



King County

Transportation, Economy and Environment Committee

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item:	5	Name:	Kendall Moore Rick Bautista
Proposed No.:	2012-B0045	Date:	April 3, 2012
Invited:	Paul Reitenbach and Harry Reinert, DDES Karen Wolf, Executive's Office		

SUBJECT

Briefing on Executive's 2012 proposed amendments to King County Comprehensive Plan ("KCCP") policies and text contained in Chapter 2 (Urban Communities).

The Growth Management Act ("GMA") requires the County to designate Urban Growth Areas ("UGA") for growth that makes intensive use of the land for buildings, infrastructure, and impermeable surfaces such that agriculture, natural resources and mineral extraction uses, and uses of a rural character are incompatible.¹ One of the GMA goals is to "encourage development in the urban areas where public facilities already exist or can be provided in an efficient manner."²

There are not broad new initiatives proposed in this Chapter. Instead, the Executive's proposed changes are more aimed at incorporating into existing policies the concepts of public health and sustainability. The policies regarding Housing, found in "Section III Housing," starting on page 2-38 through 2-62, have undergone the many revisions. Council staff analysis of these policies will be reported out as part of the April 17, 2012 TREE briefing.

SYNOPSIS OF KEY ISSUES

- Adding new concepts that have no definition or context
- Revising policies to refocus intent of the policy
- Eliminating reliance the automobile as a preferred mode of transportation
- Less emphasis on annexation

¹ RCW 36.70A.030(18).

² RCW 36.70A.020(1)

- Reformulating policies on low impact development to more broadly encompass stormwater management

OVERVIEW OF PERTINENT CHAPTER SECTIONS AND ISSUES:

ANALYSIS

Section 1. Urban Communities, (pp. 2-2 through 2-33)³ contain the policies that govern the varied urban uses including housing, mixed use, commercial and industrial.

1. p. 2-2

U-101 Development within the Urban Growth Area should create and maintain safe, healthy and diverse communities. These communities should contain a range of affordable, healthy housing and employment opportunities, school and recreational facilities and should be designed to protect the natural environment and significant cultural resources

ISSUE: Because the term "healthy housing" is undefined and not a widely recognized term of art, it is unclear the full scope of what is intended by adding the adjective to modify the term "housing." In response to an inquiry, Executive staff reported it could entail where the house is located, materials used in its construction, and/or the house being toxic free. Council staff has requested a definition from Executive staff that could be included either in the text before this policy or in the Glossary so that the reader has a clear understanding of the intent of this modifier.⁴

2. p. 2-3

The first full paragraph at the top of top of page⁵ causes confusion with the tables included at pages i-5 and i-6 of the Introduction. The tables are added for the first time by the Executive. These tables are an updated version of "Quick Facts" sheet, which used to be included in the Annual Growth Reports. The Executive branch stopped producing these Reports in 2009.⁶

³ The KCCP chapters use an outline form to divide the chapters. The hierarchy is: Roman numerals for the overall section; then using capital letters to demark subsections; and then a subsection may further broken down into numbered subparts (e.g.: **III.** Housing, **A.** Housing Choice and Opportunity Throughout King County, **1.** Range of Housing Choices is on page 2-38)

⁴ Members will recall that the transmitted Executive's proposed 2012 updates did not include the Glossary or the Frequently Used Acronym page. Staff propose the 2008 version of these, and as may be amended during the Council's process, be added to the 2012 Comprehensive Plan. The link to the web page on which the adopted 2008 Glossary can be found is: www.kingcounty.gov/property/permits/codes/growth/CompPlan/2008_2010update.aspx#glossary. A copy will be added to the members' Comp Plan binder.

⁵ Page numbers on the odd numbered pages omitted in the spiral bound version of the proposed comprehensive plan updates. This will be corrected by amendment.

⁶ The following is a link to what appears to be the last Annual Growth Report and Quick Facts sheet from 2009: www.kingcounty.gov/exec/PSB/PerformMgmt/KCGrowthReport/AboutKCGrowthReport.aspx.

The data in the tables in the Introduction is from 2008 through 2010; whereas the data in chapter 2, at both pages 2-3 and 2-34, is reportedly based more recent information and causes confusion when compared to the tables in the Introduction.

ISSUES: Because the tables do not provide clarity to the demographic text in the Introduction, and do not line up with the data in the later chapters, Council staff recommend that they be removed from the Introduction. Executive staff are not opposed to these being removed. The Council could consider adding to the work plan for the Executive a request to reinstitute the Annual Growth Reports, including the "Quick Facts" tables, annually and make them available on line.

Additionally, a new paragraph should be added to direct the reader to the official Land Use Map referenced in **U-102**, which can be found at the end of Chapter 1.

3. p. 2-3

U-103 Parcels (~~which~~)that are split by the Urban Growth Area boundary line should be reviewed for possible (~~redesignated~~) redesignation to either all urban or all rural unless the parcel is split to recognize environmentally sensitive features, geographic features, (~~or~~) the requirements of interlocal agreements, or the requirements of King County plans.

ISSUE: According to the Executive staff, the proposed revision is to clarify that redesignation is not required on split parcels but that should be considered when certain situations exist. However, as drafted the revision is awkward. Also the revision does not address an important factor raised in discussion with Executive staff to consider whether an adjoining city will add the land redesignated as urban to its Potential Annexation Area or will the redesignation create an addition to the already existing pool of unclaimed urban lands.

Council staff is working on a revision to this policy.

4. p. 2-5 - 1. Growth in cities and Urban Centers and the promotion of Public Health for All

ISSUE: The current description in the first introductory paragraphs seems to be written toward growth in cities and urban centers located in them; while the Executive staff reports that the policies in this subsection only apply to Urban Centers in unincorporated King County. The introductory text needs to be revised to clarify that the Urban Centers discussed in the following policies relate to the unincorporated types of Urban Centers: Unincorporated Activity Center (White Center), Community Business Centers and Neighborhood Business Centers. Also the map at the end of this chapter entitled

According to Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget staff, the Executive intends to restart this reporting (sometime in June), strictly online, including the Quick Facts sheet.

"Urban Centers 2012" needs to be replaced with one that does not include Urban Centers in incorporated areas. Executive staff will be providing a new map.

Additionally the sentence structure of the last sentence in the second paragraph is strained:

Communities that feature ~~((many))~~ a variety of land uses, access to healthy foods, higher housing density, sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, and street connections ~~((and))~~ to nearby services encourage physical activity such as walking and bicycling.

It not intuitively clear how "access to healthy foods" encourages "physical activity such as walking and bicycling." A solution may be to separate this concept and include it as its own sentence. From a review of a Center for Disease Control webpage includes these concepts in its definition of a "healthy community design."⁷ Linking these elements to the phrase "healthy communities," may assist the reader later when that phrase is used in policy U-109.

5. p. 2-6

U-109 King County supports the development of Urban Centers to meet the region's needs for housing, jobs, services, culture and recreation and to promote ~~((health))~~ healthy communities that encourage walking and bicycling. Strategies may include exploring opportunities for ~~((J))~~joint ~~((D))~~development or ~~((T))~~transit ~~((O))~~oriented ~~((D))~~development, siting civic uses in mixed-use areas, and leveraging or utilizing existing county assets in urban centers.

ISSUE: The policy also does not indicate if this is a mandatory policy ("will" or "shall"⁸) or a "should" policy, which in KCCP policy terms means "noncompulsory guidance, in which cost, availability of funding, and public benefit associated with the policy's purpose are considered as part of the implementation decision; establishes that the county has discretion in making decisions." 2008 Glossary, p. G-24. Without the auxiliary verb directive, a reader is left wondering as to the County's policy intent.

In discussion with Executive staff agreed that "supports" could be replaced with "should support" in the first line.

Regarding the phrase "healthy communities" see discussion above.

6. p. 2-7 - introductory text and new policy

King County is successfully promoting and supporting policies and programs that focus on the health of students at school. However, the school environment is only one aspect of the overall health of the student. A new King County strategy, Healthy Routes

⁷ www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces

⁸ "Shall" indicates "the policy is imperative and nondiscretionary—the county must make decisions based on what the policy says to do." 2008 Glossary, p. g-24.

to School, is presented in order to consider the impact the broader environmental factors have on the health of a student. This strategy focuses on the environment surrounding a school and the routes a typical student travels to school or nearby school-related destinations. A Healthy Routes to School strategy includes consideration of managing density of retail uses that primarily sell alcohol, tobacco, and low-nutrition products; enhancing green space sites; creating safe areas to walk and bicycle to school; providing for transit and related facilities; and, reducing exposure to environmental toxins and other types of unsafe environments along routes to school.

U-113a Promote children's health by encouraging and supporting land uses in the environment surrounding a school and on travel routes to schools that complement and strengthen other formal programs, such as Safe Routes to School.

ISSUE: The new introductory text references a new strategy "Healthy Routes to School," although it unclear what County agency is overseeing this "strategy" and what is meant by the terms strategy as opposed to program or plan. A search of the Public Health webpage makes no mention of this strategy. Safe Routes to School, identified in the proposed U-113a is a program mentioned on the Public health webpage.⁹ According to the information on that webpage, the Safe Routes to Schools program involves local school districts and bicycle and fitness non-profits. The program's focus is to make it easier for children to walk and bike safely to school, and in effect promote physical activity to combat associated health problems such as obesity.

As indicated in the introductory text, the focus of proposed U-113a is to expand the concept of Safe Routes to Schools program to include the potential of regulating the types of uses along a walking/biking route to a school. While no code change is proposed at this time, the introductory text identifies restricting land uses that could include prohibiting the retail sales of products such as alcohol and tobacco, or limiting land uses to reduce exposure to environmental toxins or other "unsafe environments" along the routes to schools.

