



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
501 Delta Avenue ♦ Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8000

November 16, 2022

Schemata Workshop
Attn: Miles Cook

Re: PA22-042 – Sunnyside Village Co-Housing – Technical Review 1
3121 66th Ave NE – APN: 29050300402100

Dear Miles,

After preliminary review of the above referenced proposal, the Planning Division has the following comment(s):

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION / CUP COMMENTS

1. Include File Number PA22-042 on all future correspondence, in addition to all site, civil and landscape plans.
2. Amend Site Plan to depict all encumbrances outlined in the provided title report, prepared by Old Republic National Title Insurance Company, dated September 19, 2022. If the encumbrances cannot be depicted they will need to be referenced.
3. As mentioned in the Pre-Application Comments, dated July 20, 2021, the cover letter submitted should identify under which provision the cottage housing development is being pursued per MMC 22C.010.280(2). The provided narrative does not adequately address the criteria of (2)(d). Please revise narrative to accurately demonstrate applicability.
4. Preliminary cottage floor plans are needed to ensure compliance with the following dimensional standards of MMC 22C.010.280(7):
 - 4.1. Maximum cottage main floor area: 800 sq. ft.
 - 4.2. Maximum cottage total floor area: 1 ½ times the area of the main floor or 1,200 sq. ft. (whichever is less)
 - 4.3. Primary Porch: 60 sq. ft. with min. dimension of 6 ft.
 - 4.4. Secondary Porch: 36 sq. ft. with min. dimension of 6 ft.
5. Staff has reviewed the requested modifications and variances proposed per MMC 22C.010.280(14) and has the following comments:
 - 5.1. **For Measuring Main Floor Area & Total Floor Area:** Based on determination from the Community Development Director, the cottages may be measured from the interior finished walls rather than to the exterior walls.

Based on discussions with the Building Official, Mike Snook, the building code indicates that "interior space is measured from inside finished walls". The definition of "Floor Area" per [MMC 22A.020.070](#) conflicts with building code. The direction by the Director is if the code conflicts,

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

1 - Documents have been updated accordingly

2 - Additional recording number references have been added to site plan. Recording numbers for easements not depicted pertain to easements located on parcels adjacent to project parcel, or to easements which have been or will be abandoned. Reference submitted property survey drawing for depiction of easements not depicted on site plan.

3 - SW: The cover letter has been revised to more accurately demonstrate applicability.

4 - SW: Sheet G210 has been included in resubmittal documents, and demonstrates compliance with referenced dimensional standards.

5.1 - Noted.

staff should use the less restrictive; therefore, measuring interior space (enclosed space) from the inside of the finished walls.

- 5.2. **For Increasing Maximum Building Coverage:** In order to evaluate the request to increase the maximum building coverage, the applicant must demonstrate compliance with the criteria set forth in MMC Section 22C.010.280(14)(a)&(b). Please demonstrate compliance with these criteria.
- 5.3. As submitted, the demonstrated compliance with MMC 22C.010.280(14)(a) & (b) are a bit lacking. Please provide an overall explanation for the modification requests that clearly demonstrates that the criteria of 14 (a) & (b) are met.
- 6. Demonstrate that each cottage has 200 sq. ft. of private open space meeting the provisions of MMC 22C.010.280(8)(c)-(d).
- 7. Provide a table identifying the square footages
- 8. To better identify the required private and common open spaces, please revise site plan to color code or otherwise delineate the different open space areas.
- 9. As proposed, the cottages do not appear to be visually different enough per MMC 22C.010.280(9). Proposed cottage plans A & B and C & D appear to be the same externally, with the exception of color. The cottages must offer a variety of visual interest, such as different roof forms, window design and entries.
- 10. The provided site plan shows a well on site—please clarify as to whether the well is to be decommissioned in accordance with Snohomish County Health District standards or if to be retained for irrigation purposes.
- 11. Any on-site septic system shall be decommissioned in accordance with Snohomish County Health District standards.
- 12. The following are the impact fees that apply to this project:

Impact Fee Type	Impact Fee Rate
Traffic*	\$6,300 per PM peak hour trip
Parks**	\$1,684 per unit
Schools (Marysville)**	\$0 per unit

* Fees vest with preliminary approval and are due prior to recording of final plat

** Impact fees vest at building permit submittal and shall be paid prior to building permit issuance

LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

- 13. A final landscape plan shall be required to be approved, prior to civil construction plan approval, and designed to comply with the applicable provisions outlined in [MMC Chapter 22C.120, Landscaping and Screening](#). **Specifically, please revise the Landscaping Plan to include:**
 - 13.1. Typical side view of perimeter landscape areas.
 - 13.2. The proposed storm water management facility is required to be screened with a [5 ft. buffer of L5 Landscaping](#) and must meet the following design standards: (a) All sides visible from a public right-of-way shall be screened; (b) All sides located adjacent to a residentially zoned property shall be screened, unless it can be demonstrated that

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

5.2 - The description of this modification request has been updated in the resubmitted modification and variance letter to demonstrate compliance with MMC Section 22C.010.280 (14)(a)&(b).

5.3 - The resubmitted modification and variance letter has been amended to demonstrate overall compliance with MMC Section 22C.010.280 (14)(a)&(b).

6-8 - A color coded diagram and table with private open space calculations for each cottage unit have been added to resubmittal documentation.

9 - Updated revised elevations will be provided for review.

10 - Intention is to retain well and utilize it for site irrigation.

11 - Noted - This requirement will be documented on the site demolition plan within the civil drawing set.

12 - Noted.

13.1 - Perimeter landscape cross section will be submitted with civil permit application.

13.2 - The proposed storm water facility is below grade and concealed from view, so it is our understanding screening is not required.

adequate screening exists; (c) Screening shall be consistent with the Marysville administrative landscaping guidelines.

- 13.3. If fencing is proposed within landscaped areas, please identify and note that yard and open space fencing shall not exceed 3 ½ ft. tall.
- 13.4. Denote existing trees that are to be retained, if applicable.

