

1. Agenda

Documents:

[11-09-2017 CDC AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[BUSINESS LICENSES.PDF](#)

[CIP 2018-2023.PDF](#)

[CODE EDITS TATTOO AND BED AND BREAKFAST.PDF](#)

[PARK IMPACT FEES.PDF](#)



City Council Committee Meeting Agenda

Community & Economic Development Committee

Stanwood-Camano School District
Administration Building Board Room
26920 Pioneer Highway, Stanwood

Thursday November 9, 2017 6:00 PM

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2018 – 2023 | 1-1 |
| 2. Park Impact Fees | 2-1 |
| 3. Code Edits Title 17- Tattoo and B&B Changes (Zoning Use Table) | 3-1 |
| 4. Odor Language in the General Industrial (GI) & Light Industrial (LI) | 4-1 |
| 5. Business License | 5-1 |



MEMORANDUM

City of Stanwood
10220 270th St NW
Stanwood, WA 98292
360-629-4577

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

TO: Community Development Committee

FROM: Ryan C. Larsen, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Business License

DATE: NOVEMBER 9, 2017

ATTACHMENT: A. Letter from United Methodist Church dated July 6, 2017

Staff is providing the Community Development Committee with background information pertaining to business licenses. During the regular meeting of the City Council on July 27, Pastor Dan Sailor from the Stanwood United Methodist Church addressed the requirement that churches obtain a business license within the City of Stanwood. He indicated the church has no business revenue and therefore he would like the Council to consider an exemption for churches so they are not required to obtain a business license and file annual reports with the State. Staff suggested that this issue be brought before the Community Development Committee for consideration.

There are approximately 70 cities within the State of Washington that are involved in the State Business License program administered by the Department of Revenue.

The following are the different ways the cities administer business licenses for non-profits.

Out of the 70 cities:

- 6 cities require non-profits to renew the city endorsement each year
 - Non-profits pay the \$19 State fee each year to include the city endorsement on their business license.
- 24 cities require non-profits to submit 501C paperwork

- By submitting the 501 C paperwork, the non-profits would pay the one-time \$19 State fee, then they would be put on the non-profit list and would only renew the Master License each year, exempt from the \$19.
- 25 cities require non-profits to register with the Secretary of State
 - Similar to #2, registering with the Secretary of State allows the non-profit to pay the one-time \$19 State fee, then they would be placed on the non-profit list and would only renew the Master License each year, exempt from the \$19.
- 14 cities exempt non-profits
 - Non-profits would not submit any paperwork to the State, just to the City.
- 1 city requires non-profits to contact the city directly for a non-profit business license
- City has its own non-profit business license. Paperwork maintained by the City.

The City of Stanwood currently follows the first bullet listed above and requires non-profits to renew the City endorsement each year. The Non-profits are exempted from the \$50 business license fee, but must pay the \$19 State fee each year to renew the endorsement.

In the past the City of Stanwood ran its own business license program and could waive all the fees, therefore the non-profits did not have to pay any fees to renew the endorsement each year.

Since moving to the State Business Licenses several years ago, some non-profits have not renewed their City endorsement to avoid the \$19 year fee assessed by the State. The City can waive the \$50 city fee, but cannot waive the State \$19 processing fee unless the City chooses to change the yearly reporting requirements.

Community Development Committee Options to Consider:

- Clarify the code to require that non-profits obtain the City endorsement and renew it yearly. The City will waive the City fee, but non-profits will have to pay the \$19 state fee each year.
- Change the Municipal Code to require non-profits to submit their 501c paperwork to the City. The City will notify the State and they will be exempted from the yearly renewal.
- Change the Municipal Code to require non-profits to register with the Secretary of State. The State will exempt them from the yearly renewal.
- Change the Municipal code to exempt non-profits.
- Change the Municipal Code to require non-profits to obtain a business license from the City. The City would create its own license for non-profits and keep separate records from the State.



**CITY OF STANWOOD
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA STAFF REPORT**

DATE: November 9, 2017

SUBJECT: Public Hearing – Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
(Capital Facilities Element Update)

CONTACT PERSON: Kevin Hushagen, Public Works Director

ATTACHMENTS: A. 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

ISSUE

The issue is whether or not to accept the proposed list of capital improvements in the 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Review and discuss the 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
2. Make a recommended changes to staff on the 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) prior to the Public Hearing

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The purpose of capital improvement planning is to:

- Provide adequate public facilities to serve existing and new development;
- Reduce the cost of serving new development with public facilities; and
- Ensure that these facilities will be in place when development occurs.

The capital improvement plan is a six or more year plan of capital projects with estimated costs and proposed methods of financing that are updated annually.

The Washington State Growth Management Act requires jurisdictions fully planning under the GMA to include a Capital Facilities Element in their comprehensive plans (RCW 36.70A.070 (3)). The Capital Facilities Element is required before a jurisdiction can impose GMA impact fees.

The capital improvement plan implements the land use element of the comprehensive plan, and these two elements, including the financing plan within the Capital Facilities Element, must be coordinated and consistent.

DISCUSSION

The Comprehensive Plan amendment would occur in the Capital Facilities Element and is needed to update the list of projects and projected costs for the next 6 years. The

updated list identifies building improvements, drainage, fire impact fees, parks, sewer, streets, and water capital projects with updated funding identified for the next 6 years.

The amendment maybe processed pursuant to RCW 36.70.130(2)(a)(iv) which allows the city to amend the Capital Facilities Element concurrently with the adoption of the City budget: 2(a) "... Amendments may be considered more frequently than once per year under the following circumstances..." (iv)"The amendment of the Capital Facilities Element of a comprehensive plan that occurs concurrently with the adoption or amendment of a county or city budget". The Stanwood Municipal Code 17.157.040 also allows the city to apply to amend the Capital Facilities Element when required for correlation with the budget up to December 30th each year.

While the City Council adopts a capital budget each year, the planning and actual expenditure of funds for capital projects generally occurs over a period of years. The City's Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facilities Plan, Transportation Improvement Plan, Water System Plan, General Sewer Plan, Park and Recreation Open Space Plan and Stormwater Management Plan identify the capital improvements needed to serve existing residents and maintain levels of service as new residents and businesses move into the City. The City Council also adopts a set of community improvement goals as a part of the annual budget process. The CIP for the various departments are attached in Exhibit A.