Also the auxiliary verb is missing. There is no planned action on this policy by the Executive at this time,; nevertheless, the policy should be rewritten to reflect the County's intent (mandatory "shall" or non-compulsory "should").

7. p. 2-7 - 2. Urban Growth Area Targets

The text before U-114 references a table entitled "DP-1." This naming convention is not intuitive and the header on the table itself (found at page 2-9) does not clarify what the table is (as compared to the 2008 version of the table). Executive staff report that the

⁹ Follow the link to the May 2011 Healthy King County Newsletter at: www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/partnerships/cppw/newsletter.aspx. In the 2008 KCCP Chapter 7 (Transportation), there was referenced the Schools Pathways Program which had the similar goal of fostering safe conditions for students to walk to school. In the 2012 proposed updates, references to this program are eliminated.

table contains the growth targets adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council ("GMPC") in 2011 but have yet to be ratified by the County and necessary number of cities. The housing targets set forth in the last published version of the approved Countywide Planning Policies ("CPPs"), dated December 2010, have slightly different allocations.

ISSUES: As drafted, the table at page 2-7 creates an inconsistency with the adopted CPPs. If the targets contained in the table at page 2-9 are approved by the GMPC and ratified by the requisite number of cities prior to the Council's final action on the KCCP, this problem may be averted. Another option is to put in the table from the December 2010 CPPS and footnote any additional information. See attachment 2.

Additionally, no discussion of the recent amendment to RCW 36.70A.110(2)¹⁰ is mentioned in Chapter 2. This is relevant because under CPP FW-1 Step 8, the County has historically evaluated requests to move the UGB to allow an area to be added to a city's PAA for eventual annexation by that city on the whether that city already has sufficient incorporated area to accommodate a 20 year projection of household and employment growth. The amendment to RCW 36.70A.110(2) would appear to expand the elements for a city planning under the GMA to evaluate more than just those two elements.

The Council may want to consider at least mentioning the statute's amendment in the first full text paragraph at page 2-7, as this paragraph refers to planning by both the County and the cities.

Revisions to the introductory text, both at page 2-7 and before the table on page 2-8 should be considered to clarify if the status of the table at 2-9.

8. p. 2-10

U-119 King County should (~~apply~~) limit the application of the urban residential, low land use designation and only use: to protect floodplains, critical aquifer recharge areas, high function wetlands and unstable slopes from degradation, and link these environmental features into a network of open space, fish and wildlife habitat and urban separators. The residential density for land so designated should be maintained at one unit per acre (~~(, provided that lands that are sending sites))~~and further protected through density transfers under the Transfer of Development Rights Program (~~(may transfer density at a rate of at least four units per acre))~~).

¹⁰ Amended in 2011, the underlined portion is new language added to RCW 36.70A.110(2): "Based upon the growth management population projection made for the county by the office of financial management, the county and each city within the county shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county or city for the succeeding twenty-year period, except for those urban growth areas contained totally within a national historical reserve. As part of this planning process, each city within the county must include areas sufficient to accommodate the broad range of needs and uses that will accompany the projected urban growth including, as appropriate, medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail, and other nonresidential uses."

ISSUE: The current policy allows down zoning for the reasons listed but does limit down zoning for only those reasons. According to Executive staff, the revision is to shift the intent so that down zoning will only occur if the conditions listed exist.

A revision to this policy is suggested to replace the phrase "and only use:" to "use:"

Council staff are also looking at whether, with the changes proposed for the Transfer of Development Rights program, the last sentence could end at "one unit per acre."¹¹

9. p. 2- 12

U-124 King County shall (~~not approve~~) support proposed zoning changes to increase density within the Urban Area (~~unless~~) when consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and when the following conditions are present:

- a. The development will be compatible with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood;
- b. Urban public facilities and services are adequate, consistent with adopted levels of service and meet GMA concurrency requirements, including King County transportation concurrency standards;
- c. The proposed density change will not increase unmitigated adverse impacts on environmentally critical areas, either on site or in the vicinity of the proposed development;
- d. The proposed density increase will be consistent with or contribute to achieving the goals and policies of this comprehensive plan, and subarea plan, if applicable; and
- e. (~~The proposal is consistent with the adopted city comprehensive plan for the Potential Annexation Area where the rezone is located if the proposed density exceeds eight dwelling units per acre. If the city is not planning for urban densities and efficient land use patterns consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, then this paragraph shall not apply;~~) The development is in close proximity to transit hubs or regular transit service, is within walking distance of retail and commercial activities, and is accessible to parks and other recreation opportunities.

ISSUE: The current policy is written in the negative. The Executive's proposed change would take a positive approach. However, because the revised policy could be read to require all criteria be present to garner County support for the up zone, and according to Executive staff that is not the intent, a revision is suggested. By changing the "shall" to "should" allows for flexibility to support a proposal that may not meet all five of the criteria.

The change in subpart b reinforces the attributes a preferred up zone proposal have rather than the focusing on the adjoining city's zoning. See next policy, U-125

¹¹ Substantially the same issue regarding this revision comes up in policy U-180, p. 2-31.

¹²regarding the County working with adjoining cities to compatibility of any proposed up zone with the city's relevant zoning.

The phrase "within walking distance" is used in this policy and is explained in the text on page 2-13 as "less than one-half mile." This concept, but different language, is used in a later policy, U-166, ("within close proximity"). Moving this concept earlier in the chapter when walking as a mode of transportation is discussed, and thus make the ½ mile demarcation more applicable to the policies, may provide the reader with more clarity. Council staff are looking at the appropriate location to broaden the application of the concept of walking and biking distances as currently defined on page 2-13.

10. p. 2- 14

U-129 Design features of mixed-use developments should include the following:

- a. Integration of the retail and/or office uses and residential units within the same building or on the same parcel;
- b. Ground level spaces built to accommodate retail, such as grocery stores selling fresh fruits and vegetables, and office uses;
- c. Off-street parking behind or to the side of the buildings, or enclosed within buildings; ~~((and))~~
- d. A limit on the number of parking stalls based on availability of transit service and access to non-motorized facilities; and
- ~~((d))~~ e. Opportunities to have safe, accessible pedestrian connections and bicycle facilities within the development and to adjacent residential developments

ISSUES: In subsection b., an example of retail is given. The issue is whether this sets a precedent for later additions or listing in the policy and perhaps creating an impression that only those listed will be preferred.¹³

KCCP text is often used to give a fuller description of a policy's application. In the introductory text to the policies in the next section, "5. Urban Residential Neighborhood Design and Infill/Redevelopment," the Executive proposes to add "grocery stores with fresh fruit and vegetables" to the already listed amenities for urban neighborhoods. However, neither grocery stores or nor any other amenity is specifically called out in U-138, the policy governing nonresidential uses in urban neighborhoods. This may be the more appropriate approach to adding the concept of grocery stores with fresh produce as a preferred retail for mixed use development.

¹² **U-125** King County, when evaluating rezone requests for increases in density, shall work with the city whose PAA includes the property under review to ensure compatibility with the city's pre-annexation zoning for the area. King County shall also notify ~~((adjacent cities,))~~ special purpose districts and local providers of urban utility services and should work with these service providers on issues raised by the proposal.

¹³ The listing issue is also present in policies U-162, 167, 402, and 403. These are noted in the committee Staff comments in Attachment 1 (chapter 2 matrix).

Subsection d. is an example of a theme in this Chapter 2 - to move away from the automobile as a recognized method of transportation, a delisting in effect.¹⁴ According to Executive staff, this policy is intended to encourage designs that limit the number of parking stalls based on the accessibility of transit or walking and biking. At this time no code change is proposed to implement this policy provision.

11. p. 2-14 - 5. Urban Residential Neighborhood Design and Infill/Redevelopment

Small retail establishments integrated into residential development (e.g., a laundromat or video rental store) can provide convenient services and help residents reduce automobile trips. Urban areas that are interesting and safe for pedestrians and bicyclists, and that provide many necessary services close to residential developments, can ~~((promote public health by increasing))~~ decrease risk of injuries while promoting increased opportunities for physical activity during a normal day's activities.

ISSUE: This last sentence in the introductory text, quoted above, is awkwardly constructed and could be read to mean interesting and safe neighborhoods can reduce the risk of injuries. The intent appears to be to shift the focus of the sentence away from promoting public health to reducing risk of injuries, while promoting physical activity. This does not appear to be an improvement on the existing language.

12. p. 2-16

U-141 Residential developments within the Urban Growth Area, including mobile home parks, shall provide the following improvements:

- a. Paved streets (and alleys if appropriate), curbs and sidewalks, and internal walkways when appropriate;
- b. ~~((Adequate parking and consideration of access to bus service and passenger facilities))~~ A limit on the number of parking stalls based on availability of transit service and access to non-motorized facilities;
- c. Street lighting and street trees;
- d. Stormwater treatment and control;
- e. Public water supply;
- f. Public sewers; and
- g. Landscaping around the perimeter and parking areas of multifamily developments

ISSUE: Subsection b. is an example of the theme flowing through various policies revisions - to move away from the automobile as a recognized method of transportation. Subsection d. is an example of another new theme recognizing stormwater management as both a quality (treatment) and quantity (control) issue.

¹⁴ This theme is also manifested in the introductory text for policies relating Commercial Business Centers, found at p. 2-21 and in policies U-141b.(p. 2-16) and U-166c. (p. 2-23).

13. p. 2-22

U-162 Design features of community business centers should include the following:

- a. Safe and attractive walkways and bicycle lanes;
- b. Close grouping of stores;
- c. Off-street parking behind or to the side of buildings, or enclosed within buildings;
- d. Public art;
- e. Retention of attractive natural features, historic buildings and established character;
- f. Landscaping, which may include planters and street trees;
- g. Appropriate signage, including way finding;
- h. Public seating areas; and
- i. Architectural features (~~which~~) that provide variation between buildings or contiguous storefronts.