CRITICAL AREA REVIEW COMMENTS

- 14. The onsite wetland and buffer area must be placed in a separate Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA) tract. Please revise site plan to label accordingly.
- 15. Based on the pre-application comments, the subject property has a bald eagle nest in the vicinity. Per MMC 22E.010, an updated critical area assessment must be provided to ensure the bald eagle habitat shall be protected pursuant to the Washington State Bald Eagle Protection Rules of WAC 232-12-292.
- 16. Staff has reviewed and concurs with the findings in the Critical Areas Assessment Report prepared by GeoEngineers, dated March 16, 2020 along with the Wetland Mitigation Bank Use Plan, dated August 22, 2022 in regard to the onsite wetlands.
 - 16.1. Prior to issuing any ground disturbing activity permits, proof of purchase for Skykomish Habitat Wetland Mitigation Bank credits shall be provide to the City of Marysville to ensure adequate mitigation measures for direct and indirect wetland impacts have been addressed.
 - 16.2. Prior to issuing any ground disturbing activity permits, the applicant is required to obtain all necessary permits and approvals from Federal, State and local agencies for the proposed critical areas impacts. **See attached comments received from the Department of Ecology, dated November 1, 2022, for this process of permit application.**

Enclosed are copies of comments received from other City departments and reviewing agencies. There were also a handful of public comments Revised application materials must be accompanied with a written response detailing how each of the items outlined above and attached hereto have been addressed, and what sheet the change(s) can be found on.

After you have had an opportunity to review, please let me know what technical review comments you need clarification on. Once received I can set up a conference meeting with all of the applicable city and agency representatives, if needed. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 360.363.8216, or by e-mail at emorgan@marysvillewa.gov.

Sincerely,



Emily Morgan
Senior Planner

ecc: Chris Holland, Planning Manger

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

13.3 - The only fencing proposed is city-required fence along wetland buffer boundary. Owners may construct private yard fencing subsequent to completion of construction and have been notified of stated height limitation.

13.4 - The only trees that are anticipated to be retained are those within the wetland buffer and existing orchard area.

14 - Revised site plan has been updated accordingly

15 - Note that an eagle nest has been observed on the parcel to the East of the subject property (not on the subject property). The design team has been informed that the eagle nest was blown from its tree in a weather event, and it is unclear at this time if eagles are currently active at the nest location. The project environmental consultant plans to conduct a site visit to determine if eagles are active once spring weather arrives, and will provide a memorandum thereafter.

16 - Noted.

16.1 - We want to wait to purchase mitigation credits until we get through coordination with Ecology. But we are aware that we will need to provide documentation the City regarding proof of credits.

16.2 - Team has already connected with Doug Gresham on this project and will be submitting for an Administrative Order.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Emily Morgan – Senior Planner
FROM: Jesse Hannahs, P.E. – Traffic Engineering Manager
DATE: November 9, 2022
SUBJECT: PA 22-042 – Sunnyside Village Co-Housing

I have reviewed the Site Plan for the proposed Sunnyside Village Co-Housing Cottages at 3121 66th Ave NE and have the following comments:

- 1) Traffic impact fees will be required from the City and depending on trip generation/distribution, may be required from the County and State.
 - a. Per ILA with City of Lake Stevens, Impact fees may be required for construction of Soper Hill Road & 87th Ave NE Roundabout if Trip Generation/Distribution will include trips through intersection during PM Peak.
- 2) A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will be required.
 - i. TIA is acceptable including Soper Hill RD & 87th Ave NE Roundabout impact fee stated in TIA.
- 3) Private Drive?:
 - a. Contradiction on plans as labeled “private drive” yet ROW is identified?
 - b. Recollection of prior meeting that roadway was to be Public until a given point where fire code allowed a private road?

1 - Impact fee calculations are included in the previously submitted Traffic Impact Analysis.

2.i - Noted.

3 - Revised site plan has been updated to remove ROW designation



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
80 Columbia Avenue ♦ Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8100 ♦ (360) 651-5099 FAX

MEMORANDUM

To: Emily Morgan, Senior Planner
From: Kacey Simon, Civil Plan Reviewer
RE: Sunnyside Village Co-Housing, File# PA22-042
32 – lot cottage housing development
3121 66th Ae NE & Parcel # 29050300402100
Date: 11/4/2022

The following comments are offered after review of the above referenced application.

1. General:

- Variances are intended to allow relief from standards in special circumstances where there are topographic or other constraints that do not allow the public standards to be reasonably met, and where a suitable alternative can be provided. When considering a variance request, the City uses the decision criteria outlined in MMC 22G.010.420. Specifically, sub-item (d) does not allow granting of a variance when the need for the variance is the result of a deliberate act by the applicant. Increasing the lot-yield on the property is a deliberate act by the applicant and is not justification for the City to accept a lower design standard.

2. Modifications:

1. Proposal of a private drive aisle within a 32-ft right-of-way:

This is acceptable for the development.

2. Increase maximum building coverage:

This will be a decision for the Planning Dept.

3. Regarding measurement of floor area:

This will be a decision for the Planning Dept.

3. Engineering Variances:

1. Request a hammerhead configuration in-lieu-of cul-de-sac configuration for the 66th Ave temporary turn-around:

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

2.1 - Noted.

2.2 - Noted.

2.3 - Noted.

3.1 - Noted.

We've confirmed with our local Fire District that the proposed type of configuration is acceptable, and we are intending to revise our EDDS soon to allow this type of configuration for a temporary turn-around. This type of configuration can be allowed without an EDDS variance.

2. Provide a flush-curb/walk on either side of the proposed private access, and inverted-crown road section:

The flush-curb proposal is not consistent with the ADA-ramp configuration depicted at the intersection of 66th Ave and the proposed private drive. The proposed flush-curbs will need to be replaced with rolled curbs. Flush curbs in this location would promote pedestrian crossings all along the proposed drive aisle, which the City considers to be a safety hazard. The project proposes ADA-crossing ramps at the intersection of 66th Dr and the proposed private drive, which is an acceptable crossing location. The City would also entertain a mid-block crossing east of the Common House if it is provided with a crosswalk, ADA ramps, and pedestrian-crossing signage.

