

# 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).

<i>For all amendments</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1. Meeting with Planning Staff</b>	A pre-application meeting is required with <b>Planning</b> staff (Long Range Division) prior to submitting this application. To schedule a meeting contact Karen Stewart at (425) 257-7186 or <a href="mailto:kstewart@everettwa.gov">kstewart@everettwa.gov</a> .
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>2. Applicant name and address</b>	<i>Nate &amp; Leta Holt 602 Warren Ave Everett WA 98201</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="radio"/> Comprehensive plan – <b>text, goals, objectives, policies</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Comprehensive plan – <b>land use map</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> <b>Development regulations – Title 19 EMC</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Development regulations – <b>Zoning map</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Development regulations – <b>Maximum building height map</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Development regulations – <b>Street designation map</b></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>
<i>For site-specific amendments</i>	
<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>Nate &amp; Leta Holt 602 Warren Ave Everett WA 98201</i>
<i>Signature</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Applicant signature</b>	<i>Nate &amp; Leta Holt</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><b><i>Inadequate public notice. See Kristin Hall's application</i></b></p> <p>In 2018 the Port of Everett proposed a last-minute zoning change which neighbors including my family opposed due to the impact to our property value, lack of public review, input, or due process. Despite our neighborhood's written and founded objections in 2018 to the proposed "Port compatibility Zone" sometime in 2020 the Port of Everett has successfully passed with the Everett Planning Department a zoning change for our neighborhood affecting roughly 240-300 households, again without public input or consideration. The zoning change to the Rucker Hill area from residential to include what is termed a "Port compatibility zone" requires residents to accept repercussions from port activities and prevent us from complaining about issues such as port noise, dust, light or visual impacts from their activities going forward. It also removes the Port's responsibility to mitigate with commercially available solutions said impacts. For all intense and purposes the impact to our residential neighborhood from this zoning change is our historic neighborhood is now an industrial zone. To make matters worse, every property within the Port compatibility zone is now required to include the following statement on their property title which certainly impacts each of our property values.</p> <p>"Your real property is located within the Port Compatibility Area (PCA). Occupants of properties within the PCA may be subject to inconveniences or discomforts arising from maritime activities, including but not limited to noise, odors, glare, fumes, dust, construction activity, smoke, traffic, hours of operation, low overhead flights and other maritime activities. Everett Municipal Code (EMC) 19.17 requires that you receive this disclosure notice in connection with permits you are or may be seeking. Provisions of EMC 20.08 provide that noise exemptions apply to "created by watercraft ... in operation", and "operation of equipment or facilities of surface carriers engaged in commerce by railroad". The City of Everett has adopted PCA regulations in Chapter 19.17 EMC which may affect you and your land."</p> <p>The City of Everett should repeal this zoning change based on the lack of public input, the significant impact to residents and our historic neighborhoods and the lack of due process.</p> <p>The email below outlines similar objections to the zoning proposal in 2018 which was abandoned at that time. When this was passed in 2020 the approval committed process committed the same missteps outlined in our 2018 objections but instead was passed. The Port compatibility zone should be removed for the above reasons.</p> <p>Opposed to LU 24 Yahoo/Sent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">•</p>



**nate holt** <nateholt2002@yahoo.com>

To:metro@everttwa.gov

Tue, Mar 6, 2018 at 8:58 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I just read a disturbing land use proposal from the Port of Everett being considered by the city of Everett on March 20<sup>th</sup> Titled LU-24.

The immediate concern is the one-sided land use definition as proposed would eliminate the Port's obligation to work with residents and with the City of Everett to abide with regulations to mitigate or reduce their impacts from noise and light pollution as well as view obstructions and beach access to name a few select common issues. Allowing a land use proposal such as this will allow the Port of Everett to operate without accountability or regard to its neighbors, constituents and the City of Everett and further degrades the very environment Everett residents and new arrivals desire to maintain and foster.

Additionally, the proposal if approved would have a material negative financial impact to property values requiring home owners to record, "LU-24: New residential and mixed-use development within the Port Compatibility Area shown in Figure 27 will require notice on the title advising of the potential impacts associated with living/working in close proximity to an active marine terminal." We will join you on March 20<sup>th</sup> to oppose this one-sided land use proposal that benefits the Port at the unnecessary expense of their neighbors and constituents. On behalf of our neighborhoods please do not allow LU-24 to pass.

Thank you,

Nate & Leta Holt

*Clearly and completely address the factors below for each amendment category selected in question 3*

Comprehensive plan – text, goals, objectives, policies

EMC 15.03.400(E) The following factors shall be considered in reviewing proposed amendments to comprehensive plan policies.

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.

*[Insert comments here]*

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.

*[Insert comments here]*



	<p>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 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>

	<i>[Insert comments here]</i>
Development regulations – Title 19 EMC	<p>EMC 15.03.300(C)(4) The city may amend the text of the unified development code if it finds that:</p> <p>a. The proposed amendment is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Everett comprehensive plan; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>b. The proposed amendment bears a substantial relation to public health, safety or welfare; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>c. The proposed amendment promotes the best long-term interests of the Everett community <i>[Insert comments here]</i></p>
Development regulations – Zoning map	<p>EMC 15.03.300(B)(4) The review authority may approve an application for a site-specific rezone if it finds that:</p> <p>a. The proposed rezone is consistent with the Everett comprehensive plan; and <i>[Insert comments here]</i></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p>
Development regulations – Maximum building height map	
Development regulations – Street designation map	