ISSUE: In subsection b., an example of appropriate signage is given.¹⁵ This is another revision that creates the impression that this type of signage may be more equal than others. Additionally, "way finding" is not an intuitive descriptor.

14. p. 2-25

U-170 Commercial, retail and industrial developments should foster community, create enjoyable outdoor areas and balance needs of automobile movement with pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety. Commercial and industrial developments shall provide the following improvements:

- a. Paved streets;
- b. Sidewalks and bicycle lanes in commercial and retail areas;
- c. Adequate parking for employees and business users;
- d. Landscaping along or within streets, sidewalks and parking areas to provide an attractive appearance;
- e. Adequate stormwater control, including curbs, gutters and stormwater retention facilities;
- f. Public water supply;
- g. Public sewers; and
- h. (~~Controlled~~) Limited/combined direct traffic access to arterials and intersections.

ISSUE: The change proposed for subsection h is not intuitive. While "controlled" covers signage/traffic lights and is relatively understood by the layperson, it is unclear what "limited/combined direct" as a modifier to "traffic access" is intended to convey. Executive staff were asked to respond. If the revision is just a more technical term for "controlled," Council staff recommend against the change. If the revision is intended to do more than signage and traffic lights, then an explanation should be included in text so the average reader could understand the policy direction.

¹⁵ Same issue in U-167g.

15. p. 2-26

U-172 Industrial development should not have direct external access ~~((from arterials or freeways))~~ to local streets and residential neighborhoods and should be located to have close access to freeway and state highways. ~~__((Access))~~ Direct access points should be ~~((combined and limited in number))~~ designed to allow ~~((smooth))~~ efficient traffic flow on servicing arterials. ~~((Access through residential areas should be avoided.))~~

ISSUE: This revision appears to emphasize that industrial development should use not local, residential streets. However, as currently written:

Industrial development should have direct access from arterials or freeways. Access points should be combined and limited in number to allow smooth traffic flow on arterials. Access through residential areas should be avoided. ✱

seems to say the same thing and is more direct.

16. p. 2-32-33

U-185 King County shall use the following criteria for evaluating open space in Four-to-One proposals:

- a. Quality of fish and wildlife habitat areas;
- b. Connections to regional open space systems;
- c. Protection of wetlands, stream corridors, ground water and water bodies;
- d. Unique natural, biological, cultural, historical, or archeological features;
~~((and))~~
- e. Size of proposed open space dedication and connection to other open space dedications along the Urban Growth Area line; and
- f. The land is not needed for any facilities necessary to support the urban development

U-186 King County shall preserve the open space acquired through this program primarily as natural areas, passive recreation sites or resource lands for farming or forestry. King County may allow the following additional uses only if located on a small portion of the open space, provided that these uses are found to be compatible with the site's natural open space values and functions such as those listed in the preceding policy:

- a. Trails;
- ~~((b.))~~ ~~((Natural appearing stormwater facilities;))~~
- c. Compensatory mitigation of wetland losses on the urban designated portion of the project, consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan and the Critical Area Ordinance; and
- d. Active recreation uses not to exceed five percent of the total open space area. Support services and facilities for the active recreation uses may

locate within the active recreation area only, and shall not exceed five percent of the active recreation area. An active recreation area shall not be used to satisfy the active recreation requirements for the urban designated portion of the project as required by K.C.C. Title 21A

U-187 Land added to the Urban Growth Area under the Four-to-One Program shall have a minimum density of four dwellings per acre and shall be physically contiguous to the original Urban Growth Area, unless there are limitations due to the presence of critical areas, and shall be able to be served by sewers and other efficient urban services and facilities; provided that such sewer and other urban services and facilities shall be provided directly from the urban area and shall not cross the open space or rural area. Drainage facilities to support the urban development shall be located within the urban portion of the development. In some cases, lands must meet affordable housing requirements under this program. The total area added to the Urban Growth Area as a result of this policy shall not exceed 4,000 acres.

ISSUE: The issue running through all three of these policies is to address an unintended consequence of allowing the dedicated open space portion of a 4 to 1¹⁶ proposal to be used for drainage or stormwater facilities. As reported by Executive staff, in at least one instance, when the city annexed the urban portion, the stormwater detention facilities stayed in Rural Area, dedicated open space. The result: the County continued to have the responsibility of maintaining the facilities but no Surface Water Management fees coming from the properties (now in city) generating the stormwater. (Maple Ridge Highlands). These revisions are intended to rectify this potential problem for future 4 to 1 proposals. Code changes to KCC 20.18.180 that implement these policies changes are included in at page 18 of Proposed Ordinance 2012-0103..

Section II: Potential Annexation Areas ("PAAs") (pp. 2-34 through 2-37): These policies related to the County's role in promoting annexation of the remaining urban areas of unincorporated King County within the UGA.

17. p. 2-2-34-35

The introductory text to this Section II has been updated to reflect the population changes in the County resulting from the annexations over the last four years. However, it is awkwardly drafted, starting off with 2010 census figure then several lines later acknowledging the recent annexations have reduced that number by a third.

ISSUE: Unlike in 2008, when the unincorporated urban King County population exceeded the rural population, now in 2012, the urban area population of unincorporated King County is less than the Rural Area population. Council staff suggest this first paragraph be rewritten to lead off with the current situation and explain how the annexations got the County to this point. Council staff has requested

¹⁶ The Executive proposes to extend the 4 to 1 program through 2015. Proposed Ordinance 2012-0103, p. 16.

Executive staff to update the information in the last two paragraph proposed for elimination to provide the context for the annexation policies.

18. p. 2-36

U-207 King County shall ~~((work))~~ negotiate with cities ~~((to jointly develop))~~ with the goal of developing pre-annexation agreements to address the transition of service provision from the county to the annexing cities. The development of such agreements should include a ~~((comprehensive))~~ public ~~((involvement))~~ outreach process to residents and property owners in the PAAs. Pre-annexation agreements may address a range of considerations, including but not limited to: (no changes to subparts a through k proposed)

ISSUE: Executive staff report that the suggested changes this policy are intended to set expectations for residents in areas where a city is anticipated to annex, the County may not be able to reach an agreement with the city pre-annexation. However, the proposed first sentence as revised is wordy and leaving it as is and changing the "shall" to "should" may be a better approach. The second sentence as proposed could be interpreted as the County is proposing to do less and more limited outreach. According to Executive staff this was not the intent. Council staff are working with Executive staff on a reworking of this sentence.

IV Sustainable Development (pp. 2-63 through 2-66): these policies related to the County's commitment to building green and reducing the impact of development on the land.

19. p. 2-62 -

The third paragraph of text:

Green building is defined as design, construction and operational practices that significantly reduce or eliminate the negative impact of buildings through sustainable site planning, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, durability, and enhanced indoor environmental quality for occupants. Buildings may also be more durable and sustainable if they are built with flexibility to accommodate households with diverse needs at various stages of life. A key feature of green building and great communities is the intersection of housing and transportation, reducing the use of single occupant cars. One strategy of green building is low impact development (LID). LID is an approach to land development that emphasizes maintaining or restoring a site's natural hydrologic function by protecting and enhancing native vegetation and soils, minimizing impervious surfaces and managing storm water at its source. Green building also applies to existing structures where retrofits can achieve additional resource conservation.

ISSUE: The first two paragraphs the introductory text are substantially unchanged and limited to the concept that sustainable development involves green building and low

impact development (i.e. stormwater management). The additions to the third paragraph add new concepts to what is meant by sustainable development. Council staff are working with Executive staff to reformulate the introductory text to avert confusion of adding new concepts at the end of the introductory text.

20. p. 2-64

U-402a King County should participate in the development of national standards for measuring sustainability at the community scale and the breadth and effectiveness of county policies and practices that improve community-scale sustainability.

ISSUE: There is no discussion in the text to explain this new policy. However, it is something that the County is doing as part of its near-term climate change "work plan"¹⁷ approved by the Council in Motion 13644. Since this participation is going to be studied as a strategy to be potentially included in the County's Strategic Climate Action Plan due later this year, inclusion of this policy at this time in the KCCP may be premature and/or redundant.

21. p. 2-65-66

U-405 King County should incorporate state-of-the art stormwater management techniques including low impact development principles and practices into the design, construction and operation of all county facilities and county-funded projects to the ((fullest)) maximum extent feasible.

U-406 King County should work with residential and commercial developers to incorporate state-of-the art stormwater management techniques including low impact development practices that protect native vegetation and soils, facilitate reuse of resources, such as reclaimed water, reduce the carbon footprint of the project, and reduce impervious surface. When King County provides technical assistance and incentives for the use of low impact development practices, it shall be at no cost to any private sector development.

U-407 King County shall identify and evaluate potential changes to land use development regulations and building codes to support and promote state-of-the art stormwater management techniques including low impact development.

ISSUE: In all three of the above policies, the change reflects that low impact development is a tool of stormwater management. By including the phrase "state-of-the art stormwater management techniques" the Executive is opening up the policy to adapt to new techniques as they may be developed over ensuing years.

¹⁷ See Motion 13644, lines 146-150, where the County's continued participation as a test community for STAR program that is developing national standards for measuring sustainability on a community level is described.

To avoid the concept of listing Council staff suggest removing the listing of the descriptive phrase "low impact development."