4. Dedication Requirements:

- a. The extension of 66th Ave NE shall require a 50' wide dedication.

5. Drainage:

All projects in the city of Marysville must comply with requirements stipulated under the MMC 14.15.040 and 14.15.050.

- 1. Stormwater drainage: The city has adopted the 2019 Ecology Manual. Projects above the 2,000 square feet threshold must comply with requirements stipulated in Volume I, Chapter 2 of the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.
- 2. Please include a SWPPP at civil submittal.
- 3. Unfortunately we will not allow pumps for storm drainage. As per DOE, allowing pumps would be in violation of our permit.
- 4. The maximum allowed impervious surface coverage for the Zoning designation is 50%.

ii. Projects that are submitted after 7/1/22 will be required to be compliant with the 2019 Ecology manual.

Standard Comments:

- 5. Survey control datum NAVD-88 and NAD-83 are required to be used. Civil construction plans will not be accepted in any other datum.
- 6. Trench restoration is to be completed in accordance with section 3-703 of the EDDS. A full lane or full street overlay may be required.

3.2 - The private drive road section will be revised with removal of the flush curb and replacement with a rolled curb.

4.a - The 66th Ave NE is shown as a 50' wide ROW on civil street sections.

5.1 - Noted.

5.2 - Draft SWPPP will be included with civil plan review submittal.

5.3 - Per meeting with Douglas Howie at Ecology and Shane Whitney with City of Marysville on 01/05/2023, we understand the following:

- The SWMMWW does not provide conveyance system requirements. Conveyance including pump design to be per City design requirements.
- The proposed stormwater conveyance system downstream of the flow control facility shall be designed in compliance with the Flow Control Performance Standard per SWMMWW

5.4 - Impervious surface coverage is in conformance with MMC 22C.010.280 (6) - reference architectural site plan for associated calculations.

Standard comments - Noted.

7. The onsite grading and placement of any retaining walls must be compliant with section 22D.050.030 of the MMC.
8. A right of way use permit for all work proposed within City right of way is required. Cost for the ROW permit is \$250.00. ROW permit fees must be paid before right of way permit issuance.
9. The applicant is responsible for identifying any existing well or septic systems on site or on adjacent properties. If there are any existing septic systems on site they need to be decommissioned based on the Snohomish Health District standards. If there are any wells on site they need to be decommissioned based on Department of Ecology standards.
10. Engineering construction plan review fees will be due prior to release of approved civil construction plans.

Engineering construction plan review per MMC 22G.030.020:

Residential = \$250.00 per lot or unit (for duplex or condominium projects),
\$2000.00 minimum for first two reviews, \$120.00/hour for each subsequent review.

Multiple residential/commercial/industrial = \$250.00 base fee + \$135.00 per hour.

11. Engineering construction inspection fees will be due prior to project final or building final whichever comes first.

Engineering construction inspection fees per MMC 22G.030.020:

Residential = \$250.00 per lot/unit (for duplex or condominium projects),
\$2000.00 minimum

Multiple residential/commercial/industrial = \$250.00 base fee + \$135.00 per hour.

Bond administration fee = \$20.00/lot or unit, with a minimum amount being \$250.00

12. **All civil construction plan submittals are to be routed directly to Kacey Simon, Civil Plan Reviewer.** The first *civil construction* plan submittal is to consist of a plan set, a copy of the drainage report, and a copy of the geotechnical report. **Once the documents are ready to be submitted, we will provide you a link to where the materials can be uploaded to.**

a. Review timing:

- i. First review = 5 weeks
- ii. Second review = 3 weeks
- iii. Third review = 3 week
- iv. Subsequent reviews will be 3 weeks.

13. Please be advised these comments are in reference to specific items and do not imply a full review of the proposed application. Additional comments which may change the design requirements will be provided during the civil construction plan review process.

If you have additional questions regarding the above comments, please contact me at ksimon@marysvillewa.gov or at (360) 363-8280.

cc: Ken McIntyre, PE, Assistant City Engineer



Marysville Fire District

YOUR RISK PREVENTION TEAM
1094 Cedar Avenue, Marysville WA 98270

Phone (360) 363-8500
Fax (360) 659-1382

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

To: Emily Morgan, Senior Planner
From: Don McGhee, Assistant Fire Marshal
Date: October 13, 2022
Subject: PA22-042 Sunnyside Village Cohousing Cottages 3121 66th Ave NE

I have completed a second review of plans for this project proposing development of a 4.75-acre site for residential housing. The project consists of a “cohousing community” of 32 1,000-1200 SF cottage dwellings, plus a shared 2,800 SF common house, and shared outdoor amenity spaces. *Buildings will require residential fire sprinkler installations.*

The plans show one fire apparatus access into the site from the north, and internally through the village, by a 22’ wide private drive access road, a 360’ long dead-end extension from existing 66th Ave NE. Plans show a fire access turnaround near the end of the private drive. Access for fire apparatus appears adequate.

The plans show water service for the project from the north by connection to existing 8” water main on 66th Ave. Plans also shown an 8” water main on the private drive. Plans show two hydrants being added, one approx. 70’ north of private drive on 66th Ave. and one about 250’ in on private drive. Hydrant spacing appears adequate.