The Planning Commission has review the proposed CIP at their October 9, 2017 and will hold a public hearing at their October 23, 2017 meeting. The Commission will forward a recommendation City Council following the hearing.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Approval of a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) allows the City to apply for grant in the future and is a required element in establishing impact fees. Not having a CIP would affect both of these negatively by reducing the grants the city can apply for and the city's ability to collect impact fees.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Recommend bringing the proposed 2018 – 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to Council for adoption through an ordinance.
- 2) Direct staff to provide alternatives to the 2018 – 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to consider prior to bringing back to City Council.
- 3) Recommend denial of the proposed 2018 – 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

RECOMMENDED ACTION

None at this time

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Fire Impact Fees (105)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits						
Beginning Cash & Investments		29	40	26	20	20	20
Revenues		\$60,206	\$66,006	\$74,006	\$79,206	\$83,206	\$87,206
Impact Fees							
Interest		\$5,800	\$8,000	\$5,200	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Total Resources (includes BNC)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
		\$66,006	\$74,006	\$79,206	\$83,206	\$87,206	\$91,206
Expenditures:							
Machinery & Equipment							
	Total Proj Cost						
		\$0					
Total Expenditures		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ending Cash & Investments		\$66,006	\$74,006	\$79,206	\$83,206	\$87,206	\$91,206

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Building Improve (110)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2022
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$638,487	\$670,487	\$662,487	\$3,664,487	\$666,487	\$668,487
Revenues							
Impact Fees		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REET 1 Transfer-In		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds		\$700,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Interest		\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$10,012,435	\$1,340,487	\$672,487	\$3,664,487	\$3,666,487	\$668,487	\$670,487
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
City Hall furnace	\$20,000	\$20,000					
New City Hall/ PD	\$3,600,000	\$600,000			\$3,000,000		
Fire Station (lighting/paint/floors/kitchen/windows)	\$50,000	\$50,000					
Police Station (paint)	\$10,000		\$10,000				
Total Expenditures	\$3,680,000	\$670,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0
Ending Cash & Investments	\$6,332,435	\$670,487	\$662,487	\$3,664,487	\$666,487	\$668,487	\$670,487

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Street (102/103/677)	SFR Building Permits	Budget					
		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Beginning Cash & Investments		29	40	26	20	20	20
Revenues		\$774,036	\$657	\$655,215	\$234,171	\$241,905	\$542,543
Impact Fees	\$3,523.39	\$77,508	\$77,508	\$70,480	\$70,480	\$70,480	\$70,480
WSDOT/Safe Routes to School							
DOC/Safe Routes to School							
FWHA - STP							
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grants		\$1,885,000	\$10,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$1,260,000	\$7,000,000
Transportation Sales Tax		\$292,200	\$298,788	\$301,776	\$304,794	\$307,842	\$307,842
Interest		\$2,000	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$46,653,621	\$2,830,742	\$10,378,551	\$10,029,051	\$13,611,025	\$1,981,807	\$7,922,445
Total							
Expenditures:	Proj Cost						
Sidewalks	\$240,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Downtown Sidewalk Imprv.	\$120,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
Wayfinding	\$5,000		\$5,000				
Miscellaneous	\$150,000	\$25,000		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
72nd (272nd - 276th) *	\$5,280,000		\$1,056,000	\$528,000	\$3,696,000		
Pavement Inventory	\$50,000		\$50,000				
Viking Way / 90th *	\$3,300,000	\$300,000	\$3,000,000				
102nd Ave Overlay *	\$390,000	\$390,000					
Cedarhome Dr. Overlay *	\$300,000	\$300,000					
92nd Ave Overlay *	\$400,000	\$400,000					
SR532/Ovenell Access *	\$3,500,000	\$330,000	\$700,000	\$2,470,000			
SR532/88th Hamilton Access *	\$3,500,000		\$525,000	\$700,000	\$2,275,000		
Downtown Corn. Study *	\$275,000	\$75,000	\$200,000				
SR532 Corridor Study *	\$950,000	\$350,000					
102nd Ave Sidewalk *	\$106,498	\$106,498					
92nd Ave Sidewalk *	\$72,228	\$72,228					
273rd Pl. Sidewalk *	\$172,452		\$175,452				
72nd Ave Sidewalk *	\$391,356	\$391,356					
101st Ave Reconstruction *	\$2,640,000		\$660,000	\$132,000	\$1,848,000		
272nd St Reconstruction *	\$4,000,000		\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000
SR 532 Flood Berm/Bike Path *	\$1,112,000		\$1,112,000				
90th Ave 271st to 272nd *	\$124,884		\$124,884				
80th Ave Reconstruction *	\$7,030,000			\$2,109,000	\$4,921,000		
SR532 & 64th Roundabout *	\$3,500,000			\$3,500,000			
284th St Sidewalk *	\$185,880			\$185,880			
98th Dr. Sidewalk 268th to 270th *	\$123,240				\$123,240		
284th St Sidewalk *	\$185,880			\$185,880			
270th St. Redesign Curb *	\$735,828				\$735,828		
272nd St Sidewalk 72nd to 76th *	\$533,436				\$533,436		
276th St. Sidewalk 70th to 73rd *	\$898,125						\$898,125
Cedarhome Dr. Sidewalk 271st to 276th *	\$714,612						\$714,612
WWTP Loop Trail *	\$2,772,500						\$2,772,500
Church Creek Park Loop Trail *	\$535,000						\$535,000
Heritage Park Loop Trail *	\$411,750						\$411,750
WWTP Access Road Trail *	\$402,000			\$100,000	\$250,000		\$402,000
Total Expenditures	\$44,507,669	\$2,830,085	\$9,723,336	\$9,794,880	\$13,369,120	\$1,339,264	\$7,803,987
Ending Cash & Investments	\$2,145,952	\$657	\$655,215	\$234,171	\$241,905	\$542,543	\$118,458

* Project also included in TIP

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Parks (104/106/120/121)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$1,053,432	\$1,038,415	\$485,297	\$518,208	\$1,652,274	\$1,936,340
Revenues							
Impact Fees	\$640.80	\$18,583	\$25,632	\$16,661	\$12,816	\$12,816	\$12,816
REET 1 Transfer-In	\$720,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000
Bond Proceeds / Debt	\$0						
Grant Proceeds	\$1,150,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000	\$250,000
Ovenell							
Hamilton (WWRP/ALEA			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$2,250,000		
Johnson (Conservation Futures)		\$500,000					
Interest	\$7,650	\$1,400	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$11,910,940	\$2,193,415	\$1,435,297	\$873,208	\$2,902,274	\$2,186,340	\$2,320,406
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
Ovenell Property	\$130,000	\$55,000		\$75,000			
Heritage Park - 4th Field & Trail	\$1,050,000	\$50,000			\$1,000,000		
Hamilton Property	\$1,000,000	\$50,000	\$950,000				
Trail Plan Implementation	\$750,000			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	
Farmland Acquisition	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000					
New Neighborhood Park	\$280,000			\$30,000			\$250,000
Total Expenditures	\$4,210,000	\$1,155,000	\$950,000	\$355,000	\$1,250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Ending Cash & Investments	\$7,700,940	\$1,038,415	\$485,297	\$518,208	\$1,652,274	\$1,936,340	\$2,070,406