ATTACHMENT

1. Matrix
2. Excerpts from December 2010 CPPs

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-101</p> <p>Development within the Urban Growth Area should create and maintain safe, healthy and diverse communities. These communities should contain a range of affordable, <u>healthy</u> housing and employment opportunities, school and recreational facilities and should be designed to protect the natural environment and significant cultural resources.</p>	<p>a. to modify housing with the term "healthy"</p> <p>b. a greater recognition of healthy housing in creating complete communities.</p>	<p>Need a definition of what is meant by "healthy housing."</p>
<p>U-102</p> <p>The Urban Growth Area designations shown on the official Land Use Map includes enough land to provide the capacity to accommodate growth expected over the period ((2004-2022)) <u>2006-2031</u>. These lands should include only those lands that meet the following criteria:</p> <p>a. Are characterized by urban development ((which)) <u>that</u> can be efficiently and cost effectively served by roads, water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage, schools and other urban governmental services within the next 20 years;</p> <p>b. Do not extend beyond natural boundaries, such as watersheds, which impede provision of urban services;</p> <p>c. Respect topographical features that form a natural edge such as rivers and ridge lines;</p> <p>d. Are sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support urban growth without major environmental impacts unless such areas are designated as an urban separator by interlocal agreement between jurisdictions;</p> <p>e. Are included within the Bear Creek Urban Planned Development (UPD) sites; and</p> <p>f. Are not rural land or unincorporated agricultural or forestry lands designated through the Countywide Planning Policies Plan process.</p>	<p>Technical</p>	<p>Need reference in text above that the Land Use Map is located at end of Chapter 1. Remove word "official" - see warning on maps</p>
<p>U-103</p> <p>Parcels ((which))<u>that</u> are split by the Urban Growth Area boundary line should be <u>reviewed for possible</u> ((redesignated)) <u>redesignation</u> to either all urban or all rural unless the parcel is split to recognize environmentally sensitive features, <u>geographic features</u>, ((or)) the requirements of interlocal agreements, or <u>the requirements of King County plans</u>.</p>	<p>a. to recognize that not all parcels split by the UGA should be redesignated to one category or another</p> <p>b. to allow certain parcels to remain split by the UGA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite to delete the word "unless" and replace with "taking into consideration" • Need text to include consideration of city and inclusion into PAA

Chapter 2: Urban Communities		
Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-106 ((Except for the Blakely Ridge and Redmond Ridge Fully Contained Communities designations, no new Fully Contained Communities shall be approved in King County.))</p>	<p>Moved to U174a</p>	<p>Appropriate move to subsection d of the chapter.</p>
<p>p. 2-5 1. Growth in Cities and Urban Centers and the promotion of Public Health for All</p> <p>The King County Comprehensive Plan directly affects land use planning decisions only in unincorporated King County. The cities, however, contain most of the county's economic base and much of its urban population and provide urban services to adjacent unincorporated areas. In addition, many public services vital to urban growth are provided to unincorporated areas by independent special purpose districts. The Countywide Planning Policies guide the development of urban centers, which are located in cities, and should accommodate concentrations of housing and employment. The significant role of the cities and districts, therefore, must be recognized in county decision-making and through future planning efforts.</p> <p>Focusing development in urban areas can have a positive effect on public health while also addressing climate change. The percentage of King County residents who are overweight or obese has risen rapidly since the late 1980s. With obesity comes increased risk for diabetes, hypertension and heart disease. Evidence suggests one major reason for rising obesity is the lack of physical activity. Growth patterns in suburban areas, which discourage <u>active transportation modes such as walking and bicycling</u> and promote a reliance on private auto use, have contributed to this public health problem. Communities that feature ((many)) a <u>variety of land uses, access to healthy foods, higher housing density, sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, and street connections ((and)) to nearby services</u> encourage physical activity such as walking and bicycling.</p>		<p>Need to rework the first paragraph to clarify that Urban Centers discussed in this section are in unincorporated King County only.</p> <p>Suggest breaking out the new language regarding access to healthy foods as a separate concept which should be encouraged in Urban Centers.</p>
<p>U-108</p> <p>King County supports land use and zoning actions that promote public health by increasing opportunities for every resident to be more physically active. Land use and zoning actions include: concentrating growth into the Urban Area, promoting urban centers, allowing mixed-use developments, and adding pedestrian and <u>bicycle</u> linkages.</p>	<p>a. to add bicycle linkages to the list of attributes promoting public health</p> <p>b. to recognize the importance of bicycle linkages within the UGA</p>	<p>Recommend replacing "supports" with the phrase "should support" in order resolve ambiguity if policy is mandatory or gives discretion</p> <p>The addition of bicycle is not new policy - already in existing U-110</p>

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-109</p> <p>King County supports the development of Urban Centers to meet the region's needs for housing, jobs, services, culture and recreation and to promote ((health)) <u>healthy communities that encourage walking and bicycling</u>. Strategies may include exploring opportunities for ((J))joint ((D))development or ((T))transit ((O))oriented ((D))development, siting civic uses in mixed-use areas, and leveraging or utilizing existing county assets in urban centers.</p>	<p>a. to clarify that promoting health means promoting walkable communities</p> <p>b. to foster more walkable communities</p>	<p>Needs an auxiliary verb before "support" - Exec staff agree to "should".</p> <p>Stylistic changes from "health" to "healthy communities" and qualifying such communities as those that encourage walking and biking.</p> <p>Look at CDC definition and incorporate into text at p. 2-5.</p>
<p>U-112</p> <p>Development standards for urban areas should emphasize ways to allow maximum permitted densities and uses of urban land while not compromising the function of critical environmental areas. Mitigating measures should serve multiple purposes, such as drainage control, groundwater recharge, stream protection, air quality <u>improvement</u>, open space preservation, cultural and historic resource protection and landscaping preservation. When technically feasible, standards should be simple and measurable, so they can be implemented without lengthy review processes.</p>	<p>Technical</p>	
<p>p. 2-7 :</p> <p><u>King County is successfully promoting and supporting policies and programs that focus on the health of students at school. However, the school environment is only one aspect of the overall health of the student. A new King County strategy, Healthy Routes to School, is presented in order to consider the impact the broader environmental factors have on the health of a student. This strategy focuses on the environment surrounding a school and the routes a typical student travels to school or nearby school-related destinations. A Healthy Routes to School strategy includes consideration of managing density of retail uses that primarily sell alcohol, tobacco, and low-nutrition products; enhancing green space sites; creating safe areas to walk and bicycle to school; providing for transit and related facilities;</u></p>	<p>a. to bring attention to the environment in which children encounter on their way to and from school.</p> <p>b. to improve the environment surrounding the routes that children travel to and from school</p>	<p>New introductory text and policy. Healthy Routes to School is a new strategy. However, the scope of the strategy is not set in policy but in text and is broad in its potential application. No code changes yet proposed.</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities		
Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>and, reducing exposure to environmental toxins and other types of unsafe environments along routes to school.</p> <p><u>U-113a</u></p> <p><u>Promote children's health by encouraging and supporting land uses in the environment surrounding a school and on travel routes to schools that complement and strengthen other formal programs, such as Safe Routes to School.</u></p>		The policy lacks auxiliary verb.
<p><u>U-114</u></p> <p>Land use policies and regulations shall accommodate a growth target of approximately <u>12,470((13,400)) housing units((households))</u> and approximately <u>9,060((7,900)) jobs by 2031((2022))</u>, established in the Countywide Planning Policies for the unincorporated portion of the Urban Growth Area.</p>	Technical	
<p><u>U-116</u></p> <p>King County shall use ((household)) <u>housing</u> and employment targets to implement the comprehensive plan in urban communities. The targets allocated to subareas of unincorporated King County will be monitored and may be refined through future planning that includes communities, affected cities and service providers.</p>	Technical	
<p><u>U-116a</u></p> <p>King County should work the Growth Management Planning Council to adopt Countywide Planning Policies ((which)) that support annual ratifications to allocated housing and employment growth targets for cities and the county.</p>	Technical	
<p><u>U-118</u></p> <p>King County shall seek to achieve through future planning efforts over the next twenty years, an average zoning density of at least ((seven-to)) eight homes per acre in the Urban Growth Area through a mix of densities and housing types. ((A lower density zone may be used to recognize existing subdivisions with little or no opportunity for infill or redevelopment.))</p>	<p>a. to clarify that the minimum urban density should average 8 du/acre and not a range;</p> <p>b. slightly higher densities within the UGA</p>	Removal of the last sentence is because the down zoning in applicable areas has already occurred or the areas have been already annexed.

Chapter 2 - Urban Communities

Policy Revision

Executive Purpose

Committee Staff Comment

U-119

King County should ~~((apply))~~ limit the application of the urban residential, low land use designation and only use: to protect floodplains, critical aquifer recharge areas, high function wetlands and unstable slopes from degradation, and link these environmental features into a network of open space, fish and wildlife habitat and urban separators. The residential density for land so designated should be maintained at one unit per acre ~~((, provided that lands that are sending sites))~~ and further protected through density transfers under the Transfer of Development Rights Program ~~((may transfer density at a rate of at least four units per acre)).~~

- a. to clarify limited application of the Urban-Low designation and to reference density transfers more generally;
- b. to apply the Urban-Low designation in very limited circumstances and to move the specific formula for density transfers to the Code.

Awkward sentence structure.
Suggest deleting the phrase "and only use:" and replace with "only:".
Intent of policy restructure is to limit the use of down zoning to those situations identified after the colon. By the existing policy, down zoning could apply in those instances but not be limited to them.

The change in the last sentence will be under review as part of the TDR program proposed changes.

U-120

Multifamily housing in the Urban Growth Area should be sited as follows:
a. In or next to unincorporated activity centers or next to community or neighborhood business centers;
b. In mixed-use developments in centers and activity areas; and
c. On small, scattered parcels integrated into existing urban residential areas. New multifamily housing should be built to the scale and design of the existing community or neighborhood, while contributing to an area-wide density and development pattern that supports transit and allows for a range of housing choices. Over time, zoning should encourage a larger proportion of multifamily housing to be located on small scattered sites rather than on larger sites.