The City GIS water map shows an existing 8” water main dead-ends near the north property line along 66th Ave NE, with a fire hydrant located about 150’ north of the property line, and an existing 12” water main along Sunnyside Blvd. No information about available fire flow is provided for nearby fire hydrants. *An adequate water supply for fire flow shall be provided.*

Additional comments related to fire code compliance for this project are noted below:

1. The project shall comply with International Fire Code (IFC) requirements including WA State and local City of Marysville amendments to the fire code. Any fire code required construction permits (IFC section 105.7) are obtained through Marysville Community Development at 80 Columbia Avenue.
2. Fire marshal approval of fire access and fire hydrant/water supply systems is required and will be part of the site and civil construction plans review and approval processes.
3. It is the developer’s responsibility to see that adequate water for fire protection is attainable. The minimum required fire flow is determined using IFC Appendix B, and depends upon building sizes, construction types, and sprinkler systems. Proof of fire flow will be required. Documentation/certification of available water supplies for providing the required fire flows is required for final approval of the water system for this project and prior to building construction. Check with the city Public Works Dept. for water system information.
4. The minimum required fire flow for hydrants protecting SFR dwellings is 1,000 gpm (with 20-psi minimum residual pressure) for dwellings not exceeding 3,600 square feet in size.

1 - Noted.

2 - Noted.

3 - October 2022 fire flow test report is included in Land Use Application resubmittal package.

4 - October 2022 fire flow test result's calculated 2,130 GPM @20 psi residual pressure is greater than minimum required fire flow of 1,000 GPM for dwellings

We Care About You!

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

5 - October 2022 fire flow test result's calculated 2,130 GPM @20 psi residual pressure is greater than minimum required fire flow of 1,500 GPM for common house.

6 - Water main is designed to loop through 66th Ave NE.

7 - Civil drawings are citing City standard plans.

8 - Contractor has been informed of this construction sequencing requirement.

9 - All buildings are being designed with sprinkler systems, for compliance with exception 1.

10 - Revised site plan has been updated to reflect this requirement

11 - Contractor has been informed of this construction sequencing requirement.

12 - Noted.

13 - Per meeting with city staff on 12/19/22, the design team understands that the walkway configuration in the preliminary site plan, with walkways extending to the front porch of each cottage, is sufficient, and that the paved walks do not need to extend to the back doors. Also per the meeting discussion, the design team understands that the one cottage (lot #1) that is just beyond the 200' distance of fire apparatus access will be acceptable to the fire department.

14 - Fire extinguishers will be noted on common house drawings in building permit submittal.

15 - Hardiplank type siding will be specified for all buildings. Asphalt shingle roofs will be specified.

16 - 1" meters are indicated on civil plan. Configuration has been updated to indicate a single service tap.

5. The minimum fire flow for hydrants protecting the common house building is 1,500 gpm.
6. Fire hydrants on an approved circulating/looped water main extension are required within the site for this development. Provide water main extensions with hydrants along the new roadways in approved locations, with maximum spacing of 600 feet apart.
7. Fire hydrants shall comply with city Water Design Standard 2-060 Hydrants.
8. Fire hydrants with approved water supply must be in service prior to building construction.
9. The single external access proposed for the development (from 66th Ave NE) does not meet municipal code requirement for two separate access roads for developments exceeding 30 dwellings (includes existing 16 dwellings to the north that share the single access).

MMC 9.04.503.1.5 Section 503.1.5 – One- or two-family dwelling residential developments. Developments of one- or two-family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds 30 shall be provided with separate and approved, unobstructed fire apparatus access roads and shall be placed a distance apart equal to not less than one half of the length of maximum overall diagonal dimension of the property or area to be served, measured in a straight line between accesses. Exceptions: 1. Where there are more than 30 dwelling units on a single public or private fire apparatus access road and all dwelling units are equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2 or 903.3.1.3 access from two directions shall not be required. 2. The number of dwelling units on a single fire apparatus access road shall not be increased unless fire apparatus access roads will connect with future development, as determined by the fire code official.

Sprinklers shall be provided in all new homes to use exception 1, and future access road connections must be provided concurrently with this development to use exception 2.

10. Recommend the access roadway be posted “NO PARKING – FIRE LANE” to maintain unobstructed emergency access.
11. An adequate access route for fire apparatus must be in service prior to any building construction with combustible building materials.
12. The city address committee will determine road names and address numbers for the lots.
13. Access for firefighting operations along all sides of all buildings is required. Approved access walkways to all exterior doors and openings shall be provided. All parts of the building exteriors should be accessible for firefighting by an approved route around the building, and be within 150 feet of fire apparatus access (within 200' with fire sprinkler systems in buildings). Formal review of access for approval is normally part of the civil and building plans review processes.
14. Fire extinguishers are required in the common house and outbuildings- minimum 2A-10B-C UL rated.
15. Recommend the buildings to be constructed here include fire-resistant exterior construction (such as hardiplank type siding).
16. Where residential fire sprinklers are required the developer should install a water service per Standard Plan 2-090-001 Full ¾” x 1” Meter Service. Under this plan a 1” tap is made at the water main and 1” piping is run to the 1” meter setter. If in the end a ¾” water meter will suffice then all that is required is to install two reducer bushings with the ¾” water meter. A single service tap should be used where sprinklers are required, not a double service installation.

We Care About You!

From: [Gresham, Doug \(ECY\)](#)
To: [Emily Morgan](#)
Subject: [External!] Sunnyside Village Co-Housing (PA22-042)
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 4:00:11 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)



Emily,

I reviewed the Sunnyside Village Co-housing application for wetland impacts and mitigation. Although they already addressed the wetland issues, here are my formal comments.

The wetlands delineated on this property would be waters of the state subject to the applicable requirements of state law (see RCW 90.48 and WAC 173.201A) and Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC §1341) and 40 CFR Section 121.2. Because direct impacts are proposed in Wetlands A, B, and D the applicant shall obtain all necessary state and federal authorizations prior to beginning any ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal. To obtain state and federal authorization, they should provide:

- A jurisdictional determination from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers stating which delineated wetlands on the property are under federal jurisdiction.
- For any non-federally regulated wetlands that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers does not take jurisdiction for, submit a JARPA to Ecology at ecyrefedpermits@ecy.wa.gov so we can issue an Administrative Order.
- A mitigation bank use plan for unavoidable wetland impacts following the standards in Wetland Mitigation in Washington State – Part 1: Agency Policies and Guidance (Ecology Publication # 21-06-003).

