

**Community  
Development**



**501 Delta Ave  
Marysville, WA 98270**

**Planning  
Commission  
Meeting Minutes**

**June 24, 2025**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Leifer called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. noting the excused absence of Gary Kemp.

**1) ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Stephen Leifer, Commissioner Jerry Andes, Commissioner Shanon Jordan, Vice Chair Brandon Whitaker, Commissioner John Ray, Commissioner Raymond Miller

**Staff:** Principal Planner Angela Gemmer, Interim Community Development Director Jeff Wilson

**Excused:** Commissioner Gary Kemp

**2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**2.1 Approval of 5/13 Minutes**

**PC 05132025.pdf**

**Motion** to approve the May 13, 2025 minutes as presented moved by Commissioner Raymond Miller seconded by Commissioner Shanon Jordan.

**AYES: ALL**

**3) AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Anton Stetner, owner, Keller Williams, Marysville, commented regarding infill development. He stated he is very pro-home ownership and would like to see more of the fee simple ownership for townhomes, ADUs, and middle housing to create more opportunities for home ownership. He spoke in support of 1200 sf ADUs as allowed in

Snohomish County which creates a more livable size and design than 1000 sf. He also spoke in support of allowing two ADU's/DADU's per duplex (total of four units) which makes the development more economically feasible. He also spoke in support of having good design standards to create some uniformity. He thinks the 35' foot height should be allowed in certain transition areas. He is supportive of the lot coverage increasing to 55 or 60%. For duplexes, he thinks that a full party wall shouldn't be required; just having a bump-out with the garage touching is enough. He stated his goal is to create more affordable products.

Russell Joe, Master Builders of King and Snohomish County, Bellevue, commented on the middle housing ordinance. He encouraged the City to take advantage of the opportunity they have to look at what other cities have done. He encouraged them to think creatively. He concurred with the recommendation from Mr. Stetner to allow two ADUs with a duplex as a way to allow ADUs to go in and keep neighborhood character. He hopes the City will consider the 1400 or 1600 maximum for ADUs which provides a better looking product. He referred to the proposed exceptions for middle housing. He agrees that railroad crossings and no secondary access would fall under the 25% exemption; however, he encouraged them to carefully consider whether floodplains/wetlands, and water/sewer would fall in there. Both of those items are covered by code and would need to be upgraded or mitigated before any unit could go in so there is already adequate protection in existing code. He encouraged the City to find ways to creatively think about ways to modify the code so existing housing can come in the way that the Planning Commission and the City would like to see it come in.

#### 4) PUBLIC HEARING

#### 5) OLD BUSINESS

##### 5.1 Middle Housing and Accessory Dwelling Units - Additional Policy Questions

#### **Memo re Middle Housing Additional Policy Questions**

Principal Planner Gemmer explained that the City Council adopted interim regulations last night. To complete work on the Middle Housing and Accessory Dwelling Unit regulations, policy direction is requested from Planning Commission on some additional key matters. These topics are as follows:

- Topic 1 – Accessory dwelling unit – size cap

The current ADU limit is 1000 square feet or 50% of the SFR. State law requires two ADUs be allowed per lot and 1000 sf per ADU. Staff is proposing an upper limit of 1200, 1400, or 1600 sf if the single family residence is 2000 sf or bigger.

Vice Chair Whitaker thought 1200-1400 sf would be adequate to meet the purpose of ADUs/middle housing.

Chair Leifer noted there are still other requirements that will limit the sizes of ADUs. Ms. Gemmer concurred and noted that it would generally require a larger lot. Chair Leifer agreed that the smaller size ADUs would create more home ownership opportunities.

Commissioner Jordan agreed that an upper limit was needed. He thought 1200-1400 sf made sense.

Commissioner Miller thought somewhere between 1000 and 1500 sf would be right.

Vice Chair Whitaker wondered if there would be a difference between 1000 and 1500 when it comes to affordability. Mr. Stetner reviewed his thoughts. He would like to see the minimum size be 1200 with a maximum 1400 or 1500 sf. He thought that very few people would actually be able to take advantage of this in Marysville. Ms. Gemmer agreed that they are very infrequent. She spoke to the need for the ADU to be subordinate or equal in size to the house.

There appeared to be agreement to go with the 1200 sf. Commissioner Andes was in favor of the 1400 sf. Chair Leifer indicated that higher limits for larger houses made sense.

Commissioner Jordan spoke to the purpose of the middle housing bill. He pointed out that that they were creating multigenerational living opportunities, but not necessarily affordable housing. He expressed concern about putting limits on the future. He wondered how many lots in Marysville would even be able to have two ADUs.

Staff will do more research on this and bring back more context.