Technical - clarification

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-124</p> <p>King County shall ((not approve)) <u>support</u> proposed zoning changes to increase density within the Urban Area ((unless)) <u>when consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and when the following conditions are present:</u></p> <p>a. The development will be compatible with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood;</p> <p>b. Urban public facilities and services are adequate, consistent with adopted levels of service and meet GMA concurrency requirements, including King County transportation concurrency standards;</p> <p>c. The proposed density change will not increase unmitigated adverse impacts on environmentally critical areas, either on site or in the vicinity of the proposed development;</p> <p>d. The proposed density increase will be consistent with or contribute to achieving the goals and policies of this comprehensive plan, and subarea plan, if applicable; and</p> <p>e. ((The proposal is consistent with the adopted city comprehensive plan for the Potential Annexation Area where the rezone is located if the proposed density exceeds eight dwelling units per acre. If the city is not planning for urban densities and efficient land use patterns consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies, then this paragraph shall not apply;)) <u>The development is in close proximity to transit hubs or regular transit service, is within walking distance of retail and commercial activities, and is accessible to parks and other recreation opportunities.</u></p>	<p>a. to switch the policy from a negative statement to a positive one and to delete confusing statement regarding PAAs in favor of policy U-125.</p> <p>b. to be clear that KC supports upzones when criteria is met</p>	<p>Revision intended to make this a positive policy. However, because of the possibility the revision could be interpreted to require all 5 criteria be met and that was not the intent, Executive staff agree that "shall" be changed to "should."</p> <p>Need new text before the policy to clarify that "walking distance" as used in subpart e. equals less than ½ mile. See p. 2-13.</p> <p>Text of subpart e. deleted and replaced with policy that focuses on what amenities should be considered rather than the density level of the PAA city.</p>
<p>U-125</p> <p>King County, when evaluating rezone requests for increases in density, shall <u>work with the city whose PAA includes the property under review to ensure compatibility with the city's pre-annexation zoning for the area.</u> King County shall also notify ((adjacent cities,)) special purpose districts and local providers of urban utility services and should work with these service providers on issues raised by the proposal.</p>	<p>a. to promote consultations with cities regarding zoning changes within their PAAs</p> <p>b. to have better coordination with cities regarding land use within their PAAs</p>	<p>Removal of "adjacent cities" is appropriate because the revision requires County to work with the PAA city of the area proposed for increased density.</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-126</p> <p>King County shall not support requests for residential density increases <u>or conversion of non-residential property to residential uses</u> on lands located within the outer boundaries of the ((Noise Remedy Area)) <u>Federal Aviation Administration approved Noise Mitigation Boundary</u> as identified by Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and King County International Airport.</p>	<p>Technical – update for current references</p>	<p>Updated language for Noise Remedy and adds KCIA.</p>
<p>U-129</p> <p>Design features of mixed-use developments should include the following:</p> <p>a. Integration of the retail and/or office uses and residential units within the same building or on the same parcel;</p> <p>b. Ground level spaces built to accommodate retail, <u>such as grocery stores selling fresh fruits and vegetables</u>, and office uses;</p> <p>c. Off-street parking behind or to the side of the buildings, or enclosed within buildings; ((and))</p> <p>d. <u>A limit on the number of parking stalls based on availability of transit service and access to non-motorized facilities; and</u></p> <p>((d)) e. Opportunities to have safe, accessible pedestrian connections and bicycle facilities within the development and to adjacent residential developments.</p>	<p>a. to recognize the advantage mixed-use developments have in increasing outlets for healthy food and for increasing reliance on transit and non-motorized mobility options</p> <p>b. to increase the presence of grocery outlets selling fresh and healthy produce and to decrease the number of parking stalls required in favor of public transit and access to non-motorized facilities</p>	<p>Subpart b.: starts a list of preferred retail.</p> <p>May be more appropriate to include description of retail in text like in next section. See p. 2-14.</p> <p>Subpart d. while no code change proposed at this time, this policy change is example of a new theme of moving away from car as an encouraged mode of transportation.</p>

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>Introductory Text to Section 5. at p. 2-14:</p> <p>King County residents can enjoy their urban neighborhoods both for their unique character and for the amenities they provide. Outdoor spaces need to be usable, attractive, comfortable, and enjoyable. The design of urban streets, including features such as parking strips, street trees, alleys and off-street parking all contribute to the character of urban neighborhoods. Careful site planning can incorporate neighborhood features, contribute to aesthetic value, minimize site disturbance, conserve energy and, in some cases, reduce development costs. Neighborhood shopping, grocery stores with fresh fruits and vegetables, libraries, larger parks, high schools and public golf courses are examples of uses that provide amenities for nearby residents. Small retail establishments integrated into residential development (e.g., a laundromat or video rental store) can provide convenient services and help residents reduce automobile trips. Urban areas that are interesting and safe for pedestrians and bicyclists, and that provide many necessary services close to residential developments, can ((promote public health by increasing)) <u>decrease risk of injuries while promoting increased</u> opportunities for physical activity during a normal day's activities.</p>		<p>Adding example of grocery <u>shopping</u></p> <p>Suggest removing video store as antiquated use</p> <p>Revision to last sentence diverts the focus of the sentence away from promoting public health to reducing risk of injuries. Sentence structure awkward because now "interesting and safe neighborhoods" can reduce risks of injuries. The proposed change diverts the focus of the sentence away from promoting public health to reducing risk of injuries.</p>
<p>U-141</p> <p>Residential developments within the Urban Growth Area, including mobile home parks, shall provide the following improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Paved streets (and alleys if appropriate), curbs and sidewalks, and internal walkways when appropriate; ((Adequate parking and consideration of access to bus service and passenger facilities)) <u>A limit on the number of parking stalls based on availability of transit service and access to non-motorized facilities;</u> Street lighting and street trees; Stormwater <u>treatment and</u> control; Public water supply; Public sewers; and Landscaping around the perimeter and parking areas of multifamily developments. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> to limit parking in favor of increasing reliance on transit and non-motorized mobility options to realize developments that will have smaller parking lots 	<p>Subpart b.- same issues as in U-129, while no code change proposed at this time, this policy change is example of a new theme of moving away from car as a encouraged mode of transportation</p> <p>Subpart d. new theme for stormwater of both quantity (control) and quality (treatment)</p>

Chapter 2 - Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-151</p> <p>King County may designate new unincorporated activity centers or expand existing unincorporated activity centers only through a subarea planning process ((which)) <u>that</u> should address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The relationship of the entire center to its surrounding uses; b. Availability of supporting public services; c. The function of the center to other centers in the sub-region; d. The need for additional commercial and industrial development; e. The size and boundaries of the center; and f. Zoning. 	<p>Technical</p>	
<p>p. 2-21 text before U-157.</p> <p>White Center was selected as one of three case study areas for further study as part of the King County Land Use Transportation Air Quality and Health project, now known as HealthScape. Information from the study ((will show which)) <u>showed the types of changes in the urban form of the area ((or)) and in the transportation system that will lead to an increase in public health. These results ((should be)) have been used to guide development in the White Center area and to prioritize capital expenditures such as the construction of the 98th Street Connector, which is a pedestrian walkway between Greenbridge and the commercial area of White Center.</u> ((Additionally, the redevelopment of Park Lake Homes was selected as a demonstration project for low impact development in the county.))</p>		<p>Awkward sentence structure in 2d sentence. Staff to rewrite.</p> <p>According to Executive staff, last sentence removed because Park lake Homes built out and no longer a demonstration project.</p>
<p>U-157</p> <p>In the White Center Unincorporated Activity Center, new major residential developments should include low-impact design features and should promote public health by increasing opportunities for physical activity in daily life. The development should include: safe walkways and bicycle ((lanes)) <u>facilities</u> with access to commercial areas, schools, and community facilities; trails; and pocket parks.</p>	<p>Technical – the term “facilities” is more encompassing than “lanes”</p>	<p>Facilities include more than lanes. According to Executive staff could be separated bike path away from auto lane</p>

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>p. 2-21 text before U-158:</p> <p>Community business centers are primarily retail developments designed to serve a nearby market area of 15,000 to 40,000 people. Community business centers should be sited so they do not adversely affect other centers and are easily accessible by (automobile) public transportation, <u>walking or bicycling</u>. Community business centers should be designed to be compatible with adjacent residential uses, and should promote pedestrian and bicycle access.</p>		<p>Another example of Executive's theme of removing cars as a promoted mode of travel</p>
<p>U-162</p> <p>Design features of community business centers should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Safe and attractive walkways and bicycle lanes; b. Close grouping of stores; c. Off-street parking behind or to the side of buildings, or enclosed within buildings; d. Public art; e. Retention of attractive natural features, historic buildings and established character; f. Landscaping, which may include planters and street trees; g. Appropriate signage, including way finding; h. Public seating areas; and i. Architectural features ((which)) <u>that</u> provide variation between buildings or contiguous storefronts. 	<p>Technical change to clarify that signage should include way-finding</p>	<p>Subpart g: Another example of listing in policy</p> <p>"way finding" not an intuitive term. Inclusion not necessary. But if included should be defined in text before used in policy.</p>

