options presented in preparation for the public hearing. The intent is to move forward with a solid recommendation to City council for their work. The recommendation could include a supporting note regarding fiscal considerations not in the scope of Planning Commission.

Ms. Grueter added that a parks impact fee was addressed in the existing Comprehensive Plan Parks Element policies as one method to ensure that growth pays for growth since parks are seen as an amenity to help the City achieve the growth targets.

Chair Yanasak asked about Table 3 in the staff report. Ms. Grueter explained that the residential equivalent addressed in the first row was the baseline and the three options shown vary from that baseline. He preferred that the options listed be listed as 4 options in Table 3.

Chair Yanasak provided the following comments: 1) How are the parks currently funded; 2) What would happen if the City didn't impose an impact fee; 3) How does that correlate to new development and housing affordability; 4) How employees vs. residents are calculated; and, 5) How would the collection of impact fees address barriers to parks/access issues such as sidewalks and bus service that are affecting the level of service. He added that he was supportive of parks; however, he felt that citizens would probably want more information on how the park impact fees would be implemented.

Commissioner Lavra appreciated that the consultant provided more detailed information on how the residential equivalent was calculated in the presentation. She suggested that the park impact fee should include an exemption for housing affordability.

Commissioner Zelinski supports parks impact fees. He commented that the residential equivalency for employees should be firmly established for park impact fees.

Citizen Comments

Dylan Sluder, Master Builders Association, was concerned about the timeline, and the increase in development costs. The National Association of Home Builders annual priced out data estimates that for every \$1,000 increase in the median price of a home in Washington, 2,524 households are priced out. In looking at Everett housing needs, there is going to be approximately 23,000 new housing units for all income levels in the planning period. Increasing costs disincentivizes housing and makes it even harder to build the needed homes in Everett. He will send in a comment letter.

Laura McMurray, 2501 Baker Avenue, recommended that businesses be included in the comparable calculation of park impact fees. She asked if the City was considering the changes in work structure and building structure. Mixed use development changes the dynamic of the work and living space relationship. There is a very different labor structure where people are working remotely as independent contractors and gig economy. She was also concerned about affordable housing.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda thanked everyone for their comments. Staff will review the comments and come back to Commissioners with an updated staff report at the September 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Commissioner Beck stated that she would like information about lessons learned from other jurisdictions in the region who have implemented park impact fees. She was concerned about housing costs.

**ADJOURNED 8:10 PM**

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

11/3/21  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

10-6-2021  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