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plant
2018-2023

Drainage (411/412)		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments	Fees	\$58,062	\$3,497	\$513,447	\$1,261,287	\$1,989,637	\$17,952
Revenues							
Plant Investment Fees	\$665	\$19,285	\$26,600	\$17,290	\$13,300	\$13,300	\$13,300
Drainage Connection Fees	\$200	\$5,800	\$8,000	\$5,200	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Transfer-In from Drainage Operating			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds		\$200,000	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$1,500,000
Interest		\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$8,184,455	\$323,497	\$538,447	\$2,036,287	\$3,278,937	\$2,007,287	\$1,535,602
	Total						
(CIP#) Expenditures	Proj Cost						
(-) Drainage Rate Study	\$65,000	\$65,000					
(-) Retention Pond Improvements	\$125,000		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
(10) 85th Ave N Runoff	\$738,635			\$50,000	\$344,300	\$344,335	
(1) Irvine Slough Stormwater Separation	\$200,000	\$200,000					
(11) SR532 Flood Berm	\$1,055,000	\$55,000		\$450,000	\$550,000		
(7) 101st, 102nd, 103rd Replacement	\$1,500,000			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000	
(2) 92nd Ave (271st-SR532)	\$640,000				\$120,000	\$520,000	
(3) 271st (101st-102nd)	\$100,000					\$100,000	\$400,000
(4) 276th PI Pioneer Hwy Drainage Imp	\$58,791						\$58,791
(6) Augusta St. Pipe Upsize	\$292,915						\$292,915
(8) 271st St. NW @ Florence Rd Upsize	\$158,642						\$158,642
Total Expenditures	\$4,398,635	\$320,000	\$25,000	\$775,000	\$1,289,300	\$1,989,335	\$935,348
Ending Cash & Investments		\$3,497	\$513,447	\$1,261,287	\$1,989,637	\$17,952	\$600,254

Note 1: Split 50% with Sewer

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Water (422/423/424)		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$485,364	\$525,954	\$492,824	\$483,774	\$491,844	\$555,914
Revenues							
Connection Fees	\$600	\$12,000	\$13,200	\$13,200	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Cedar Home Benefit Area							
Transfers-In from Operating Funds		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plant Investment Charge (\$5,280)	\$5,280	\$153,120	\$211,200	\$137,280	\$105,600	\$105,600	\$105,600
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds			\$300,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$1,800,000	\$900,000
Interest		\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$7,584,774	\$651,534	\$1,051,404	\$844,354	\$1,052,424	\$2,410,494	\$1,574,564
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
Rate Study	\$65,000	\$65,000					
Improvements	\$300,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Transfer to Water Operating Fund 421	\$63,480	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580
Long Term Water Supply Study	\$40,000			\$20,000			\$20,000
297 Zone Res Design and Construction	\$2,000,000				\$500,000	\$1,500,000	
Hatt Slough Study	\$25,000					\$25,000	
Telemetry	\$33,000					\$33,000	
Decommission Fure Well	\$30,000			\$30,000			
Cedarhome Sand Production	\$0						
Cedarhome Generator	\$250,000			\$250,000			
Knittle Generator (2021-2026)	\$260,000						\$260,000
Knittle Booster Upgrades	\$945,000					\$236,000	\$709,000
Viking Way water main	\$498,000		\$498,000				
85th Dr water main	\$400,000					\$355,000	
Bryant Well monitor	\$30,000			\$30,000			
Cedarhome Dr water main	\$517,000				\$67,000	\$450,000	
Knittle tank recoating	\$540,000					\$540,000	
Park Lane water main	\$484,000					\$62,000	\$420,000
Total Expenditures	\$4,011,480	\$125,580	\$558,580	\$360,580	\$560,580	\$1,854,580	\$1,049,580
Ending Cash & Investments		\$525,954	\$492,824	\$483,774	\$491,844	\$555,914	\$524,984

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Sewer (403/405)		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
		\$2,095,555	\$1,658,109	\$1,026,399	\$28,025	\$223,795	\$533,565
Beginning Cash & Investments							
Revenues							
Connection Fees	\$500	\$14,500	\$20,000	\$13,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Plant Investment Charge	\$6,476	\$187,804	\$259,040	\$168,376	\$129,520	\$129,520	\$129,520
Performance Bond Proceeds							
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds							
Transfer in from Operations				\$100,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,800,000
Interest		\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$15,078,228	\$2,303,109	\$1,942,399	\$1,313,025	\$2,272,795	\$1,668,565	\$5,578,335
Expenditures:							
Total Proj Cost							
Miscellaneous Improvements Pipe Replacement (EX1)	\$1,096,000			\$274,000	\$274,000	\$274,000	\$274,000
Collector/Interceptor Syst Flow Monitoring & Video (EX 2)	\$353,000	\$45,000	\$40,000		\$40,000		\$233,000
Church Creek Collection System Construction (EX5A)	\$1,025,000						\$1,025,000
Cedarhome Collection System Construction (EX5B)	\$175,000						\$175,000
UV Energy Efficiency Upgrades	\$48,000		\$48,000				
272nd/101st-99th (EX13)	\$1,700,000			\$200,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	
Upper Pioneer Hwy/85th to Cedarhome (EX16)	\$572,000			\$86,000	\$486,000		
Pioneer Highway/Cedarhome to 267th St (EX 17)	\$559,000	\$50,000	\$509,000				
Lower Pioneer Highway Interceptor (EX18)	\$569,000			\$569,000			
72nd Avenue and 261st St. Interceptor (EX19)	\$717,000						\$717,000
72nd Ave Gravity Main Replacement (DF2)	\$193,000						\$193,000
Church Creek Loop Gravity Main Replacement (DF3)	\$423,000						\$423,000
68th Ave Gravity Main Replacement (DF4)	\$321,000						\$321,000
Miscellaneous Improvements Facilities (EX6)	\$140,000			\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Telemetry System Upgrades (EX7)	\$225,000	\$225,000					
Biosolids (EX8A-B)	\$2,035,000	\$110,000					\$1,925,000
Grit Removal Unit Installation (EX9)	\$203,000				\$51,000	\$76,000	\$76,000
Viking Way	\$169,000		\$169,000				
Main Lift Station Upgrades	\$486,000			\$73,000	\$413,000		
Ultra violet disinfection	\$173,000			\$48,000			\$125,000
Smoke Testing/camera/flow meter basin 1	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000				
Wastewater Rate Study	\$115,000	\$65,000					\$50,000
Total Expenditures	\$11,602,000	\$645,000	\$916,000	\$1,285,000	\$2,049,000	\$1,135,000	\$5,572,000
Ending Cash & Investments	\$3,476,228	\$1,658,109	\$1,026,399	\$28,025	\$223,795	\$533,565	\$6,335



**CITY OF STANWOOD
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA STAFF REPORT**

DATE: October 12, 2017

SUBJECT: Public Hearing – Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
(Capital Facilities Element Update)

CONTACT PERSON: Kevin Hushagen, Public Works Director

ATTACHMENTS: A. 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

ISSUE

The issue is whether or not to accept the proposed list of capital improvements in the 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Review and discuss the 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
2. Make a recommended changes to staff on the 2018-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) prior to the Public Hearing

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The purpose of capital improvement planning is to:

- Provide adequate public facilities to serve existing and new development;
- Reduce the cost of serving new development with public facilities; and
- Ensure that these facilities will be in place when development occurs.

The capital improvement plan is a six or more year plan of capital projects with estimated costs and proposed methods of financing that are updated annually.

The Washington State Growth Management Act requires jurisdictions fully planning under the GMA to include a Capital Facilities Element in their comprehensive plans (RCW 36.70A.070 (3)). The Capital Facilities Element is required before a jurisdiction can impose GMA impact fees.