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-166</p> <p>The specific size and boundaries of neighborhood business centers should be consistent with the criteria listed below.</p> <p>a. Ten acres or less in size, excluding land needed for surface water management or protection of environmentally sensitive features;</p> <p>b. Designed to provide convenience shopping for a market population of 8,000 to 15,000 people;</p> <p>c. Located ((on a minor arterial with adequate traffic capacity;</p> <p>d. Serviced by intersections free of traffic congestion caused by topography or poor road)) within close proximity to transit hubs or regular transit service; and</p> <p>((e)) d. Located one to three miles from another neighborhood business center.</p>	<p>a. to highlight the importance of being on a bus line instead of congestion-free intersections</p> <p>b. to promote more commercial centers with bus access</p>	<p>The deletion of existing subsection d is to in keeping with the theme that policies are silent as to use of autos as a mode of transportation; rather focusing on encouraging or promoting transit and non-motorized travel. .</p> <p>Executive staff report that "close proximity" means less than ½ mile walking distance. That should be indicated in the introductory text and as this say distance is also the definition of "walking distance, moving this concept to earlier in the chapter in Section I.A.1. (p. 2-5) may be more appropriate. p</p>
<p>U-167</p> <p>Design features of neighborhood business centers should include the following:</p> <p>a. Safe and attractive walkways and bicycle ((lanes)) facilities;</p> <p>b. Close grouping of stores;</p> <p>c. Off-street parking behind or to the side of buildings, or enclosed within buildings;</p> <p>d. Public art;</p> <p>e. Retention of attractive natural features, historic buildings or established character;</p> <p>f. Landscaping, which may include planters and street trees;</p> <p>g. Appropriate signage including way finding;</p> <p>h. Public seating areas; and</p> <p>i. Architectural features which provide variation between buildings or contiguous storefronts.</p>	<p>Technical change because the term "facilities" is more encompassing than "lanes" and to clarify that signage should include way-finding</p>	<p>Subpart a.: Facilities include more than lanes. According to Executive staff could be separated bike path away from auto lane</p> <p>Subpart g: Another example of listing in policy</p> <p>"way finding" not an intuitive term. Inclusion in the policy does seem necessary. But if included should be defined in text before used in policy.</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-170</p> <p>Commercial, retail and industrial developments should foster community, create enjoyable outdoor areas and balance needs of automobile movement with pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety. Commercial and industrial developments shall provide the following improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Paved streets; Sidewalks and bicycle lanes in commercial and retail areas; Adequate parking for employees and business users; Landscaping along or within streets, sidewalks and parking areas to provide an attractive appearance; Adequate stormwater control, including curbs, gutters and stormwater retention facilities; Public water supply; Public sewers; and ((Controlled)) Limited/combined direct traffic access to arterials and intersections. 	<p>Technical</p>	<p>Subpart h: proposed change not intuitive. While "controlled" covers signage/traffic lights, it is unclear what "limited/combined direct" is intended to convey - whether traffic controls or actual access to the arterials and intersections. .</p> <p>If it is the former - Staff suggest leaving as is. If latter , then introductory text to describe for the reader the intent of this subpart</p>
<p>U-171 NOTE TO COUNCIL STAFF NEED TO ADD COMMA AFTER OPENING PHRASE "Within the UGA,</p>		<p>Technical</p>
<p>U-172</p> <p>Industrial development should <u>not</u> have direct <u>external</u> access ((from arterials or freeways)) <u>to local streets and residential neighborhoods and should be located to have close access to freeway and state highways.</u> __((Access)) <u>Direct access</u> points should be ((combined and limited in number)) <u>designed</u> to allow ((smooth)) <u>efficient</u> traffic flow on <u>servicing</u> arterials. ((Access through residential areas should be avoided.))</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> to clarify that industrial development should be located away from residential neighborhoods to move industrial traffic away from neighborhood streets to freeways and highways 	<p>All the components of the rewrite are currently in the policy. As rewritten focus is change to emphasize should have no access to local streets, but awkward and the original policy is clearer.</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-174a</p> <p><u>Except for the Blakely Ridge and Redmond Ridge Fully Contained Communities designations, no new Fully Contained Communities shall be approved in King County.</u></p>	<p>Moved from U-106</p>	<p>Moving to subsection D of chapter, starting on p. 2-28, dealing with Fully Contained Communities ("FCC") is appropriate but this policy should be at the end of the subsection - not first</p> <p>Staff recommend this be Policy U179a, to follow after all the policies explaining FCC & UPDs</p>
<p>U-176</p> <p>The creation of Urban Planned Developments (UPDs) is intended to serve as a model for achieving a mix of uses, appropriate development patterns, and high quality design as well as providing for public benefits ((which)) that shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Open space and critical areas protection; b. Diversity in housing types and affordability; c. Quality site design; and d. Transit and nonmotorized transportation opportunities. 	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p> <p>Technical</p>	
<p>U-177</p> <p>King County has established a new Fully Contained Community. One area is designated through this plan shown on the Land Use Map as a Fully Contained Community: the Bear Creek UPD area comprised of Trilogy at Redmond Ridge, Redmond Ridge, and Redmond Ridge East Urban Planned Development sites. Nothing in these policies shall affect the continued validity of the approved Urban Planned Development permits for either of these sites. This FCC designation may be implemented by separate or coordinated FCC permits.</p>		<p>No change proposed by Executive. However, this policy as drafted is antiquated. The FCC area is not new</p> <p>Council staff working with Executive staff to make a technical correction.</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-180</p> <p>Urban separators are corridors of land that define community or municipal identities and boundaries, provide visual breaks in the urban landscape, and link parks and open space within and outside the Urban Growth Area. These urban corridors should include and link parks and other lands that contain significant environmentally sensitive features, provide wildlife habitat or critical resource protection, contain defining physical features, or contain historic resources. The residential density for land so designated should be maintained at one unit per acre ((, provided that lands that are sending sites)) <u>and can be further protected through density transfers under the Transfer of Density Rights Program ((may transfer density at a rate of at least four units per acre)).</u></p>	<p>a. Technical change to remove specific formula from policy b. to allow formula to be specified in the code</p>	<p>The change in the last sentence will be under review as part of the TDR program proposed changes.</p> <p>However, at the very least the word "Density" should be changed to "Development."</p>
<p>U-185</p> <p>King County shall use the following criteria for evaluating open space in Four-to-One proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quality of fish and wildlife habitat areas; b. Connections to regional open space systems; c. Protection of wetlands, stream corridors, ground water and water bodies; d. Unique natural, biological, cultural, historical, or archeological features; ((and)) e. Size of proposed open space dedication and connection to other open space dedications along the Urban Growth Area line; <u>and</u> f. <u>The land is not needed for any facilities necessary to support the urban development.</u> 	<p>a. to prohibit dedicated open space land from containing urban facilities that support the urban development</p> <p>b. to keep the dedicated open space as a complete public amenity; to have urban facilities supporting urban development contained within the UGA; allows annexing cities to have governance over facilities supporting development within their cities</p>	<p>This change and those in U-186 and 187 were prompted by past experience.</p> <p>As reported by Executive staff, in previous 4 to 1 proposals when the city annexed the urban portion, the stormwater detention facilities stayed in rural open space, with the care left with the county but no SWM fees coming from the properties (now in city) generating the stormwater. (Maple Ridge Highlands)</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy/Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee/Staff Comment
<p>U-186</p> <p>King County shall preserve the open space acquired through this program primarily as natural areas, passive recreation sites or resource lands for farming or forestry. King County may allow the following additional uses only if located on a small portion of the open space, provided that these uses are found to be compatible with the site's natural open space values and functions such as those listed in the preceding policy:</p> <p>a. Trails;</p> <p>((b.)) ((Natural-appearing stormwater facilities;))</p> <p>c. Compensatory mitigation of wetland losses on the urban designated portion of the project, consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan and the Critical Area Ordinance; and</p> <p>d. Active recreation uses not to exceed five percent of the total open space area. Support services and facilities for the active recreation uses may locate within the active recreation area only, and shall not exceed five percent of the active recreation area. An active recreation area shall not be used to satisfy the active recreation requirements for the urban designated portion of the project as required by K.C.C. Title 21A.</p>	<p>a. to prohibit storm-water facilities supporting the urban development located within the dedicated open space</p> <p>b. to keep the dedicated open space as a complete public amenity; to have urban facilities supporting urban development contained with the UGA; allows annexing cities to have governance over facilities supporting development within their cities</p>	<p>See policy U-185 above</p>
<p>U-187</p> <p>Land added to the Urban Growth Area under the Four-to-One Program shall have a minimum density of four dwellings per acre and shall be physically contiguous to the original Urban Growth Area, unless there are limitations due to the presence of critical areas, and shall be able to be served by sewers and other efficient urban services and facilities; provided that such sewer and other urban services and facilities shall be provided directly from the urban area and shall not cross the open space or rural area. <u>Drainage facilities to support the urban development shall be located within the urban portion of the development.</u> In some cases, lands must meet affordable housing requirements under this program. The total area added to the Urban Growth Area as a result of this policy shall not exceed 4,000 acres.</p>	<p>a. to prohibit drainage facilities supporting the urban development located within the dedicated open space</p> <p>b. to keep the dedicated open space as a complete public amenity; to have urban facilities supporting urban development contained with the UGA; allows annexing cities to have governance over facilities supporting development within their cities</p>	<p>See policy U-185 above</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>p. 2-34 introductory text to Potential Annexation Area Policies</p> <p>There were ((are 226,300 people living in)) <u>201,400 residents of urban unincorporated King County, ((as reported in the 2007 Annual Growth Report)) according to the 2010 Census.</u> Subsequent to ((this report)) <u>the census</u>, approximately ((31,000)) <u>72,600 residents have transitioned ((te)) into a city through annexations to ((Auburn and Renton)) Burien, Kent and Kirkland during 2010-2011.</u> The ((2008)) <u>remaining 2011</u> urban incorporated population is estimated at ((495,300 nears the populations of Vancouver or Tacoma, the second and third largest cities)) <u>129,900 – comparable to the population of Bellevue, the fifth largest city in the state.</u> The land base in these <u>remaining urban</u> areas is primarily residential, with limited amounts of commercial and retail development. Much of the urban unincorporated area is made up of geographically isolated islands surrounded by cities or adjacent to the urban growth boundary. Because these areas are scattered across the county, the provision of local services is costly. The lack of a substantive urban unincorporated area tax base exacerbates these difficulties((,)) and covering the cost of serving these areas reduces the amount of revenue available for regional services and for local services in the Rural Area. Therefore, King County has a strong fiscal interest in seeing the remaining urban unincorporated areas ((be)) annexed to cities next several years.</p> <p>The annexation of urban unincorporated areas is also good public policy. The State Growth Management Act and the regionally adopted Countywide Planning Policies stipulate that counties are the appropriate providers of regional services and of local services to the Rural Area. For their part, cities are the appropriate providers of local urban services to all areas within the designated urban growth boundary. This logical split of government services is in part a reflection of the greater taxing authority afforded to cities by the state Legislature. County taxing authority remains similar to what was historically adopted in the state constitution. Annexation is a means to achieve the desired governmental service and land use vision set forth in regional policy and state law.</p> <p>((Although it is the policy of the county to support and promote annexation, its formal ability to do so is extremely limited. State laws provide the cities, county residents and property owners with the authority to initiate the annexation process. A successful annexation initiative depends on establishing a collaborative and ongoing dialogue between the three affected</p>		<p>The first paragraph is a bit misleading by leading off with what urban was in 2010 before annexation of JFK into Kirkland. The gets to current estimated population, taking into consideration of the JFK annexation. Council staff working with Executive staff on a rewrite.</p> <p>According to the Executive, the Annexation Initiative is no longer active so the last 2 paragraphs of introductory text eliminated. However, Council staff suggest that</p>

