

**Community
Development**



**501 Delta Ave
Marysville, WA 98270**

**Planning Commission
February 11, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Leifer. He welcomed new commissioner John Ray who introduced himself.

1) ROLL CALL

Present:

Commission: Chair Stephen Leifer, Vice Chair Brandon Whitaker, Commissioner Gary Kemp, Commissioner Jerry Andes, Commissioner Shanon Jordan, Commissioner Raymond Miller, Commissioner John Ray.

Staff: Community Development Director Haylie Miller, Principal Planner Angela Gemmer, Planning Technician Emily Tsan

2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of December 10, 2024 Minutes

December 10, 2024 PC Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the December 10, 2024 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented moved by Commissioner Raymond Miller seconded by Commissioner Jerry Andes.

AYES: ALL

3) AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

4) OLD BUSINESS

None

5) NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Annual election of Chairperson

Commissioner Andes nominated Steve Leifer as Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion to elect Steve Leifer as Planning Commission Chairperson moved by Commissioner Jerry Andes seconded by Commissioner Gary Kemp.

AYES: ALL

Commissioner Kemp nominated Brandon Whitaker as Vice Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion to elect Brandon Whitaker as Planning Commission Vice Chair moved by Commissioner Gary Kemp seconded by Commissioner Jerry Andes.

AYES: ALL

5.2 Garage sale clean-up code amendments

Garage sale clean-up amendments

Planning Technician Emily Tsan reviewed proposed revisions to the development conditions pertaining to garage sales in the Marysville MMC. This would make it clear that garages sale signs are subject to the temporary sign code, and also clean up confusing language to make it clear that garage sales are an allowed residential use if they comply with the code section.

Commissioner Whitaker asked if a limit of two garage sales per year is typical. Ms. Gemmer explained it is a longstanding provision in the City. There was some discussion about enforcement and how it plays out in multifamily developments.

Motion to schedule a Public Hearing for the garage sale clean-up code amendments moved by Commissioner Raymond Miller seconded by Commissioner Jerry Andes.

AYES: ALL

5.3 Middle Housing - State House Bill 1110

Principal Planner Angela Gemmer made a presentation regarding Middle Housing - State House Bill 1110. She reviewed major middle housing requirements.

- Clarification questions and answers followed regarding density, affordable units, height limits, stormwater standards, and utilities.
- Commissioner Jordan raised a concern about the expense of developers' required improvements not making it "affordable" housing anymore.
- Commissioner Ray wondered why anyone would designate a unit as affordable when it would have to stay that way for 50 years.

- There was some discussion about the drawbacks of the affordable housing designation.
- Commissioner Miller commented on the use of the term "mixed use" housing instead of "low income" housing to protect privacy.

Ms. Gemmer continued to review items for policy consideration:

Unit Types: The City must allow six of the nine possible types of middle housing.

Concerns were raised by several commissioners about the high costs involved for developers in doing frontage improvements, drainage, sewer, and potentially undergrounding utilities. Ms. Gemmer noted there is a threshold involved for undergrounding. She did not think the expectation of undergrounding was likely in an infill situation. Other requirements would be equivalent to single family home requirements. Chair Leifer questioned the wisdom of requiring frontage improvements in areas where no other frontage improvements exist. Ms. Gemmer discussed potential exceptions for frontage improvements. Commissioner Ray brought up the RDI funds and asked what they would be used for. Director Miller explained they were generally earmarked for Public Works capital projects.

Vice Chair Whitaker commented that the middle housing development seems like it will be mostly market-driven at this point. He wondered if there would be any potential penalties from the State for cities that do not reach a certain amount of middle housing. Ms. Gemmer explained there is no prescribed amount of middle housing that jurisdictions are required to meet. They simply have to allow it.

Parking: The statute limits parking within 1/2 mile walking distance of a major transit stop. On lots under 6,000 square feet the City is allowed to have one spot per unit. On lots over 6,000 square feet the City is allowed to have two spots per unit. The City will try to make the case that Marysville should have more parking for safety.

Vehicle Access, carports, garages, and driveway: Ms. Gemmer reviewed potential layouts and stressed that design review is an important aspect of the standards that will be brought forward.

Discussion Questions:

Question 1: Should multiple single family residences be allowed on a lot?

There was discussion about the implications of various configurations and parts of the statute that are unclear. Commissioner Kemp asked about the minimum lot size for someone to be able to build two middle housing units. Ms. Gemmer reviewed current lot sizes and explained staff is still working out the recommendation. There was significant discussion about scenarios for potential future subdivision of lots including short plats or unit lot subdivisions which will result in much higher densities. Chair Leifer thought bulk and dimension standards would ultimately be the limiting factor.

Concerns were raised about no parking being required within 1/4 mile of a transit station and limited parking resulting in spillover into the streets. Other commissioners agreed that cars represent freedom and adequate parking is important. Staff agreed that parking is a concern.