The capital improvement plan implements the land use element of the comprehensive plan, and these two elements, including the financing plan within the Capital Facilities Element, must be coordinated and consistent.

DISCUSSION

The Comprehensive Plan amendment would occur in the Capital Facilities Element and is needed to update the list of projects and projected costs for the next 6 years. The

updated list identifies building improvements, drainage, fire impact fees, parks, sewer, streets, and water capital projects with updated funding identified for the next 6 years.

The amendment maybe processed pursuant to RCW 36.70.130(2)(a)(iv) which allows the city to amend the Capital Facilities Element concurrently with the adoption of the City budget: 2(a) "... Amendments may be considered more frequently than once per year under the following circumstances..." (iv)"The amendment of the Capital Facilities Element of a comprehensive plan that occurs concurrently with the adoption or amendment of a county or city budget". The Stanwood Municipal Code 17.157.040 also allows the city to apply to amend the Capital Facilities Element when required for correlation with the budget up to December 30th each year.

While the City Council adopts a capital budget each year, the planning and actual expenditure of funds for capital projects generally occurs over a period of years. The City's Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facilities Plan, Transportation Improvement Plan, Water System Plan, General Sewer Plan, Park and Recreation Open Space Plan and Stormwater Management Plan identify the capital improvements needed to serve existing residents and maintain levels of service as new residents and businesses move into the City. The City Council also adopts a set of community improvement goals as a part of the annual budget process. The CIP for the various departments are attached in Exhibit A.

The Planning Commission has review the proposed CIP at their October 9, 2017 and will hold a public hearing at their October 23, 2017 meeting. The Commission will forward a recommendation City Council following the hearing.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Approval of a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) allows the city to apply for grant in the future and is a required element in establishing impact fees. Not having a CIP would affect both of these negatively by reducing the grants the city can apply for and the city's ability to collect impact fees.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Recommend bringing the proposed 2018 – 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to Council for adoption through an ordinance.
- 2) Direct staff to provide alternatives to the 2018 – 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to consider prior to bringing back to City Council.
- 3) Recommend denial of the proposed 2018 – 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

RECOMMENDED ACTION

None at this time

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Fire Impact Fees (105)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits						
Beginning Cash & Investments		29	40	26	20	20	20
Revenues		\$60,206	\$66,006	\$74,006	\$79,206	\$83,206	\$87,206
Impact Fees							
Interest		\$5,800	\$8,000	\$5,200	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Total Resources (includes BNC)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
		\$66,006	\$74,006	\$79,206	\$83,206	\$87,206	\$91,206
Expenditures:							
Machinery & Equipment	Total Proj Cost						
	\$0						
Total Expenditures							
	\$0						
Ending Cash & Investments		\$66,006	\$74,006	\$79,206	\$83,206	\$87,206	\$91,206
	\$0						

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Building Improve (110)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2022
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$638,487	\$670,487	\$662,487	\$3,664,487	\$666,487	\$668,487
Revenues							
Impact Fees		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REET 1 Transfer-In		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds		\$700,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Interest		\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$10,012,435	\$1,340,487	\$672,487	\$3,664,487	\$3,666,487	\$668,487	\$670,487
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
City Hall furnace	\$20,000	\$20,000					
New City Hall/ PD	\$3,600,000	\$600,000			\$3,000,000		
Fire Station (lighting/paint/floors/kitchen/windows)	\$50,000	\$50,000					
Police Station (paint)	\$10,000		\$10,000				
Total Expenditures	\$3,680,000	\$670,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0
Ending Cash & Investments	\$6,332,435	\$670,487	\$662,487	\$3,664,487	\$666,487	\$668,487	\$670,487

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Street (102/103/677)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$774,036	\$657	\$655,215	\$234,171	\$241,905	\$542,543
Revenues							
Impact Fees	\$3,523.39	\$77,508	\$77,508	\$70,480	\$70,480	\$70,480	\$70,480
WSDOT/Safe Routes to School							
DOC/Safe Routes to School							
FWHA - STP							
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grants		\$1,885,000	\$10,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$1,260,000	\$7,000,000
Transportation Sales Tax		\$292,200	\$298,788	\$301,776	\$304,794	\$307,842	\$307,842
Interest		\$2,000	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$46,653,621	\$2,830,742	\$10,378,551	\$10,029,051	\$13,611,025	\$1,981,807	\$7,922,445
Total							
Expenditures:							
Proj Cost		\$70,000		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Sidewalks	\$240,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
Downtown Sidewalk Imprv.	\$120,000						
Wayfinding	\$5,000		\$5,000				
Miscellaneous	\$150,000	\$25,000		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
72nd (272nd - 276th) *	\$5,280,000		\$1,056,000	\$528,000	\$3,696,000		
Pavement Inventory	\$50,000		\$50,000				
Viking Way / 90th *	\$3,300,000	\$300,000	\$3,000,000				
102nd Ave Overlay *	\$390,000	\$390,000					
Cedarhome Dr. Overlay *	\$300,000	\$300,000					
92nd Ave Overlay *	\$400,000						
SR532/Ovenell Access *	\$3,500,000	\$330,000	\$700,000	\$2,470,000			
SR532/88th Hamilton Access *	\$3,500,000		\$525,000	\$700,000	\$2,275,000		
Downtown Corn. Study *	\$275,000	\$75,000	\$200,000				
SR532 Corridor Study *	\$950,000	\$350,000					
102nd Ave Sidewalk *	\$106,498	\$106,498					
92nd Ave Sidewalk *	\$72,228	\$72,228					
273rd Pl. Sidewalk *	\$172,452		\$175,452				
72nd Ave Sidewalk *	\$391,356	\$391,356					
101st Ave Reconstruction *	\$2,640,000		\$660,000	\$132,000	\$1,848,000		
272nd St Reconstruction *	\$4,000,000		\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000
SR 532 Flood Berm/Bike Path *	\$1,112,000		\$1,112,000				
90th Ave 271st to 272nd *	\$124,884		\$124,884				
80th Ave Reconstruction *	\$7,030,000			\$2,109,000	\$4,921,000		
SR532 & 64th Roundabout *	\$3,500,000			\$3,500,000			
284th St Sidewalk *	\$185,880			\$185,880			
98th Dr. Sidewalk 268th to 270th *	\$123,240				\$123,240		
284th St Sidewalk *	\$185,880			\$185,880			
270th St. Redesign Curb *	\$735,828				\$735,828		
272nd St Sidewalk 72nd to 76th *	\$533,436				\$533,436		
276th St. Sidewalk 70th to 73rd *	\$898,125						\$898,125
Cedarhome Dr. Sidewalk 271st to 276th *	\$714,612						\$714,612
WWTP Loop Trail *	\$2,772,500						\$2,772,500
Heritage Park Loop Trail *	\$535,000						\$535,000
Church Creek Park Loop Trail *	\$411,750						\$411,750
WWTP Access Road Trail *	\$402,000			\$100,000	\$250,000		\$402,000
Total Expenditures	\$44,507,669	\$2,830,085	\$9,723,336	\$9,794,880	\$13,369,120	\$1,339,264	\$7,803,987
Ending Cash & Investments	\$2,145,952	\$657	\$655,215	\$234,171	\$241,905	\$542,543	\$118,458