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>interest groups: residents, the county, and the affected city. King County has a long history of engaging in annexation discussions with urban unincorporated area residents. Though the county's formal role in affecting annexation is limited, in 2004 the County Council adopted Motion No. 12018, a multi-year initiative intended to accelerate the pace of the annexation of urban areas by establishing the Annexation Initiative (AI). Since the establishment of the AI, there have been seven elections for annexation or incorporation in the county resulting in four successful elections and approximately 35,000 residents transitioning to a city. Of these seven elections, four were approved by voters with the areas annexing; one was approved by voters and subsequently rejected by the proposed annexing city; two annexation and one incorporation effort were rejected by voters. The county will continue to work collaboratively with urban unincorporated area residents and with the cities to plan for orderly and timely governance transitions.</p> <p>The policies in this section are intended to guide the county's decision making on annexation-related issues to ensure the needs of citizens in the urban unincorporated area are considered, and that a smooth transition from county to city government occurs.))</p>		<p>too much removed and some of the facts should be updated to reflect the total annexation picture up to now. Council staff working to get information from Executive staff to propose a rewrite to this introductory section.</p>
<p>U-203</p> <p>The ((Interim)) Potential Annexation Areas Map adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council illustrates city-designated potential annexation areas (PAAs), contested areas (where more than one city claims a PAA), and those few areas that are unclaimed by any city. For contested areas, the county should attempt to help resolve the matter, or to enter into an interlocal agreement with each city for the purpose of bringing the question of annexation before voters. For unclaimed areas, King County should work with adjacent cities and service providers to develop a mutually agreeable strategy and time frame for annexation.</p>	<p>Technical – to match the title of the map in the CPPs</p>	
<p>U-204</p> <p>King County shall support annexation proposals that are consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the Washington State Growth Management Act, ((and)) when the area proposed for annexation is wholly within the annexing city's officially adopted PAA, and <u>when the area is not part of a contested area.</u></p>	<p>Technical</p>	

Chapter 2 Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-207</p> <p>King County shall ((work)) <u>negotiate</u> with cities ((to jointly develop)) <u>with the goal of developing</u> pre-annexation agreements to address the transition of service provision from the county to the annexing cities. The development of such agreements should include a ((comprehensive)) public ((involvement)) <u>outreach process to residents and property owners in the PAAs</u>. Pre-annexation agreements may address a range of considerations, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establishing a financing partnership between the county, city and other service providers to address needed infrastructure; b. Providing reciprocal notification of development proposals in PAAs, and opportunities to identify and/or provide mitigation associated with such development; c. Supporting the city's desire, to the extent possible, to be the designated sewer or water service provider within the PAA, where this can be done without harm to the integrity of existing systems and without significantly increasing rates; d. Assessing the feasibility and/or desirability of reverse contracting in order for the city to provide local services on the county's behalf prior to annexation, as well as the feasibility and/or desirability of the county continuing to provide some local services on a contract basis after annexation; e. Exploring the feasibility of modifying development, concurrency and infrastructure design standards prior to annexation, when a specific and aggressive annexation timeline is being pursued; f. Assessing which county-owned properties and facilities should be transferred to city control, and the conditions under which such transfers should take place; g. Transitioning county employees to city employment where appropriate; h. Ensuring that land use plans for the annexation area are consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies with respect to planning for urban densities and efficient land use patterns; provision of urban services, affordable housing, and transportation; the protection of critical areas; and the long-term protection of urban separators; i. Continuing equivalent protection of cultural resources, and county landmarks and historic resources listed on the King County Historic Resource Inventory; j. Maintaining existing equestrian facilities and establishing equestrian linkages; and k. Establishing a timeline for service transitions and for the annexation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. to clarify that KC can't presuppose an outcome when negotiating with cities b. to provide more realistic expectations to residents of the PAAs regarding potential ILAs with annexing cities 	<p>According to Exec staff this revision intended to set expectations for persons affected by proposed annexations.</p> <p>However, as rewritten leaves an impression that the county doing less outreach.</p> <p>Council staff working with Executive staff to address intent while at same time preserving the outreach intended.</p>

Chapter 2- Urban Communities

Policy Revision

Executive Purpose

Committee Staff Comment

SECTION III HOUSING (pp 2-38 THROUGH 2-62) WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE 4/17 BRIEFING

p. 2-62 Introductory paragraphs under header "IV. Sustainable Development"

It is the goal of King County to work toward a model sustainable community where both the public and private sectors seek to balance urban growth with natural resource protection while addressing climate change. Sustainable development seeks to achieve this goal by addressing the impacts of the built environment in which we live and work. Sustainable development is implemented through planning, design and construction methods, including green building and low impact development (LID) that promote environmental quality, economic vitality and ((social benefits)) healthy communities.

Current development practices contribute significantly to the adverse impacts buildings and associated infrastructure have on our environment. These impacts include heavy consumption of energy and water, large-scale production of wastes, water pollution, degradation of habitats and other ecological resources, and contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. Implementing sustainable development involves incorporating green building and LID practices into our policies through education, incentives and regulation to help reduce these negative impacts.

Green building is defined as design, construction and operational practices that significantly reduce or eliminate the negative impact of buildings through sustainable site planning, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, durability, and enhanced indoor environmental quality for occupants. Buildings may also be more durable and sustainable if they are built with flexibility to accommodate households with diverse needs at various stages of life. A key feature of green building and great communities is the intersection of housing and transportation, reducing the use of single occupant cars. One strategy of green building is low impact development (LID). LID is an approach to land development that emphasizes maintaining or restoring a site's natural hydrologic function by protecting and enhancing native vegetation and soils, minimizing impervious surfaces and managing storm water at its source. Green building also applies to existing structures where retrofits can achieve additional resource conservation.

Council staff propose a rewrite at page 2-5 to define "healthy communities" as that term is used earlier in the chapter.

Working with Executive staff on revising the added information to the overall introduction. As drafted muddled concepts , especially in new addition in last paragraph

Chapter 2: Urban Communities		
Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-402</p> <p>King County should leverage its purchasing power related to capital improvement projects to help expand the markets for green building products, including recycled-content materials and clean, renewable energy technologies <u>such as, but not limited to, electric vehicle charging stations.</u></p>	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p> <p>a. add example of electric vehicle charging stations as a specific example</p> <p>b. more electric vehicle charging stations leading to greater abundance of electric cars</p>	<p>Another example of listing in the policy. May be more appropriate in introductory text.</p>
<p>U-402a</p> <p><u>King County should participate in the development of national standards for measuring sustainability at the community scale and the breadth and effectiveness of county policies and practices that improve community-scale sustainability.</u></p>	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p> <p>By participating in national standards development, King County can access the most relevant performance measures and community conditions indicators, benchmark with similar jurisdictions, and learn what jurisdictional actions most strongly correlate to improved conditions.</p>	<p>Already called out in motion Part of the SCAP</p>
<p>U-403</p> <p>King County should encourage, support and promote the application of sustainable development practices in all private sector development within the county. This may be accomplished through working with residential and commercial developers to reduce impervious surface areas, protect ground and surface water within a watershed, assure that habitat protection needs are incorporated into development proposals to the extent possible, incorporate greater use of green building materials, <u>reduce the impacts of lead paint or other materials that pose health hazards,</u> and utilize systems that conserve or reuse resources, including those that use energy more efficiently. When King County provides technical assistance and incentives for the use of sustainable development practices, it shall be at no cost to any private sector development. King County shall collaborate with the private sector on potential future regulatory tools.</p>	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p> <p>a. add example of toxic substances that are to be avoided</p> <p>b. healthier buildings without toxic substances that can harm human health</p>	<p>The list contained in this policy is of broad categories. The inclusion of lead paint seems to be specific and could be covered in a rewrite such as "eliminate to the extent possible materials that pose health hazards"</p>

Chapter 2: Urban Communities

Policy Revision	Executive Purpose	Committee Staff Comment
<p>U-405</p> <p>King County should incorporate <u>state-of-the art stormwater management techniques including</u> low impact development principles and practices into the design, construction and operation of all county facilities and county-funded projects to the ((fullest)) <u>maximum</u> extent feasible.</p>	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p>	<p>In the following policies U-405 through 407, the focus is redirected to stormwater management of which low impact development is a tool.</p> <p>To avoid the listing issue remove "low impact development"</p> <p>NOTE: IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE INTRODUCTORY TEXT (p. 2-65) , THE WORD "QUANTIFY" SHOULD BE CHANGED TO "QUANTITY."</p>
<p>U-406</p> <p>King County should work with residential and commercial developers to incorporate <u>state-of-the art stormwater management techniques including</u> low impact development practices that protect native vegetation and soils, facilitate reuse of resources, such as reclaimed water, reduce the carbon footprint of the project, and reduce impervious surface. When King County provides technical assistance and incentives for the use of low impact development practices, it shall be at no cost to any private sector development.</p>	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. clarifying that the policy pertains stormwater management techniques b. more sustainable county facilities 	<p>See U-405</p>
<p>U-407</p> <p>King County shall identify and evaluate potential changes to land use development regulations and building codes to support and promote <u>state-of-the art stormwater management techniques including</u> low impact development.</p>	<p>Not included in transmitted I-207 matrix</p> <p>From Executive's webpage version of matrix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. clarifying policy to specify state-of-the-art stormwater management techniques b. innovative code and building standards 	<p>See U-405</p>

King County Countywide Planning Policies

Updated December 2010

This document includes all amendments approved and ratified through December, 2010. If you have questions about the Countywide Planning Policies document, please contact Paul Reitenbach of the Department of Development and Environmental Services at 206.296.6705 or email him at paul.reitenbach@kingcounty.gov.