Commissioner Jordan felt that the decision of one or two houses should be left up to the owner/developer. There was consensus that it should be flexible. Because of the costs, it is not likely to happen often. Commissioner Miller stressed that developers will only build if it is profitable for them.

Question 2: If a lot is both within 1/4 mile of a major transit stop and one affordable housing unit is provided, should six units be allowed on the lot instead of four units?

Commissioner Miller wondered about housing units for disabled individuals. Ms. Gemmer explained that the units would follow the IRC requirements regarding disabled accessibility.

Chair Leifer reiterated that if any of this is going to happen it will be by a developer who is trying to make a profit. He thought if they are going to allow four units in a single family neighborhood, six doesn't make much difference, from the perspective of single-family residential areas. He stressed that he was not necessarily advocating for it, but six would allow the developments to pencil better for developers to create more affordable housing.

Ms. Gemmer added that the area around the likely SWIFT station that they are talking about north of 104th on 51st Avenue is currently one of the lowest density single family neighborhoods in the city. Chair Leifer expressed frustration about the community subsidizing mass transit and the development requirements around transit stations when very few people in the area even ride it.

Commissioner Andes raised concerns about people with disabilities who live within a quarter mile of transit stops on 51st where there are no sidewalks. Ms. Gemmer explained that they might need to solicit grants, or have Community Transit make improvements, or potentially have gaps until improvements happen.

Most commissioners felt strongly that four units was more desirable. Commissioner Jordan noted that that six units would be required by the State in 2030 anyway; maybe it was better to go ahead and allow it now.

Commissioner Jordan asked about available right of way near transit stops on 51st. Ms. Gemmer thought there was sufficient right of way there to make improvements. Commissioner Jordan noted that even with the housing bills, there aren't any lots to build on. How are the improvements going to get made for handicapped individuals? Ms. Gemmer noted they don't have the answers to that now.

Commissioner Ray asked if the City has the ability to put limitations on developers as to the type of housing they build (such as age limitations). Ms. Gemmer did not think the City was able to put an age limit on it.

Question 3: Under HB 1337, cities have the option of allowing: a) an SFR plus two ADUs or a duplex on a lot, or b) a duplex plus ADUs on a lot. Which approach is preferred?

Some commissioners did not like either choice. There were questions about where they would put the cars. Ms. Gemmer noted there is a lot of uncertainty.

Preferences:

- Miller - A
- Jordan - A
- Ray - A
- Andes - neither
- Kemp - A
- Leifer - A - Assuming that one of these would be a single family residence, there might be more control over what goes on with the rental housing.
- Whitaker - A

Ms. Gemmer noted that HB 1337 eliminates the owner occupancy requirement, so they can all be rentals.

Question 4: Currently ADUs must meet a 20 foot rear yard setback. Should the rear yard setback for ADUs be reduced to 10 to 15 feet to enable infill?

- Ray - 20 feet
- Andes - 10-15 feet
- Leifer - He'd rather not have any extra housing on single family lots, but they are being forced into it. Since this is the case, he thinks they need to reduce the setbacks.
- Kemp - He thought they would have to reduce the setbacks to allow one or two ADUs.
- Whitaker - He supported reducing setbacks to 10-15 feet
- Miller - 10-15 feet to allow more places for people to live.
- Jordan - 10-15 feet

Question 5: A continuum of different setbacks and dimensional standards is possible ranging from statutory compliance only to adopting Commerce's suggested Middle Housing Ordinance. Which option is preferred?

Commissioner Ray was supportive of statutory compliance only. Commissioner Jordan commented that in addition to parking concerns, he is concerned in general about adding so much impervious surface to the area and the impacts on stormwater drainage. Commissioner Ray noted that if there is not enough runoff, people who have

wells also run the risk of wells running dry. The more open space they have, the more it can infiltrate. Commissioner Ray expressed great frustration about all of the requirements and the impacts on communities. Commissioner Jordan agreed, but noted it is coming, and they need to plan. Chair Leifer commented that infiltration is the best method if it is possible. If you have to do something else, you end up building some sort of storage device that will only allow you release limited amounts. He agreed that they would need to allow moderate level of flexibility. There was agreement that they would need to allow moderate level of flexibility.

Question 6: Currently the size of buildings is regulated based on a combination of lot coverage factors, setbacks, and height. Floor area ratio (FAR) is an alternative that regulates the size of based on a ratio of floor area/lot size. Should FAR be explored?

There was discussion about the pros and cons of each. There was consensus to keep things as they are for now.

Ms. Gemmer noted that staff would probably be coming back with more changes because of what they have recently learned from Commerce.

Middle Housing memo and DRAFT amendments

6) DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Welcome to Commissioner Ray and thanks to everyone for the input.

7) ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:37 p.m. moved by Commissioner Raymond Miller seconded by Commissioner Gary Kemp.

AYES: ALL

The meeting was adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Stacy Jones for
Laurie Hugdahl, Recording Secretary

8) NEXT MEETING - February 25, 2025