* Project also included in TIP

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Parks (104/106/120/121)		Budget 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$1,053,432	\$1,038,415	\$485,297	\$518,208	\$1,652,274	\$1,936,340
Revenues							
Impact Fees	\$640.80	\$18,583	\$25,632	\$16,661	\$12,816	\$12,816	\$12,816
REET 1 Transfer-In	\$720,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000
Bond Proceeds / Debt	\$0						
Grant Proceeds	\$1,150,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000	\$250,000
Ovenell							
Hamilton (WWRP/ALEA			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$2,250,000		
Johnson (Conservation Futures)		\$500,000					
Interest	\$7,650	\$1,400	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$11,910,940	\$2,193,415	\$1,435,297	\$873,208	\$2,902,274	\$2,186,340	\$2,320,406
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
Ovenell Property	\$130,000	\$55,000		\$75,000			
Heritage Park - 4th Field & Trail	\$1,050,000	\$50,000			\$1,000,000		
Hamilton Property	\$1,000,000	\$50,000	\$950,000				
Trail Plan Implementation	\$750,000			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	
Farmland Acquisition	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000					
New Neighborhood Park	\$280,000			\$30,000			\$250,000
Total Expenditures	\$4,210,000	\$1,155,000	\$950,000	\$355,000	\$1,250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Ending Cash & Investments	\$7,700,940	\$1,038,415	\$485,297	\$518,208	\$1,652,274	\$1,936,340	\$2,070,406

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plant
2018-2023

Drainage (411/412)		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments	Fees	\$58,062	\$3,497	\$513,447	\$1,261,287	\$1,989,637	\$17,952
Revenues							
Plant Investment Fees	\$665	\$19,285	\$26,600	\$17,290	\$13,300	\$13,300	\$13,300
Drainage Connection Fees	\$200	\$5,800	\$8,000	\$5,200	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Transfer-In from Drainage Operating							
Bond Proceeds / Debt		\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Grant Proceeds		\$200,000	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$1,500,000
Interest		\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$8,184,455	\$323,497	\$538,447	\$2,036,287	\$3,278,937	\$2,007,287	\$1,535,602
	Total						
(CIP#) Expenditures	Proj Cost						
(-) Drainage Rate Study	\$65,000	\$65,000					
(-) Retention Pond Improvements	\$125,000		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
(10) 85th Ave N Runoff	\$738,635			\$50,000	\$344,300	\$344,335	
(1) Irvine Slough Stormwater Separation	\$200,000	\$200,000					
(11) SR532 Flood Berm	\$1,055,000	\$55,000		\$450,000	\$550,000		
(7) 101st, 102nd, 103rd Replacement	\$1,500,000			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,000,000	
(2) 92nd Ave (271st-SR532)	\$640,000				\$120,000	\$520,000	
(3) 271st (101st-102nd)	\$100,000					\$100,000	\$400,000
(4) 276th PI Pioneer Hwy Drainage Imp	\$58,791						\$58,791
(6) Augusta St. Pipe Upsize	\$292,915						\$292,915
(8) 271st St. NW @ Florence Rd Upsize	\$158,642						\$158,642
Total Expenditures	\$4,398,635	\$320,000	\$25,000	\$775,000	\$1,289,300	\$1,989,335	\$935,348
Ending Cash & Investments		\$3,497	\$513,447	\$1,261,287	\$1,989,637	\$17,952	\$600,254

Note 1: Split 50% with Sewer

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Water (422/423/424)		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$485,364	\$525,954	\$492,824	\$483,774	\$491,844	\$555,914
Revenues							
Connection Fees	\$600	\$12,000	\$13,200	\$13,200	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Cedar Home Benefit Area							
Transfers-In from Operating Funds		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Plant Investment Charge (\$5,280)	\$5,280	\$153,120	\$211,200	\$137,280	\$105,600	\$105,600	\$105,600
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds			\$300,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$1,800,000	\$900,000
Interest		\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$7,584,774	\$651,534	\$1,051,404	\$844,354	\$1,052,424	\$2,410,494	\$1,574,564
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
Rate Study	\$65,000	\$65,000					
Improvements	\$300,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Transfer to Water Operating Fund 421	\$63,480	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580	\$10,580
Long Term Water Supply Study	\$40,000			\$20,000			\$20,000
297 Zone Res Design and Construction	\$2,000,000				\$500,000	\$1,500,000	
Hatt Slough Study	\$25,000					\$25,000	
Telemetry	\$33,000					\$33,000	
Decommission Fure Well	\$30,000			\$30,000			
Cedarhome Sand Production	\$0						
Cedarhome Generator	\$250,000			\$250,000			
Knittle Generator (2021-2026)	\$260,000						\$260,000
Knittle Booster Upgrades	\$945,000					\$236,000	\$709,000
Viking Way water main	\$498,000		\$498,000				
85th Dr water main	\$400,000					\$355,000	
Bryant Well monitor	\$30,000			\$30,000			
Cedarhome Dr water main	\$517,000				\$67,000	\$450,000	
Knittle tank recoating	\$540,000					\$540,000	
Park Lane water main	\$484,000					\$62,000	\$420,000
Total Expenditures	\$4,011,480	\$125,580	\$558,580	\$360,580	\$560,580	\$1,854,580	\$1,049,580
Ending Cash & Investments		\$525,954	\$492,824	\$483,774	\$491,844	\$555,914	\$524,984