- e. Open space areas shall remain in rural designations and should generally be dedicated in such a way that it can connect with open space on adjacent properties. Open space areas should generally parallel the urban-rural line, according to criteria in k. below.
- f. The minimum depth of the open space buffer between the proposed addition to the Urban Growth Area and the Rural Area shall be at least one-half of the property width.
- g. The minimum size of property to be considered will be 20 acres, which includes both the proposed addition to the Urban Growth Area and the land proposed for open space dedication. Smaller properties may be combined to meet the 20 acre criterion.
- h. Initial proposals for open space dedication and urban development must be received between July 1, 1994 and June 30, 1996. Review by King County shall conclude by June 30, 1997.
- i. Where applications are adjacent to city boundaries or potential annexation areas, King County shall consult with and solicit recommendations from the city.
- j. The King County Executive will evaluate proposals for quality of open space and urban development. The highest quality proposals will be recommended by the Executive to the Metropolitan King County Council for adoption. This adoption will constitute an amendment to the Urban Growth Area. If the 4,000 acre limit on land added to the Urban Growth Area is not reached in the first round of proposals, due to either insufficient number of proposals or proposals of insufficient quality, additional rounds of applications may be accepted. King County will set the application and review periods for any additional rounds.
- k. Criteria for evaluating proposals shall include:
 - 1. The quality of wildlife habitat areas;
 - 2. Connections to regional open space systems;
 - 3. Protection of wetlands, stream corridors and water bodies;
 - 4. Unique natural features;
 - 5. The amount of dedicated open space and connections between dedicated open space lands along the urban rural boundary; and
 - 6. Ability to provide efficient urban governmental services to lands to be added to the Urban Growth Area.
- l. Proposals which add more than 200 acres to the Urban Growth Area shall include affordable housing consistent with King County policies for urban planned developments. As an incentive for additional affordable housing development, the required open space dedication shall be three and a half acres for each acre added to the Urban Growth Area for proposals smaller than 200 acres that provide 30 percent affordable housing units, or for larger developments that exceed 30 percent affordable housing units.

- STEP 8. a. The citizens and jurisdictions of King County are committed to maintaining a permanent Rural Area. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall review all Urban Growth Areas ten years after the adoption and ratification of Phase II Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies. The review shall be

conducted utilizing monitoring reports and benchmark evaluation and be coordinated with evaluation and reporting requirements of state law. As a result of this review the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor may recommend to the Metropolitan King County Council amendments to the Urban Growth Area. Alternatively, King County may initiate consideration of Urban Growth Area amendments. Amendments shall be based on an evaluation of the following factors:

- the criteria in policies LU-26 and LU-27;
- the sufficiency of vacant, developable land and redevelopable land to meet projected needs;
- the actual and projected rate of development and land consumption by category of land use including both development on vacant land and redevelopment projects;
- the capacity of appropriate jurisdictions to provide infrastructure and service to the Urban Growth Areas;
- the actual and projected progress of jurisdictions in meeting their adopted 20-year goals and targets of number of households and employees per acre;
- the actual and projected rate of population and employment growth compared to adopted 20-year goals and target ranges, and compared to revised projections from the Washington State Office of Financial Management;
- the actual and projected trend of economic development and affordable housing indicators, as reported annually through the adopted monitoring and benchmarks program;
- indicators of environmental conditions, such as air quality, water quality, wildlife habitat, and others.

STEP 8(b) was deleted by GMPC Motion 01-3, ratified September 16, 2002.

- c. In the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan, the King County Executive may propose for adoption by the Metropolitan King County Council minor technical changes, not to exceed 300 acres, to the Urban Growth Area recommended by the Growth Management Planning Council in the Countywide Planning Policies. These minor technical changes are not subject to ratification under policy FW-1.

STEP 9. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies may be developed by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, or by the Metropolitan King County Council, as provided in this policy. Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies, not including amendments to the Urban Growth Area pursuant to Step 7 and 8 b and c above, shall be subject to ratification by at least 30 percent of the city and County governments representing 70 percent of the population in King County. Adoption and ratification of this policy shall constitute an amendment to the May 27, 1992 interlocal agreement among King County, the City of Seattle, and the suburban cities and towns in King County for the Growth Management Planning Council of King County.

Table LU-1: Housing and Employment Growth Targets (2006 - 2031)*				
Regional Geography	Housing Target	PAA Housing Target	Employment Target	PAA Employment Target
City / Subarea	Net New Units	Net New Units	Net New Jobs	Net New Jobs
Metropolitan Cities				
Bellevue	17,000	290	53,000	
Seattle	85,000		146,700	
Subtotal	103,000		199,700	
Core Cities				
Auburn	9,620		19,350	-
Bothell	3,000	810	4,800	200
Burien	3,900		4,600	
Federal Way	8,100	2,390	12,300	290
Kent	7,800	1,560	13,200	290
Kirkland	7,200	1,370	20,200	650
Redmond	10,200	640	23,000	
Renton	14,835	3,895	29,000	470
SeaTac	5,800		25,300	
Tukwila	4,800	50	15,500	2,050
Subtotal	75,255		167,250	
Larger Cities				
Des Moines	3,000		5,000	
Issaquah	5,750	290	20,000	
Kenmore	3,500		3,000	
Maple Valley**	1,800	1,060	2,000	
Mercer Island	2,000		1,000	
Sammamish	4,000	350	1,800	
Shoreline	5,000		5,000	
Woodinville	3,000		5,000	
Subtotal	28,050		42,800	
Small Cities				
Algona	190		210	
Beaux Arts	3		3	
Black Diamond	1,900		1,050	
Carnation	330		370	
Clyde Hill	10		-	
Covington	1,470		1,320	
Duwall	1,140		840	
Enumclaw	1,425		735	
Hunts Point	1		-	
Lake Forest Park	475		210	
Medina	19		-	
Milton	50	90	160	
Newcastle	1,200		735	
Normandy Park	120		65	
North Bend	665		1,050	
Pacific	285	135	370	
Skykomish	10		-	
Snoqualmie	1,615		1,050	
Yarrow Point	14		-	
Subtotal	10,922		8,168	
Urban Unincorporated				
Potential Annexation Areas	12,930		3,950	
North Highline	1,360		2,530	
Bear Creek UPD	910		3,580	
Unclaimed Urban Unincorporated	650		90	
Subtotal	15,850		10,150	
King County UGA Total	233,077		428,068	

* Targets base year is 2006. PAA / city targets have been adjusted to reflect annexations through 2008.
** Target for Maple Valley PAA contingent on approval of city - county joint plan for Summit Place.

- LU-26 The lands within Urban Growth Areas shall be characterized by urban development. The Urban Growth Area shall accommodate the 20-year projection of household and employment growth with a full range of phased urban governmental services. The Countywide Planning Policies shall establish the Urban Growth Area based on the following criteria:
- a. Include all lands within existing cities, including cities in the Rural Area and their designated expansion areas;
 - b. The Growth Management Planning Council recognizes that the Bear Creek Master Plan Developments (MPDs) are subject to an ongoing review process under the adopted Bear Creek Community Plan and recognizes these properties as urban under these Countywide Planning Policies. If the applications necessary to implement the MPDs are denied by King County or not pursued by the applicant(s), then the property subject to the MPD shall be redesignated rural pursuant to the Bear Creek Community Plan. Nothing in these Planning Policies shall limit the continued review and implementation through existing applications, capital improvements appropriations or other approvals of these two MPDs as new communities under the Growth Management Act;
 - c. Not include rural land or unincorporated agricultural, or forestry lands designated through the Countywide Planning Policies plan process;
 - d. Include only areas already characterized by urban development which can be efficiently and cost effectively served by roads, water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage, schools and other urban governmental services within the next 20 years;
 - e. Do not extend beyond natural boundaries, such as watersheds, which impede provision of urban services;
 - f. Respect topographical features which form a natural edge such as rivers and ridge lines; and
 - g. Include only areas which are sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support urban growth without major environmental impacts unless such areas are designated as an urban separator by interlocal agreement between jurisdictions.
- LU-27 Urban separators are low-density areas or areas of little development within the Urban Growth Area. Urban separators shall be defined as permanent low-density lands which protect adjacent resource lands, Rural Areas, and environmentally sensitive areas and create open space corridors within and between Urban Areas which provide environmental, visual, recreational and wildlife benefits. Designated urban separators shall not be redesignated in the future (in the 20-year planning cycle) to other urban uses or higher densities. The maintenance of these urban separators is a regional as well as a local concern. Therefore, no modifications should be made to the development regulations governing these areas without King County review and concurrence.

