

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 18, 2022  
APPROVED:     kmd**



**1. ROLL CALL**

Chair Michael Finch called the meeting to order. Commissioners in attendance: Christine Lavra, Adam Yanasak, Michael Zelinski, Carly McGinn, Demi Chatters, Kevin Ballard, and Charles Adkins.

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Becky McCrary, Steve Ingalsbe, Kelsey Heyd, and Kathy Davis

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** Commissioner Lavra made a motion to approve the October 4, 2022, meeting minutes.

Commissioner Chatters seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Commissioner Adkins, yes; Commissioner Ballard, yes; Commissioner Chatters, yes; Commissioner McGinn, yes; Commissioner Zelinski, yes; Commissioner Yanasak, yes; Commissioner Lavra, yes; and Chair Finch; yes.

**Motion Carried.**

**3. REPORTS OF MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES**

Commissioner Ballard stated that the ULI awarded excellence for New Hope Center located on Broadway, which was constructed as a Platinum LEED project. He added that it was the only Platinum LEED project in the city and might be one of the only ones in the state.

**4. STAFF COMMENTS**

Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Planning Director, introduced Becky McCrary, Long Range Planning Manager, Kelsey Hyde, Planner, and Steve Ingalsbe, Land Use Planning Manager who were assisting with the presentation on the accessory dwelling unit code amendments.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda stated that in response to Planning Commission comments during the Baker Heights Redevelopment briefing, the Everett Housing Authority had offered to conduct a tour of their properties accompanied by a discussion about their strategic plan and mission for interested commissioners. Staff would follow-up with Commission on scheduling that tour and the upcoming planning commission meeting dates for the last two meetings of the year.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda provided information on the efforts of the Everett Station District Alliance around planning for the Everett Station District; the comprehensive plan periodic update staff work session on middle housing; and the Housing Action Plan implementation (HAPI) grant work program status.

## 5. OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

### 6.A. ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU) CODE AMENDMENT BRIEFING

Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Planning Director, presented information on the policy guidance from State law, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Vision 2050, the regional housing strategy, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and the Rethink Housing Action Plan. Becky McCrary presented information on the number of accessory dwelling units constructed since December 2020, the potential code amendments discussed with Planning Commission in March 2022, the zones allowed and the definition, the lot size, number of units, and density, the size, setbacks, heights, and parking, and the design standards proposal.

#### Commission Discussion

Chair Finch referred to the proposed no size limit for an ADU located on one level of an existing dwelling and asked if that code amendment would permit duplexes in areas where duplexes weren't previously allowed. Ms. Heyd responded that currently duplexes were allowed in the in R1 zone on lots with a minimum 12,000 sf of lot area and permitted in the R2 zone on lots with a minimum 7500 sf of lot area.

Commissioner Chatters asked about the three-year requirement. Ms. McCrary responded if the primary and accessory unit were constructed at the same time, that structure could be considered a duplex. The three-year limitation would establish the primary unit first. Ms. Heyd added that the three-year limitation was previously in the Code and removed from the Code during the Rethink Zoning process.

Chair Finch stated that another way to get to the same outcome relative to the lot coverage bonus would be to prohibit that bonus to apply to structures that are newer than three years old. So, it would reduce the use of that bonus but would provide for a larger ADU and new construction. Commissioner McGinn supported that solution to allow ADUs within certain parameters. Commissioner Chatters agreed that it didn't make sense to prohibit the ADU from construction along with the primary structure when the resident would already have a major construction project on their site. Chair Finch referred to the presentation slide and suggested the following change:

- Maximum size: 1,000 square feet
- No size limit for an ADU located on one level of an existing dwelling ~~that has existed for at least three years.~~

Commissioner McGinn agreed with removing the limitation. Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that staff would review what would happen if the limitation was removed relative to the existing ADU cases.

Commissioner McGinn was concerned about tall, skinny ADUs adjacent to neighboring property lines. She asked about the challenges with the existing 18-foot height limitation. Ms. Heyd responded that the most common ADU requested was a dwelling unit on top of a garage or workshop space, which was currently not permitted due to the height limitation. In terms of what was being built, staff hadn't had

requests for two-story ADU structures. Commissioner McGinn preferred some language about garages specifically that would allow for more proportional buildings proposed at the 24-foot height. For stand-alone ADUs, the existing height would allow for a 1-1/2 story structure that could eliminate the possibility of a tall skinny ADU. Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that staff would consider that change.