City of Stanwood
6-Year Capital Improvement Plan
2018-2023

Sewer (403/405)		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	SFR Building Permits	29	40	26	20	20	20
Beginning Cash & Investments		\$2,095,555	\$1,658,109	\$1,026,399	\$28,025	\$223,795	\$533,565
Revenues							
Connection Fees	\$500	\$14,500	\$20,000	\$13,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Plant Investment Charge	\$6,476	\$187,804	\$259,040	\$168,376	\$129,520	\$129,520	\$129,520
Performance Bond Proceeds							
Bond Proceeds / Debt							
Grant Proceeds							
Transfer in from Operations					\$2,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,800,000
Interest		\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$5,250
Total Resources (includes BNC)	\$15,078,228	\$2,303,109	\$1,942,399	\$1,313,025	\$2,272,795	\$1,668,565	\$5,578,335
Expenditures:	Total Proj Cost						
Miscellaneous Improvements Pipe Replacement (EX1)	\$1,096,000			\$274,000	\$274,000	\$274,000	\$274,000
Collector/Interceptor Syst Flow Monitoring & Video (EX 2)	\$353,000	\$45,000	\$40,000		\$40,000		\$233,000
Church Creek Collection System Construction (EX5A)	\$1,025,000						\$1,025,000
Cedarhome Collection System Construction (EX5B)	\$175,000						\$175,000
UV Energy Efficiency Upgrades	\$48,000		\$48,000				
272nd/101st-99th (EX13)	\$1,700,000			\$200,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	
Upper Pioneer Hwy/85th to Cedarhome (EX16)	\$572,000			\$86,000	\$486,000		
Pioneer Highway/Cedarhome to 267th St (EX 17)	\$559,000	\$50,000	\$509,000				
Lower Pioneer Highway Interceptor (EX18)	\$569,000			\$569,000			
72nd Avenue and 261st St. Interceptor (EX19)	\$717,000						\$717,000
72nd Ave Gravity Main Replacement (DF2)	\$193,000						\$193,000
Church Creek Loop Gravity Main Replacement (DF3)	\$423,000						\$423,000
68th Ave Gravity Main Replacement (DF4)	\$321,000						\$321,000
Miscellaneous Improvements Facilities (EX6)	\$140,000			\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Telemetry System Upgrades (EX7)	\$225,000	\$225,000					
Biosolids (EX8A-B)	\$2,035,000	\$110,000					\$1,925,000
Grit Removal Unit Installation (EX9)	\$203,000				\$51,000	\$76,000	\$76,000
Viking Way	\$169,000		\$169,000				
Main Lift Station Upgrades	\$486,000			\$73,000	\$413,000		
Ultra violet disinfection	\$173,000			\$48,000			\$125,000
Smoke Testing/camera/flow meter basin 1	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000				
Wastewater Rate Study	\$115,000	\$65,000					\$50,000
Total Expenditures	\$11,602,000	\$645,000	\$916,000	\$1,285,000	\$2,049,000	\$1,135,000	\$5,572,000
Ending Cash & Investments	\$3,476,228	\$1,658,109	\$1,026,399	\$28,025	\$223,795	\$533,565	\$6,335



**CITY OF STANWOOD
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA STAFF REPORT**

DATE: November 9, 2017

SUBJECT: Code Edits Title 17 –Tattoo and B&B changes (Zoning Use Table)

CONTACT PERSON: Ryan C. Larsen, Community Development Director

ATTACHMENTS: A. Proposed Edits to Zoning Use Table and Footnote
B. Supporting Information for Tattoo Parlor
C. Letter from Mark Ramaley dated September 13, 2017

ISSUE

The issue before the Community Development Committee is to review the proposed edits to Title 17 affecting tattoo parlors and bed and breakfast establishments.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Review and discuss the proposed edits to Title 17 affecting tattoo parlors and bed and breakfast establishments in the zoning use table and footnote.
2. Provide any input on how to proceed with these edits.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

City staff has made a couple changes to Title 17 based on the desire of the Planning Commission and Mayor. The Planning Commission reviewed these suggested changes at their October 23 meeting and supported staff moving forward with them.

DISCUSSION

The change to the Personal Services section of the zoning use table under SMC 17.30.040 adds Tattoo Parlors as a permitted use in the MBI and GC zones. The other change to the zoning use table changes Bed and Breakfast Inns as an Administrative Conditional Use permit under SR5, MR, and GC from a Conditional Use Permit and changes Bed and Breakfast Residence from a Conditional Use to an Administrative Conditional Use permit under the SR12.4, SR9.6, SR7.0, SR5.0, MR and GC zones. Also changed footnote (6) to allow up to 6 rooms in all SR zones from 2 rooms under SMC 17.30.050.

Also, staff was asked to look at Chapter 17.50 Additional Standards – LI (Light Industrial) Zoning District to see if something similar could be done for the GI (General Industrial) zone. However, after reviewing the potential for a proposed edit, staff realized more time should be given to this issue to ensure the change is adequately done. Staff

will work on this change over the next several months and bring back to both the City Council Community Development Committee and Planning Commission for review and consideration after the first of the year.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Support the proposed edits to Title 17 affecting tattoo parlors and bed and breakfast establishments in the zoning use table and footnote and have staff move forward with Planning Commission and City Council for consideration.
- 2) Support the proposed edits to Title 17 affecting tattoo parlors and bed and breakfast establishments in the zoning use table and direct staff to provide alternative language to consider for a recommendation by both the Planning Commission and City Council.
- 3) Do not support the proposed edits to Title 17 affecting tattoo parlors and bed and breakfast establishments in the zoning use table and footnote.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

No recommendation provided.

ATTACHMENT A

17.30.040 Zoning Use Table

KEY:

Blank = Not Permitted

AC = Accessory Use

ADC = Administrative Conditional Use

C = Conditional Use

P = Permitted Use

AEO = Adult Entertainment Overlay

HO = Historic Overlay

TO = Transit Overlay

MPO = Master Plan Overlay

MXO = Mixed Use Overlay

[illegible]

Land Use	SR 12.4	SR 9.6	SR 7.0	SR 5.0	MR	TN	MB-I ²⁹	MB-II	NB	GC	LI	GI
Personal Services												
Assisted/independent living					C18	C		P11, P18		P18		
Barber shop, beauty shop					P39MXO	P	P	P	P	P, P39 MXO		P37TO
Daycare center			P12	P12	P12	P12	P12	P12	P12	P12, P39 MXO		P37TO
Daycare, family	AC12	AC12	AC12	AC12	P12		P37TO	P	P12	P12, P39 MXO		P37TO
Daycare, mini				P12	P12	P12	P12	P12	P12	P12, P39 MXO		
Dry cleaner					P39MXO	P35	P	P	P	P, P39 MXO	P	P
Equipment rental								P		P, P39 MXO	P	P
Funeral home							P	P		P, P39 MXO	P	
Health/athletic club					P39MXO		P	P		P, P39 MXO	P	
Janitorial service					P39MXO			P			P	P
Laundromat					P39MXO	P35	P	P	P	P, P39 MXO	P	P37TO
Optician					P39MXO	P	P	P	P	P, P39 MXO		P37TO
Massage clinic/center							P	P		P, P39 MXO		
Medical marijuana collective gardens							ADC	ADC		ADC	ADC	
Photo processing service					P39MXO		P	P		P, P39 MXO	P	
Photocopy/private mail center							P	P		P, P39 MXO		

Printing and publishing					P39MXO		P	P		P, P39 MXO	P	
Private clubs					P39MXO		P	P		P, P39 MXO		
Tattoo parlors					P39MXO		<u>P</u>	P		<u>P</u>		P
Travel agencies					P39MXO	P	P	P				
Video sales and rental					P39MXO	P	P37TO	P	P	P, P39 MXO	P37TO	P37TO
Other uses determined to be consistent with the definition of “personal service” as determined in this code							P51HO					

17.30.050 Zoning use conditions.

(6) A business license and compliance with conditions in SMC 17.100.060 for permitting a bed and breakfast use are required. Bed and breakfast residence use is limited to ~~two rooms per residence. Bed and breakfast inn use is limited to six rooms in the SR 5.0 zone,~~ 10 rooms in the MR zone and 16 rooms in the GC zone.