[Doug Gresham, Wetland Specialist](#)
Washington State Department of Ecology
PO Box 330316
Shoreline, WA 98133-9716
Cell: (425) 429-1846
Email: Doug.Gresham@ecy.wa.gov



Team has connected with Doug Gresham on this project and will be submitting for an Administrative Order.



MARYSVILLE
PUBLIC WORKS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Emily Morgan, Senior Planner

FROM: Kim Bryant, Water Operations Supervisor
Tim King, Utility Construction Lead II
Ryan Keefe, Water Operations Lead II

DATE: November 2nd, 2022

SUBJECT: Sunnyside Village Co-Housing, PA22-042

Public Works Operations has reviewed the Sunnyside Village Co-Housing submittal and has the following comments:

1. Relocate all water meters and fire hydrants on 66th Ave NE out of planter strip and to behind sidewalk;
2. No water details are provided;
3. Water main size and material not provided;
4. Relocate last hydrant assembly on private drive to other side of last 3 water meters;
5. Water main connection at 66th Ave NE and Sunnyside Blvd shall be a live tap with gate valve.

If the applicant has any questions about these comments, I can be contacted at (360) 363-8163 or kbryant@marysvillewa.gov.

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

- 1 - Civil plan has been revised to locate meters to back of sidewalks
- 2 - Addressed in the Civil Plan Review plan set, specifically sheets C701-C703 and C811-C812.
- 3 - Addressed in the Civil Plan Review plan set, specifically sheets C701-C703 and C811-C812.
- 4 - This has been revised on civil plan
- 5 - Addressed in the Civil Plan Review plan set, specifically sheets C701-C703 and C811-C812.

(360) 363-8100

Public Works
80 Columbia Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270



MARYSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT



MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 17, 2022
TO: Emily Morgan, Community Development Dept.
FROM: Brad Akau, Commander
RE: PA22-042

I have reviewed the information for constructing a 32-lot cottage housing development. The proposed development would include 32-detached single-family cottages, ranging from 1,000 sq. ft. to 1,200 sq. ft., along with a 2,779 sq. ft. community house including a community kitchen, dining hall, and accessory rooms. The property would include common areas with amenities such as a community garden, orchard, and open space.

The Police Department recommends the following:

- The builder/developer to provide street lighting within the proposed development
- If lighting exists in the open spaces, it will be lower and maintained within the property lines.
- Addresses should be clearly visible from the street
- Shared securable mailboxes installed where residents can view activity around it from inside their residence
- Shrubs should be no more than three (3) feet high (common areas are exempt)
- Lower branches on trees to be at least seven (7) feet off the ground for visibility (newly planted trees in common areas are exempt)

Feel free to contact me at 360.363.8301 if you have any questions.

- 1 - Comment has been relayed to developer/builder.
- 2 - Comment has been relayed to developer/builder.
- 3 - Team will add address signage to plan
- 4 - Reference architectural site plan for proposed cluster mailbox location.
- 5 - Reference architectural site plan for proposed cluster mailbox location.
- 6 - All trees outside of wetland buffer and existing orchard area are anticipated to be newly planted.



MARYSVILLE
PUBLIC WORKS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Emily Morgan, Senior Planner
FROM: Brad Zahnow, Development Services Technician
DATE: October 19, 2022
SUBJECT: PA22-042 Sunnyside Village Co-Housing
3121 66th Ave NE
APN's: 29050300402100

Residential Utility Capital Improvement Fees

Capital utility fees are assessed in accordance with the attached rate sheet. The "City" rates will be applicable to this project.

Recovery (Latecomer) Fees

No recovery fees are applicable to this project.

Utility Main Fees

No utility main fees are applicable to this project.

ULID/LID Fees

No ULID/LID fees are applicable to this project.

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

Noted



UTILITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT CHARGES - 2022

MMC Section 14.07.010 - Marysville Ord. Nos. 2607 & 2670 - Effective 1-1-2006
 Community Development Department ♦ 80 Columbia Avenue ♦ Marysville, WA 98270
 (360) 363-8100 ♦ (360) 651-5099 FAX ♦ Office Hours: Monday - Friday 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM

RESIDENTIAL UNITS

Type of Connection		Water		Sewer	
		City	Outside City	City	Outside City
Residential DU*	Eff 1/1/06	\$4,750/du	\$5,490/du	\$4,490/du	\$4,890/du
Inspection		Plumb permit varies	Plumb permit	\$100	\$100
Admin/Filing Fee		\$20	\$20	\$20	\$20

*Dwelling unit includes single-family, multi-unit housing, apts, condos, manufactured homes and mobile homes.
 Main fees or latecomer fees may apply, depending on location.

Type of Connection		Water		Sewer	
		City	Outside City	City	Outside City
Hotel/Motel	Eff 1/1/06	\$1,816/rm	\$2,099/rm	\$1,717/rm	\$1,870/rm
RV Park Pads	Eff 1/1/06	\$2,375/pad	\$2,745/pad	\$2,245/pad	\$2,445/pad

COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL

WATER

Gallons per Minute	City	Outside City
0 – 2000 gpm	\$1.64 / square foot (bldg)	\$1.99 / square foot (bldg)
2001 – 4000 gpm	\$2.40 / sf	\$2.87 / sf
4001+ gpm	\$3.16 / sf	\$3.80 / sf
Warehouse/Storage (Ord No. 3026, Eff 7/15/16)	\$0.48 / sf	\$0.65 / sf
Warehouse/Storage with fire sprinklers	\$0.36 / sf	\$0.49 / sf