Commissioner Chatters supported the proposal to allow for two stories and asked if two ADUs were allowed on a property and two stories were allowed, could two ADUs stacked on each other be permitted? Ms. McCrary responded that the proposed amendment would allow for that.

Chair Finch asked if the height was measured to the tallest part of the roof. Ms. McCrary responded that heights and setbacks were intertwined. To eliminate a flat roof at 24 feet, the eave height limit was proposed at 18 feet. Chair Finch asked about shed roofs. Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that the proposed language avoids roof pitch and regulates the size of the box or walls. Chair Finch suggested that an example be provided in the code. Mr. Stevens-Wajda commented that staff would review how the proposed language would apply to shed roofs.

Chair Finch recalled an earlier citizen testimony about a neighboring ADU that faced her rear yard and he commented that the proposed height may be exacerbating the situation. He suggested that the setback should be greater than five feet to accommodate the additional height. Commissioner Zelinski commented that the height requirement could include two options – 18 feet with a 5-foot setback or 24 feet with a greater setback.

Commissioner Chatters commented that depending on lot sizes, there may be some homeowners where an ADU would be disallowed because of the additional setback. She stated that the proposed regulations should try to balance the community and homeowner needs. Commissioner Ballard stated that he was supportive of regulations that met Everett's needs to provide more housing opportunities. Commissioner Ballard asked if the city had some examples of ADU proposals for non-alley lots. Ms. Heyd responded that the city had received frequent requests; however, dwelling units proposed on garages weren't currently allowed due to the height limitation.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda stated that staff would review the discrepancy between residential accessory buildings and residential accessory dwelling units. The current regulations allow residents to build a garage or workshop with a 5-foot setback; however, the current regulations disallow an ADU in that same footprint. Mr. Stevens-Wajda added that for the next meeting, he would provide some information about neighborhood patterns and common lot sizes for commission consideration during their discussions on ADU code amendments for heights and setbacks.

Commissioner Adkins stated that reducing parking minimums for ADUs was a recommendation in the Housing Action Plan. Commissioner Chatters asked if there was any data on ADU parking impacts within neighborhoods. She asked why the city required off-street parking if there is no evidence of any parking problems within neighborhoods. Chair Finch agreed.

Mr. Stevens-Wajda responded that the city had a long history of requiring abundant parking for developments. He stated that staff would review and commented that staff could include an exception that if the ADU was further away from transit and on street parking opportunities, that off street parking would be required.

Commissioner Zelinski stated that the city didn't have enough experience with the potential density of ADUs to know whether they would create a parking problem or not., so he had no problem with continuing to require a parking space. His other concern was on the parking threshold. He was concerned about the 1,000-foot threshold.

Commissioner Adkins asked if would be possible to provide optional language that instead of requiring one off street parking space per unit, remove that requirement with an exception for those circumstances where someone was further away from a transit stop and from on street parking.

Commissioner McGinn asked about the amendment to remove the design standards. Ms. McCrary responded that the design standards were somewhat subjective and difficult to implement. Commissioner McGinn commented that the overall quality and character to the existing structure sounded reasonable and very easy to quantify. She wasn't supportive of eliminating design standards all together.

Commissioner Ballard stated that he supported the simplicity and that eliminating the design standards would be helpful in addressing affordability. Chair Finch agreed. Commissioner Chatters stated the existing building codes would potentially address quality standards that would also apply to ADUs in a similar manner. She supported removing the regulations.

Commissioner Zelinski stated that the purpose of the design standards was to tie together the accessory unit with the principal dwelling. He added that there were ways to have simple design standards that provide flexibility to the builder. Options could include selecting a feature from the principle dwelling such as roof pitch, siding, roofing, windows, or construction materials.

Citizen Comments

None

ADJOURNED 8:06 PM

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

12/18/22  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrative Coordinator

11-22-22  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date