ATTACHMENT B

17.100.060 Conditions for permitting a bed and breakfast in single-family residential zones.

Subsequent to a public hearing, the city's hearing examiner shall find or attach the following conditions prior to issuing a conditional use permit:

- (1) Bed and breakfast businesses shall be conducted in such a manner as to give no outward appearance or manifest any characteristics of a business, except as provided below, that would infringe upon the rights of the neighboring properties to live in a quiet residents-only neighborhood.
- (2) Numbers of guest rooms shall be limited to the maximums set in the Tables of Dimensional and Density Requirements, Chapters 17.30 through 17.78 SMC.
- (3) Adequate parking per SMC 17.105.140 shall be provided on-site and screened from the view of all neighboring properties.
- (4) Safe pick-up and drop-off and loading/unloading areas shall be provided on-site.
- (5) Commercial accessory uses shall not be permitted.
- (6) Serving of meals shall be limited to overnight guests. No kitchen facilities shall be permitted in guest rooms, except microwave ovens, small refrigerators, and coffee pots.
- (7) Adequate utilities, including sewer, water, and electricity, shall be confirmed by the purveyor.
- (8) Adequate public roads shall be available or improved by the applicant as determined by the public works director.
- (9) Impact to the existing neighborhood shall be minimized to the extent possible by the provision of greater setbacks and landscaping to screen on-site activities. At a minimum, all lot lines abutting residentially developed lots shall be planted with a five-foot wide landscaping strip providing a dense visual barrier of trees and shrubs.
- (10) Signage shall be limited to one monument sign meeting the standards of SMC 17.110.235.

“Bed and breakfast house or inn” means a building other than a hotel or nursing home where meals and short-term lodging of more than two rooms are provided for compensation to guests and other transient persons.

“Bed and breakfast residence” means a building other than a hotel or nursing home where meals and short-term lodging of two rooms or less are provided for compensation to guests and other transient persons.

Land Use	SR 12.4	SR 9.6	SR 7.0	SR 5.0	MR	TN	MB-I ²⁹	MB-II	NB	GC	LI	GI
Hotels and Guesthouses												
Apartment hotel							P	P		P, P39 MXO		
Bed and breakfast inn				<u>AC6, 32</u>	<u>AC6, 32</u>		P6, 32	P6, 32		<u>AC6, 32</u>		P37TO
Bed and breakfast residence	<u>AC6, 32</u>	<u>AC6, 32</u>	<u>AC6, 32</u>	<u>AC6, 32</u>	<u>AC6, 32</u>		AC6, 32	AC6, 32		<u>AC6, 32</u>		P37TO
Guest house							P	P				
Hotel							P	P11, P		P, P39 MXO	P18	
Motel									P	P, P39 MXO	P18	
Resort											P18	

(6) A business license and compliance with conditions in SMC 17.100.060 for permitting a bed and breakfast use are required. Bed and breakfast residence use is limited to two rooms per residence. ~~Bed and breakfast inn use is limited to six rooms in the SR 5.0 zone, 10 rooms in the MR zone and 16 rooms in the GC zone.~~

(32) Restaurants that serve lunches and/or dinner shall be allowed in bed and breakfast accommodations.

(37) Permitted in the transit overlay when part of a transit-oriented project as defined in SMC 17.77.040.

ATTACHMENT C

September 13, 2017

Mr. Ryan Larsen, Community Development Director
City of Stanwood
10220 270th Ave. NW
Stanwood, WA 98292

Re: Bed and Breakfast Residences

Dear Ryan:

Several years ago, I was looking into the code to see what the potential would be for a bed and breakfast at my property, the Klondike Anderson Mansion on the east hill. Considering the size (5 bedrooms), age (1912) and land area (2+ acres on 2 tax lots), it seemed a perfect candidate for such use, if I ever were to pursue that opportunity. The code (revised 10/06) seemed to indicate that I could have up to 2 guest rooms per acre plus a primary residence. Thus, I had been under the impression these past 10 years or so that 4 guest rooms would be permitted.

Now that I am remarried and my wife and I are looking ahead into our golden years, the idea of a bed and breakfast has been rekindled. However, to my surprise, I discovered that the current code restricts a bed and breakfast residence to a maximum of 2 rooms, with no consideration given to the size of either the home or the lot. While a 2 room maximum may be appropriate for many of the smaller turn-of-the-century homes on city lots downtown, more guest rooms (and revenue) should be permitted on larger properties that are more expensive to maintain and have more land to accommodate more guests.

At a time when the city is studying ways to attract more lodging opportunities within the city limits, it would seem that the 2-room limit restricts the potential market for overnight stays in Stanwood, and is a disincentive for certain property owners who might otherwise be willing to make the investment in time and money to create unique bed and breakfast lodging.

Perhaps this restriction was an oversight and unintended. It would be interesting to learn the rationale behind this change. In any event, I would urge you to consider editing this section of the code to allow for more units and thus better economies for larger properties.

Sincerely,



Mark Ramaley
Klondike Manor, LLC



**CITY OF STANWOOD
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA STAFF REPORT**

ITEM NUMBER:

DATE: November 9, 2017

SUBJECT: Adjust the parks and recreation impact fee to reflect the current cost of park acquisition and development

CONTACT PERSON: David A. Hammond, Finance Director/City Clerk

ATTACHMENTS: A – Park Impact Fee Change
B – Parks Expansion Project List

ISSUE

The issue before the Community Development Committee is an update to the Stanwood Municipal Code (SMC) section 17.151.070, Parks and Recreation Impact Fee Component.

SUMMARY

The city currently has a Park and Recreation Impact Fee of \$640.80 for new single family residential development and \$453.90 for multi-family units. The park impact fee ensures new development pays a proportionate share for additional park capacity.

The Parks and Recreation Impact Fee has not been revised since it was first established in 1993. The Parks and Trails Advisory Committee (PTAC) recently recommended that city staff review the Park Impact Fee. Staff noted the impact fees have not been updated since well before acquisition of the Hamilton and Ovenell properties, and recalculated the impact fee using current cost information. After reviewing the alternatives outlined below, the PTAC voted in favor of increasing the Park Impact Fee.

DISCUSSION

As noted above, the Park Impact Fee has not been updated since 1993. As one of several measures intended to remedy the funding gap for park improvement projects, the Stanwood Parks and Trails Advisory Committee recommended the city recalculate the impact fee using current cost data. City staff updated the fee formula as summarized below.

The Park Impact Fee formula is based upon acquisition and development costs and the parks standard in acres, as determined in the Comprehensive Plan for neighborhood and community parks (currently 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents each, totaling 5 acres).

Acquisition costs are based on the recent Hamilton and Ovenell property acquisitions. Capacity project costs were extracted from the project list developed by the PTAC (Attachment B).

In order to communicate the differences in alternatives, the following brief introduction to the impact fee formula is helpful. The Parks and Recreation Impact Fee formula is established in the municipal code and includes four elements (C, S, U and A), the product of which is divided by 1,000 (P) to express cost per 1,000 city residents:

$$PIF = \frac{C \times S \times U \times A}{P}$$

The variables requiring update at this time are the average cost per acre for acquisition and development ("C"), standard park acreages ("S"), and standard occupancies ("U"). Current acquisition and development cost data was readily available as a result of the PTAC group's efforts (aided by city staff), standard acreages are established in the comprehensive plan, and standard occupancies were obtained from census data. The 60% adjustment for new development sales tax revenue ("A") was not changed. Detailed capacity project cost and acreage information is provided in a table as Attachment B.