- Topic 2 – Simple Fix to Existing Single-Family Zones to Accommodate Middle Housing

Ms. Gemmer explained the solution to have the existing dwelling units per acre modified to be dwelling units or lots per acre and carve out an exemption for middle housing. This would be compliant with the middle housing statute that requires the City to allow at least two units per lot on lots primarily designated for residential and four units per lot when there is a dedicated affordable housing unit or proximity to bus rapid transit.

- Topic 3 – Options for Amending Single-family Residential Zones while Accommodating Middle Housing

Staff is proposing two options for consolidation:

1. Consolidation of R-8 into R-6.5 zones with the dimensional standards of the R-6.5 zone.
2. Consolidation of R-8 and WR- R-4-8 into R-6.5 with the current R-6.5 standards.

There was consensus to consider option 2.

- Topic 4 – Middle Housing Exemptions for Locational or Physical Constraints

This would relate to considering middle housing exemptions in areas where there are access and rail constraints, and potentially inadequate parking and other factors. The City must site potential criteria such as access or railroad constraints, critical areas or floodplains, no sewer or poor water pressure, flooding or water quality issues, or areas with R-4.5 zoning. Ms. Gemmer reviewed areas that staff feels would be appropriate to exempt. The state law allows the City to exempt up to 25% of the lots that meet the criteria.

Questions to consider:

- Which criteria should be used when determining the areas that should be exempted from Middle Housing requirements?
- Should certain discrete factors (e.g. inadequate access/rail constraints, displacement risk) always be excluded?
- Should priority be given to areas where multiple factors apply (i.e. inadequate access/rail constraints, displacement risk, potential geotechnical hazards, etc.)?
- Should exemption language be added in circumstances where deficiencies can be addressed (i.e. alternate access provided, water pressure addressed, etc.)?
- In areas with significant access/rail constraints, should duplexes and/or PRDs also be prohibited until access deficiencies are addressed?

Commissioner Miller suggested considering safety issues such as access/rail constraints. Vice Chair Whitaker agreed that life safety constraints make the most sense. Commissioner Ray thought all of the criteria made sense, especially safety and parking constraints. Ms. Gemmer agreed and thought that most other issues could be mitigated. Interim Director Wilson explained that the exemptions give the City the ability to say that certain areas are not appropriate for increased density rather than addressing them on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Gemmer explained they are looking into the parking issue separately.

Vice Chair Whitaker thought they should look at significant life safety issues with regard to duplexes and PRDs and see what percentage they come up with. Other commissioners agreed.

- Topic 5 – Preserving Land Capacity in the R-12 and WR-R-6-18 Multi-family Zones

To preserve land capacity in the R-12 and WR-R-6-18 zones, should one of the following strategies be pursued?

- Set a minimum density for the R-12 and WR-R-6-18 zones that is near the density level projected in the City's Land Capacity Analysis; or
- Prohibit single family detached residences in the R-12 and WR-R-6-18 zones

Chair Leifer wondered about the likelihood of someone doing an SFR in either of those zones. Ms. Gemmer thought it was most likely in the R-12 zone.

There was discussion about the justification for preserving the land capacity in R-12 and WR-R-6-18 multifamily zones in order to meet growth targets.

There was consensus to support Option 1. Staff will bring back an appropriate level of minimum density in each of these zones in order to preserve land capacity.

- Topic 6 – Master Planned Senior Communities Allowed Density

Given that the City’s single family residential zones may be consolidated, and that City Council provided direction to modestly incentivize MPSC, the following density options are presented for consideration:

- Option 1 – Allow 6 or 8 du/acre for MPSC, depending on the zone
- Option 2 – Allow 8 or 10 du/acre for MPSC, depending on the zone
- Option 3 – Allow 10 or 12 du/acre for MPSC, depending on the zone

In each of these scenarios, a lower density would be proposed in the lower density residential zone(s) and the higher density would be proposed in the higher density residential zone(s).

There was unanimous support for Option 3.

- Topic 7 – If Single Family Residences Continue to be Permitted in Multi-family Zones, Should a Height Increase for Single Family Residences and Duplexes be Allowed?

Questions for Commission:

- Should single family residences (to the extent they are retained) and duplexes in multi-family zones be allowed to be up to 35 feet tall?
- If so, should there be provisions to require the height to reduce to 30 feet or provide additional setbacks when abutting single family zones?

There was consensus to allow up to 35 feet tall and look at either a setback or a step down.

Ms. Gemmer asked the Commission about their availability for July 8 and August 12 meetings. There appeared to be general availability for both dates.

**6) NEW BUSINESS**

**7) DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

**8) ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

**Motion** to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m. moved by Commissioner Shanon Jordan seconded by Commissioner Jerry Andes.

**AYES: ALL**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

*Stacy Jones* for  
Laurie Hugdahl, Recording Secretary

**9) NEXT MEETING - July 8, 2025**