

## SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

*Applications must include the items on this checklist, and the checklist, to be complete*

This submittal checklist and application is for formal requests to change the comprehensive plan or development regulations pursuant to state law (RCW [36.70A.470](#)) and Everett Planning Director Interpretation 2023-01.

For questions, or to submit an application, contact Karen Stewart at [kstewart@everettwa.gov](mailto:kstewart@everettwa.gov).

<b>For all amendments</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1. Meeting with Planning Staff</b>	A pre-application meeting is required with <a href="#">Planning</a> staff (Long Range Division) prior to submitting this application. To schedule a meeting contact Karen Stewart at <b>(425) 257-7186</b> or <a href="mailto:kstewart@everettwa.gov">kstewart@everettwa.gov</a> .
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>2. Applicant name and address</b>	<i>[Insert applicant name and address here]</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>3. Other contacts (if applicable)</b>	<i>[Insert other contacts here]</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>3. Amendment category</b>	Highlight all that would require amendment as part of the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive plan – <a href="#">text, goals, objectives, policies</a></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive plan – <a href="#">land use map</a></li> <li style="background-color: yellow;"><input type="checkbox"/> Development regulations – <a href="#">Title 19 EMC</a></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Development regulations – <a href="#">Zoning map</a></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Development regulations – <a href="#">Maximum building height map</a></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Development regulations – <a href="#">Street designation map</a></li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>4. Narrative Statement and criteria</b>	Written statement describing the exact request, the reason for the request, and how the request meets applicable criteria. <b>Use Attachment A.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>5. Environmental Checklist</b>	Submit <b>one</b> completed and signed copy of the SEPA Environmental Checklist <b>and</b> Optional Worksheet for Non-Project Review, available on Ecology’s website: <a href="https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-document-templates">https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-document-templates</a>
<b>For site-specific amendments</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A. Map of Site (for location-specific amendments)</b>	For location-specific amendments, a map clearly showing the area the request would apply to.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>B. Property owner name(s) and address(es)</b>	<i>Susan Hawkey 629 33<sup>rd</sup> Street Everett, WA 98201</i>
<b>Signature</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Applicant signature</b>	<i>Susan Hawkey</i>

## Attachment A

### Narrative Statement and Evaluation Criteria

All applications must be accompanied by a narrative statement describing how the proposal is consistent with the following applicable criteria. Staff can only recommend that a proposal advance if it meets the applicable criteria.

Description of the exact request	Amend Section 19.17 of the EMC to remove all references to a Port Compatibility Overlay or Port Compatibility Area, including removal of the Port Compatibility Area from Map 17-2.
Reason for the request	<p>Inadequate public notice.</p> <p>See Kristin Hall's application (draft attached) for further details.</p> <p>As a resident of the Port Gardner neighborhood, a tax payer, and a citizen living in the port compatibility area, I am requesting the city of Everett put the needs of its homeowners ahead of the Port of Everett and protect our properties. The Port has always maintained its own interest and we have always relied on the city to support and protect all property and citizens within the Port Gardner neighborhood. Our neighborhood is not controlled by the Port of Everett nor should it ever be. Rucker Hill is a historic neighborhood and should be preserved as such and not be included in the port compatibility area. Above all it is a neighborhood, not a part of the Port of Everett and should not be zoned as such.</p> <p>Please bring this matter to the attention of all necessary city of Everett personnel/staff that can help bring an immediate end to this amendment.</p>
<i>Clearly and completely address the factors below for each amendment category selected in question 3</i>	
Comprehensive plan – text, goals, objectives, policies	<p>EMC 15.03.400(E) The following factors shall be considered in reviewing proposed amendments to comprehensive plan policies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have circumstances related to the subject policy changed sufficiently since the adoption of the plan to justify a change to the subject policy? If so, the circumstances that have changed should be described in detail to support the proposed amendment to the policy. <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> <li>2. Are the assumptions upon which the policy is based erroneous, or is new information available that was not considered at the time the plan was adopted, that justify a change to the policy? If so, the erroneous assumptions or new information should be described in detail to support the proposed policy amendment. <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> <li>3. Does the proposed change in policy promote a more desirable growth pattern for the community as a whole? The manner in which the proposed policy change promotes a more</li> </ol>