The calculation of the updated impact fee includes capacity project costs identified by the PTAC for neighborhood and community parks and utilizes the combined parks standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents (Alternative One). Detail of costs included in Alternative 1 are provided in Attachment B, Table One.

Alternative Two excludes park development costs that are not planned within a six-year time horizon. Detail of costs included in Alternative 2 are provided in Attachment B, Table Two.

The third alternative excludes park development costs not planned to occur within a six-year time horizon, and also excludes associated transportation costs, which are included in the existing formula. This rationale is supported by the fact that transportation improvements within the six-year planning horizon are included in the City's Transportation Improvement Plan. Detail of costs included in Alternative 3 are provided in Attachment B, Table Three. The following table illustrates the three alternatives.

	Current Ordinance # 1164	Alternate No. 1	Alternate No. 2	Alternate No. 3	
C	\$ 89,000	\$ 866,101	\$ 539,494	\$ 320,075	C= Cost/acre for acquisition & development
S	5	5	5	5	S= Parks standard acres per comp plan (2.5 each for Community and Neighborhood Parks)
U	2.4/1.7	2.77/2.17	2.77/2.17	2.77/2.17	U= Occupants/dwelling unit (2.77 SFR/2.17 MFR)
A	60%	60%	60%	60%	A= 60% adjustment for sales tax revenue generated by new development
P	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	P= 1,000 -- to express level of service in terms of acres/per 1,000 residents
=PIF SFR	\$ 640.80	\$ 7,197.30	\$ 4,483.20	\$ 2,659.83	
=PIF MFR	\$ 453.90	\$ 5,638.32	\$ 3,512.11	\$ 2,083.69	

Staff gathered the following park impact fee data for comparison with neighboring cities; however, it is important to note that these jurisdictions' fee structures are not all recently updated, and also their parks systems have both similar and differing characteristics, which makes comparison difficult.

Comparable Cities Impact Fees		
<i>Review Date 3/3/2017</i>		
City	Single Family	Multi-Family
Mount Vernon	\$ 855	\$ 789
Marysville	\$ 1,328	\$ 938
Sedro Woolley	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Arlington	\$ 1,662	\$ 1,497
Lake Stevens	\$ 2,363	\$ 1,733
Snohomish	\$ 4,150	\$ 3,600
Monroe	\$ 4,579	\$ 3,901

The City Council was presented with this proposal at a study session on June 29, 2017. Council directed staff to bring an ordinance revising the Park Impact Fee using current cost information. The council was in favor of cost assessment Alternative Two, which excludes park development costs that are not planned within a six-year time horizon and the impact fee would be set at \$4,483.20 for single family residence and \$3,512.11 for multi-family. Council noted it would like to have the Park Impact Fee reviewed every six years.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The proposed increase is estimated to result in an increase of \$131,130 (Alternative One) or \$676,848 (Alternative Two) or \$40,381 (Alternative Three) in annual park impact fees based on an estimated twenty single family residential building permits per year.

PTAC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The PTAC considered Alternatives 1 – 3 at their June 19, 2017 meeting. The Committee did not recommend Alternative 1. Although the Committee desires to increase funding for parks and understands the importance of new development paying their fair share for park capacity projects, they also recognize the need to balance the effect of impact fees on attracting new development to Stanwood. Given that, the PTAC recommends an increase to the Park Impact Fee at either the Alternative 2 or 3 level.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Support the current proposal for the Park Impact Fee, which was Alternative 2 by the Council. This support came from the Council Study session from June 29, 2017.
- 2) Support an alternative amount of the Park Impact Fee to staff.
- 3) Support leaving the Parks Impact Fee as it currently exists.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

None at this time.

ATTACHMENT A

17.151.070 Park and recreation impact fee component.

The impact fee component for parks and recreational facilities shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{PIF} = \frac{C \times S \times U \times A}{P}$$

(1) "PIF" means the park and recreational facility component of the total development impact fee.

(2) "C" means the average cost per acre for land appraisal and acquisition plus an average development cost of ~~\$50,000~~ [\$866,101] [\$539,494] [\$320,075] per acre for neighborhood and community parks. Such cost may be adjusted periodically, but not more often than once every year. Park development costs shall be based on actual, recent comparable construction ~~and shall include associated project improvements such as streets.~~

(3) "S" means the parks standard ~~in~~ of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents each for neighborhood and community parks (total of 5 acres) as established in the city comprehensive park and recreational plan ~~to total 10 acres.~~

(4) "P" means 1,000 people.

(5) "U" means the average number of occupants per dwelling unit, or ~~2.4~~ 2.77 occupants for a single-family/duplex dwelling unit, ~~1.7~~ 2.17 occupants for any other multifamily dwelling unit.

(6) "A" means an adjustment of rate portion of anticipated tax revenues resulting from a development that is proratable to system improvements contained in the capital plan facilities. The adjustment for park impacts is determined to be 40 percent, so that "A" equals 60 percent.

ATTACHMENT B

City of Stanwood Parks Expansion (capacity) Project List

(Excerpted from Parks & Trails Advisory Committee Parks Implementation Plan)

TABLE ONE—Costs for Alternative No. 1				
Park	Project Description	Estimated Cost	Acreage	Cost/Acre
Community Parks				
Church Creek	Kitchen structure, loop and creek trails, bike parking and park expansion master plan	\$ 615,250	15.39	
Hamilton Landing		\$ 6,676,000	2.84	
Downtown		\$ 500,000		
Community Park Totals		\$ 7,791,250	18.23	\$ 427,386
Neighborhood Parks				
Lions	Restrooms, swings	\$ 130,000	0.68	
City Hall	Develop/implement park master plan (possible spray park)	\$ 250,000	0.28	
Lindstrom		\$ 10,000,000	4.53	
Ravenna Viaduct			0.38	
Neighborhood Park Totals		\$ 10,380,000	5.87	\$ 1,768,313
SubTotal Development Costs		18,171,250	24.1	\$753,994
Acquisition Cost/Acre				\$ 112,108
Total Development and Acquisition Cost/Acre				<u>\$ 866,102</u>

TABLE TWO—Costs for Alternative No. 2				
Park	Project Description	Estimated Cost	Acreage	Cost/Acre
Community Parks				
Church Creek	Kitchen structure, loop and creek trails, bike parking and park expansion master plan	\$ 615,250	15.39	
Hamilton Landing		\$ 6,676,000	2.84	
Community Park Totals		\$ 7,791,250	18.23	\$ 427,386
Acquisition Cost/Acre				\$ 112,108
Total Development and Acquisition Cost/Acre				<u>\$ 539,494</u>

TABLE THREE—Costs for Alternative No. 3				
Park	Project Description	Estimated Cost	Acreage	Cost/Acre
Community Parks				
Church Creek	Kitchen structure, loop and creek trails, bike parking and park expansion master plan	\$ 615,250	15.39	
Hamilton Landing		\$ 3,176,000	2.84	
Community Park Totals		\$ 3,791,250	18.23	\$ 207,967
Acquisition Cost/Acre				\$ 112,108
Total Development and Acquisition Cost/Acre				<u>\$ 320,075</u>