SEWER

Type of Use	City	Outside City
Retail Sales/Manufacturing/ Churches/Schools/Day Care	\$1.03 / square foot (bldg)	\$1.24 / square foot (bldg)
Offices/Medical/Dental/Nursing Homes and all other uses not listed	\$1.67 / sf	\$2.00 / sf
Warehouses/Storage	\$0.49 / sf	\$0.65 / sf
Restaurants/Taverns/Esspresso	\$2.38 / sf	\$2.86 / sf
Schools without kitchens	\$0.77 / sf	\$0.93 / sf

SURFACE WATER / STORM DRAINAGE

Surface water capital fee – Eff 1/1/11	Residential - \$95/du	Commercial - \$95/3200sf of imp surface
--	-----------------------	---

METER SERVICES

Meter Size	Tapping Fee	Meter Drop Fee
5/8" x 3/4"	\$1,050	\$500
3/4" x 3/4"	\$1,075	\$525
1"	\$1,200	\$560
1.5"	\$1,600	\$750
2"	\$1,900 min	\$850
3", 4", 6", 8"	Time and Material - \$3,500 min + \$1K/inch	Included in tapping fee

Fire sprinkler systems may require a larger meter for adequate fire flow – consult your designer.

All non-residential water services, including fire sprinkler systems and irrigation systems, require a backflow prevention assembly to be installed immediately downstream of the water meter. Contact the city's cross connection control specialist at (360) 363-8100 to determine the type of assembly required.



MEMORANDUM

Date: **October 28, 2022**

PA22-042

To: **Emily Morgan, Senior Planner**

From: **Michael Snook, Building Official**

Re: **Project Name:** Sunnyside Village Co-Housing

Applicant: Paul Cullen, Sunnyside Village

Proposal: An application was submitted October 7, 2022 for a Preliminary Subdivision with Conditional Use Permit and SEPA Environmental Review for the construction of a 32-lot cottage housing development. The proposed development would include 32-detached single family cottages, ranging from 1,000 sq. ft. to 1,200 sq. ft., along with a 2,779 sq. ft. community house including, a community kitchen, dining hall, and accessory rooms. The property would include common areas with amenities such as a community garden, orchard, open space areas. The subject property is known to contain (4) categorized wetlands; a preliminary mitigation plan was provided with application.

Address: 3121 66th Ave NE

In response to your request for review of the above project. Please see requirements below:

1. Applicant shall comply with any and or all provisions the 2018 Edition of the International Building, Residential, Mechanical, 2018 Uniform Plumbing Codes, and current Washington State Amendments.
2. All plans and permit applications will be required to be submitted electronically as part of their submittal process. One (1) complete set of building plans, structural calculations, Geotech Report, and 2018 Washington State Energy Code work sheets.
3. Contact our office if you have questions in regards to permit applications, checklists and/or handouts that you and/or your design team will be preparing plans for on your project.
4. If any demolition of structures is proposed, and you are unsure if permit/s will be required for the removal of any existing structures. Please contact the Building Division at 360-363-8100, to ask any specific questions. An asbestos report will be required for each demo permit.
5. A Geotechnical report shall be submitted to the City for this project. This is to be an in-depth report to address the following:
 - Soil Classification
 - Required Drainage Systems
 - Soil Compaction Requirements
 - Type of Footings, Foundations, and Slabs Allowed
 - Erosion Control Requirements
 - Retaining Walls
 - Fill and Grade
 - Final Grade

Please provide the below information in regards to the 2018 International Building requirements:

1. The building structure will be required to be designed under the 2018 IBC, Chapter 16, and Structural Design Requirements. The seismic zone criteria is to be established under the guidelines of a Washington State Licensed Architect and/or Structural Engineer.

1. Buildings are being designed in accordance with codes listed

2. Noted

3. Noted

4. An existing single family residence is planned to be demolished. The requirements indicated will be shown on the demolition plan.

5. The geotechnical report submitted with the Land Use Application package will be submitted with the building permit package, and includes topics listed.

1. The structural engineer will provide this information in the building permit submittal.

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

Comments 2-9 will be addressed in the building permit submittal package.

2. Please provide scaled floor plans with square footage of each room, open areas, and all levels throughout the building.
3. For the main structure, show on the plans the type of building materials proposed, and if required, what type of fire-resistant construction will be required.
4. Construction shall comply with the 2018 IBC, Chapter 5 “General Building Heights and Areas”, and any “Area Modifications”.
5. Exterior walls are to comply with the 2018 International Building Code, Chapter 6. This includes allowable openings under the 2018 IBC, Chapter 7. Site plan is to show the distance from the proposed structure to the property lines, from all sides of the building.
6. Buildings shall be accessible to all areas to persons with physical disabilities per the 2018 IBC, Chapter 11. This includes the Washington State Amendments, and ICC A117.1.-2017. (For the community house)
7. Accessible parking stalls shall be shown on the site plan and meet the requirements of the 2018 IBC, Chapter 11. (For the community house)
8. Restrooms shall be provided per the Washington State Amendments of the 2018 IBC, Chapter 29, and the 2018 UPC. (For the community house)
9. All Mechanical Equipment shall be screened from public view under MMC Provisions. Please indicate how this will be achieved on your building plan, elevation submittal sheets.
10. A Fire Sprinkler system may be required. The applicant is to verify this requirement with the Fire Marshal’s Office.
11. Per the Marysville Municipal Code, Chapter 14.10, Cross-connection devices are required on the domestic and fire sprinkler water supply. Prior to final acceptance, all required backflow devices are to be tested by an independent third party testing agency.
12. All Electrical installations are to be permitted, inspected and approved through the City. The current code is NEC 2020 with WCEC Amendments. A separate application, plans, and plan review will be required.
13. Deferred Electronic Submittals applications for the community house are to be submitted per the requirements below;
 - The registered design professional in charge of the project shall review and stamped each set of plans and specifications approved.
 - The registered design professional in charge of the project shall provide a letter stating that the plans and specifications have been reviewed and that package is general conformance with the design of the building.
 - The registered design professional in responsible charge shall be responsible for reviewing and coordinating submittal documents prepared by others, including phased and deferred submittal items, for compatibility with the design of the building.
 - The deferred submittal items shall not be installed until the deferred submittal documents have been reviewed and approved by the Building Official.
14. Special Inspection will be required. The list of the type of inspections shall be indicated on the plans by the Engineer of Record. The owner is to notify the City of the registered special inspection agency prior to permit issuance.