	<p>desirable growth pattern should be described in detail.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>4. Is the proposed policy change consistent with other existing plan policies, or does it conflict with other plan policies? The extent to which the proposed policy change is consistent with or conflicts with other existing policies should be explained in detail.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p>
<p>Comprehensive plan – land use map</p>	<p>EMC 15.03.400(D) The following factors shall be considered in reviewing requests to amend the comprehensive plan land use map.</p> <p>1. The proposed land use designation must be supported by or consistent with the existing policies of the various elements of the comprehensive plan.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>2. Have circumstances related to the subject property and the area in which it is located changed sufficiently since the adoption of the land use element to justify a change to the land use designation? If so, the circumstances that have changed should be described in detail to support findings that a different land use designation is appropriate.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>3. Are the assumptions upon which the land use designation of the subject property is based erroneous, or is new information available which was not considered at the time the land use element was adopted, that justify a change to the land use designation? If so, the erroneous assumptions or new information should be described in detail to enable the planning commission and city council to find that the land use designation should be changed.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>4. Does the proposed land use designation promote a more desirable land use pattern for the community as a whole? If so, a detailed description of the qualities of the proposed land use designation that make the land use pattern for the community more desirable should be provided to enable the planning commission and city council to find that the proposed land use designation is in the community's best interest.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>5. Should the proposed land use designation be applied to other properties in the vicinity? If so, the reasons supporting the change of several properties should be described in detail. If not, the reasons for changing the land use designation of a single site, as requested by the proponent, should be provided in sufficient detail to enable the planning commission and city council to find that approval as requested does not constitute a grant of special privilege to the proponent or a single owner of property.</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>6. What impacts would the proposed change of land use designation have on the current use of other properties in the vicinity, and what measures should be taken to assure compatibility with the uses of other properties in the vicinity?</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>7. Would the change of the land use designation sought by the proponent create pressure to change the land use designation of other properties in the vicinity? If so, would the change of land use designation for other properties be in the best long-term interests of the community in general?</p> <p><i>[Insert comments here]</i></p>

<p>Development regulations – Title 19 EMC</p>	<p>EMC 15.03.300(C)(4) The city may amend the text of the unified development code if it finds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposed amendment is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Everett comprehensive plan; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> <li>b. The proposed amendment bears a substantial relation to public health, safety or welfare; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> <li>c. The proposed amendment promotes the best long-term interests of the Everett community <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> </ul>
<p>Development regulations – Zoning map</p>	<p>EMC 15.03.300(B)(4) The review authority may approve an application for a site-specific rezone if it finds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposed rezone is consistent with the Everett comprehensive plan; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> </ul>
<p>Development regulations – Maximum building height map</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. The proposed rezone bears a substantial relation to public health, safety or welfare; and the proposed rezone promotes the best long-term interests of the Everett community; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> </ul>
<p>Development regulations – Street designation map</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. The proposed rezone mitigates any adverse impact(s) upon existing or anticipated land uses in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> <li>d. If a comprehensive plan amendment is required in order to satisfy subsection (4)(a) of this section, approval of the comprehensive plan amendment is required prior to or concurrently with the granting of an approval on the rezone. <i>[Insert comments here]</i></li> </ul>



## Karen Stewart

---

**From:** Susie Hawkey <susiehawkey@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 11, 2023 6:47 PM  
**To:** Karen Stewart  
**Cc:** Paula Rhyne; Cassie Franklin; davidsimpson@portofeverett.com; megan.dunn@snoco.org  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: FW: Rucker Hill Zoning change to industrial  
**Attachments:** Kristin-draft.docx; Hawkey\_City of Everett.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have been residing in my current home since 1992. Over the past few years, the noise levels have increased significantly due the Port of Everett operating the cranes at all hours of the day and night. I understand the need for commerce and can tolerate the noise at reasonable hours, but as said by other neighbors, the Port of Everett has **not** been a good neighbor these past few years as they have increased the noise at unreasonable hours with cranes operating past 11pm. And now they have the audacity to change the zoning code without adequate notification and input from the homeowners on Rucker Hill. This tactic of bullying the citizens of Everett by the Port of Everett is appalling and needs to be stopped.

Please find my attached request for a change in this comprehensive plan. Kristen Hall's application is also attached to provide more detail and mirror my concerns.

Please reply to this email to confirm receipt of the applications.

Susie

---

**From:** ruckerhill@googlegroups.com <ruckerhill@googlegroups.com> on behalf of Earl Martin <tbirdmojo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 11, 2023 12:15 PM  
**To:** Gene O'Neil <geneoneil@madronasales.com>  
**Cc:** Dawn O'Neil <dawnoneil702@gmail.com>; Karen Stewart <kstewart@everettwa.gov>; Prhyne@everettwa.gov <Prhyne@everettwa.gov>; cfranklin@everettwa.gov <cfranklin@everettwa.gov>; cwitters@comcast.net <cwitters@comcast.net>; davidsimpson@portofeverett.com <davidsimpson@portofeverett.com>; megan.dunn@snoco.org <megan.dunn@snoco.org>; nateholt2002@yahoo.com <nateholt2002@yahoo.com>; ruckerhill@googlegroups.com <ruckerhill@googlegroups.com>; witters@eskimo.com <witters@eskimo.com>  
**Subject:** Re: FW: Rucker Hill Zoning change to industrial

It's well documented that the Port (a tax payer supported public entity) has a spotty history with being a good neighbor.

It's difficult to understand the necessary audacity required to suggest one's neighbors should quietly accept a legal codification of a blanket indemnity clause allowing for unchecked continued abuse of their property and family's quality of life.

Hopefully our elected public policy makers and leaders will prioritize the importance of building healthy relations between our citizen's interests in maintaining healthy neighborhoods and the regional commercial interests of our valuable Port of Everett.

The Port's proposal is a non-starter.

Dr. Earl Martin