Building application for plan review will be approximately 4-6 weeks for first-time plan review comments.

We look forward to your project coming to our City!

If I may be of any further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Michael Snook, Building Official, 360-363-8210 or msnook@marysvillewa.gov during office hours 7:30 am – 4:00 pm, Monday through Friday.

9 - Team will indicate screening provisions on building permit submittal documents

10 - A fire sprinkler system is planned for cottages and common house.

11 - This information has been relayed to the associated design team members.

12 - Noted.

13 - Team will indicate deferred submittals on building permit submittal documents

14 - Team will list special inspections on building permit submittal documents

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

From: [Matt Edmunds](#)
To: miles@schemataworkshop.com; [Emily Morgan](#)
Subject: [External!] Public comment submittal regarding Sunnyside Village Co-Housing notice of application
Date: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 4:40:46 PM



To Whom it May Concern:

We received a notice of application from the city of Marysville about the proposed project in our neighborhood named Sunnyside Village Co-Housing. While we understand the importance and ecological relevance of community living and the minimal environmental impact of tiny houses, we respectfully have strong reservations to this development being built in our neighborhood. Some of our reasons, concerns, and reservations are as follows:

Housing size, density, and use:

According to MMC 22C.010.280, (2) Applicability:

“Cottage housing developments are allowed in the following areas: residentially zoned properties in Downtown Planning Area 1; single-family zones where properties are encumbered by at least 35 percent critical areas and associated buffers; and single-family zoned parcels adjacent, including across the street in some cases, to multifamily, commercial and industrial zoned parcels, as a transition to multi-family, commercial and industrial uses”

This proposal fails to identify how the cottage housing applies to our current zoning area and meets the applicability requirements. Listing that the parcel "is contiguous to Neighborhood Business zoned property" is a false statement which does not apply to the adjacent neighborhood nor the adjacent single family property (coincidentally owned by a present city-council member). In addition, the business zoned property owned by the city council member (now through an LLC) has not been utilized in the manner stated in Title 22C Land Use Standards:

(1) Neighborhood business zone.

(a) The purpose of the neighborhood business zone (NB) is to provide convenient daily retail and personal services for a limited service area and to minimize impacts of commercial activities on nearby properties. These purposes are accomplished by:

(i) Limiting nonresidential uses to those retail or personal services which can serve the everyday needs of a surrounding residential area;

(ii) Allowing for a mix of housing and retail/service uses; and

(iii) Excluding industrial and community/regional business-scaled uses.

(b) Use of this zone is appropriate in neighborhood centers designated by the comprehensive plan which are served at the time of development by adequate public sewers, water supply, roads and other needed public facilities and services.

In addition, MMC 22C.010.280 Section (4) states:

Density and Minimum Lot Area. (a) Cottage housing developments shall contain a

The citation at left does not appear to be correct. MMC 22C.010.280 (2) reads as follows:

(2) Applicability. Cottage housing developments are allowed, as follows:

- (a) Within residentially zoned properties in Downtown Planning Area 1;
- (b) Within single-family zones where properties are encumbered by at least 35 percent critical areas and associated buffers;
- (c) On single-family zoned parcels adjacent to multifamily, commercial and industrial zoned parcels, as a transition to multifamily, commercial and industrial uses, including across the street on a case-by-case basis, if approved by the director;
- (d) Within single-family zones where two or more unique site circumstances exist. Unique site circumstances may include shared common boundary with a city-owned park or nature preserve; close proximity to multifamily, commercial or industrial zoned properties as a complementary use; or other unique site circumstances as determined by the director;
- (e) Within multifamily zoned properties.

Land Use Application cover letter has been revised to clarify conformance with 22C.010.280 (2)(d). The project parcel is located adjacent to a city-owned park / nature preserve, and in close proximity to a neighborhood business zoned property, which conforms with the requirements of 22C.010.280 (2)(d).

minimum of four cottages arranged on at least two sides of a common open space or configuration as otherwise approved by the director, with a maximum of 12 cottages per development.

The current proposal is for 32 cottages, not the stated maximum of 12. This in itself should nullify the current plans. The proposed grouping of cottages should not be misconstrued to imply that there are 4 developments when in fact the stated build plan is to complete all housing construction at once and all with the same common building.

As listed in the proposal regarding initial observations,

- (1) The conditional use is designed in a manner which is compatible with the character and appearance of the existing or proposed development in the vicinity of the subject property
 - a. Response: While each cottage is smaller than typical adjacent single family residential homes, the design is compatible with adjacent neighborhood character and appearance in terms of roof profiles, exterior siding types, window and door types, porches, and bay windows.

The response fails to address that the cottages are not just smaller, but half of the square footage of the adjacent neighborhood while being at twice the structure density of the adjacent neighborhood. The dense layout of the houses and existence of separate parking lots is nothing similar to the well-established neighborhood the proposal refers to. There are no apartment buildings or similarly sized houses in the near vicinity and current in-work construction in the surrounding areas of Marysville do not resemble the proposal. Nowhere on Sunnyside Blvd from 52nd St NE to Soper Hill Rd are there such high density housing or implied "compatible" developments.

Traffic and neighborhood impact:

After looking at the survey map and observing the current entrance to the existing site, it is evident that our neighborhood will receive a disproportionate amount of extra traffic due to the 32-home increase near our home. Instead of routing traffic directly to a main road (Sunnyside Drive), the entirety of the traffic will be routed from the back of the neighborhood through to the front. With the building of this new community, the traffic to our street will be more than tripled. We do not believe this increase in traffic is safe for our narrow, dead-end street or for the many children who occupy our neighborhood. Additionally, the neighborhood is older and well-established and this is not a proposal for an adjacent neighborhood but a dissimilar, double density housing neighborhood tacked on to the back. While we understand that developments are common, what is being proposed will force us to live in a construction zone thoroughfare for the foreseeable future.

There is also included irony in the proposal of wanting a private drive with a low speed limit due to pedestrians and the concern for traffic yet diverting all the traffic at a typical residential speed limited (an estimate of nearly 300 vehicle passings a day from the traffic study) directly through an area utilized by the children of the neighborhood for having no exit and currently being safe from traffic – a selling feature of the existing housing. These are in direct opposition to each other.

The proposal lists the city's future plans for a continuation of 66th Ave NE to what I believe will be named 68th Street. The plan attempts to take credit for a street which has not been made official, may never become a reality, and is currently a driveway owned by the parcel's seller.

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

The proposed development complies with MMC 22C.010.280 section (6), which lists the density and dimensional requirements for cottage housing developments and indicates:

"Maximum development size: Minimum 4 cottage units. Maximum 12 cottage unit per grouping. Development may contain multiple groupings."

(reference site plan submitted with Land Use Application for associated information - four groupings of less than 12 units each are proposed)

The proposed development complies with MMC 22C.010.280 section (6), which lists the density and dimensional requirements for cottage housing developments and indicates:

"maximum density = 2 times the base density of the underlying zone. "

(reference site plan submitted with Land Use Application for associated calculation):

Reference Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted with Land Use Application for calculation of anticipated traffic impact. TIA is based on standard single family housing traffic rates, but proposed co-housing development community is likely to utilize car sharing more frequently than average rates of occupants of single family developments, so actual traffic rates for this development may be less than indicated in TIA.

Note that proposed private drive is a short connector to a parking area, and the proposal for a low speed limit is consistent with this use.

The proposed plan has been designed in conformance with city development regulations without reliance on the future extension of 66th Ave to connect with Sunnyside Blvd.

PA22-042 Design Team Responses

As described in the design team response on the previous page, the proposed development complies with the density and dimensional requirements of MMC 22C.010.280 section (6). This section allows a maximum of 12 units per grouping and multiple groupings per development, and a maximum density of 2x the density of the underlying zone.

While home sales and property values are not a land-use issue, there is sufficient evidence (through home sales data) to demonstrate that co-housing homes maintain their value and in some cases exceed the market rate value of nearby homes. Furthermore, developers of speculatively built homes (like in the adjacent subdivision) did not have to demonstrate that they had all their homes spoken for before their permits were approved.

MMC 22C.010.280 section 2(d) allows for cottage housing developments on single family zoned parcels meeting certain criteria, and not just in medium and high density zoned areas.

The project team endeavors to create a development that will provide high quality housing for a conscientious group of community-minded residents, who wish to make the proposed site their future home. The development consultant/contractor is known for delivering high-quality housing projects built to the "Built Green" green standard, which is this project is anticipated to conform with (targeting built green 4 star).

While there may have been an easement on the driveway to allow for the existing parcel's single family home to access Sunnyside Blvd, it appears no such easement will exist for the co-housing development which might leave the seller with the nuisance consequences of the traffic that we will have to live with as a result of a pending approval.

The proposal also started out as 19-25 houses, still greater than the 12 maximum listed in the municipal code, to now 32 and specifically requests a variance approval because the co-housing would otherwise have to limit the dwellings to 31 units to comply. This also does not address the requested variance for emergency vehicle turn-arounds to further fit more dwellings and parking spots. For a new proposal already at the end of an established neighborhood that meets these requirements, the proposal does not match the design, intent, and character of the existing neighborhood and surroundings.

Home values and future impacts to surrounding areas:

Various research projects have investigated the impact of co-housing villages and their relation to nearby property values. These projects have mixed reviews and findings but multiple co-housing starts have had premature ends due to the number of families required, internal politics, financing issues, etc. While the co-housing's website lists roughly 60% uptake of current offerings (unspecified what this level of commitment this percentage reflects), this still leaves 13 units open with the expectation that each of the vacancies will sell for the documented estimate of \$575,000 each.

From the E004 Environmental Checklist:

The proposed cottage housing development is consistent with existing (residential) land uses. Higher density affordable housing is compatible with this area as it is growing rapidly.

The estimated listing value is documented as "middle range housing costs" to match the adjacent homes but refers to this proposal as doing so at twice the typically allowed density in a region of Marysville which has consistently been designated as low density housing. Even as the zoning plans add medium and high density housing regions within the city limits, the zones are well outside of being considered "nearby" to this parcel. It is, in fact, not consistent with existing land use, nor is it consistent with city land use planning approvals accounting for the growth of our city.

While it is challenging to say with certainty whether this community living project will impact our property value, we do have strong concerns about the value of our home and all the equity we have built over the years. With the high quantity of such a niche housing type project and the high buy-in to show relative equivalency to the surrounding areas, there is justifiable reason to be wary of price cuts, lingering vacancies, single family ownership to rental conversions, etc. As the co-housing values can fall, so will the adjacent neighborhood values which have been stable relative to the housing market as a whole.

This does not even begin to address the negative impact to our investment or inhibits our ability to sell in the future going from the quietest area at the back of the neighborhood to a thoroughfare leading to a non-conforming zone density project. Should this turn into an "affordable housing project" as a result of low uptake, mismanagement, or other market factors such as the continuing inflation and interest rate increases, this will only further negatively sway current owner's property and housing values in an area known for established stability.

In summary, this project negatively impacts our Sunnyside Boulevard Neighborhood directly.

We understand that the City of Marysville has the right to make plans, build, and improve the city. We appreciate the work that our public services do for us. However, this proposal does not conform to the city's future zoning and growth plan and the intent of existing municipal codes. This is our home and we should have a say in whether a development that so deeply and directly impacts our homes and investments if it were to be approved. We respectfully submit that this co-housing proposal should not be allowed to proceed as-is or in the proposed location.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matt and Kandi Edmunds