

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Appendix D1: Growth Targets and the Urban Growth Area

December 2023



King County

20
21
22

Table of Contents

23

24

25

26 **I. Abstract 3**

27 **II. Background..... 3**

28 **III. Size of the Urban Growth Area 5**

29 A. Growth to be Accommodated..... 5

30 1. Projected Countywide Growth..... 5

31 2. Allocation of Population, Housing, and Job Growth within King County..... 7

32 3. Allocation of Projected Growth to Cities and Urban Unincorporated King County 8

33 4. 2019-2044 Urban Unincorporated Growth Targets..... 10

34 B. Land Capacity in the UGA..... 11

35 1. Countywide 11

36 2. Unincorporated King County 13

37 **IV. Conclusion 14**

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 I. Abstract

46

47 This appendix provides an analysis of the amount of growth King County and cities in King
48 County are planning for within the Urban Growth Area (UGA) for the 20-year planning period of
49 the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, and the capacity available to accommodate it. It also provides a
50 similar analysis for urban unincorporated King County. The purpose of these analyses is to
51 ensure that the UGA is appropriately sized to accommodate the housing and employment
52 projected during the planning period of the Comprehensive Plan.

53

54 Appendix D was originally prepared for the 1994 Comprehensive Plan in support of the creation
55 of King County's UGA Boundary and has been supplemented with new appendices in periodic
56 and major updates since 2004, including this 2024 Appendix. Those supplements incorporate
57 the 1994 Appendix D by reference but does not address issues already covered by the original,
58 such as delineation of the Urban Growth Area. Therefore, they supplement but does not replace
59 the 1994 Appendix D.

60

61 The key inputs to the analysis in this appendix are housing and employment growth projections
62 adopted as growth targets in Table DP-1 of the 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies
63 and estimates of developable capacity contained in the 2021 King County Urban Growth
64 Capacity Report.¹ The growth targets adopted in the Countywide Planning Policies are
65 consistent with the Growth Management Population Projections developed by the Washington
66 State Office of Financial Management (OFM), and the Puget Sound Regional Council's VISION
67 2050 Regional Growth Strategy.² The Urban Growth Capacity Report contains the required
68 review of the UGA and of urban patterns of development compared to planning objectives and
69 goals, and was accepted by the Washington State Department of Commerce in June 2021.³

70

71 King County's UGA is sized to adequately accommodate projected growth while also accounting
72 for unpredictable circumstances that could alter the calculated supply of urban growth capacity
73 or the number of housing units needed to accommodate projected population growth. The
74 location of the UGA includes areas of the county that already have urban services or have solid
75 commitments for future urban services, and as a result, would be inconsistent with the criteria
76 for rural or Natural Resource Lands. The most recent developable capacity information,
77 analyzed in the King County Urban Growth Capacity Report affirms the adequacy of the existing
78 UGA to accommodate all the county's projected growth through 2044 and beyond. This is true
79 both for the entire UGA and for the unincorporated portions of the UGA.

80

81 II. Background

82

83 A foundational element of growth management planning in Washington state is the designation
84 of urban, rural, and natural resource lands. Urban land is composed primarily of incorporated
85 cities and towns, and secondarily of un-annexed portions of unincorporated King County.
86 Certain mapped urban lands may also be subject to the sovereign governmental authority of
87 Indian tribes. Rural and natural resource lands are portions of unincorporated King County,
88 certain sub-portions of which are owned by, or held in trust for, Indian tribes. The Growth

¹ 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies [\[LINK\]](#); 2021 King County Urban Growth Capacity Report, ratified 2022 [\[LINK\]](#)

² Washington State Office of Financial Management, Growth Management Act County Projections, 2022 [\[LINK\]](#); Puget Sound Regional Council, VISION 2050 [\[LINK\]](#)

³ Required by Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.215 [\[LINK\]](#), and RCW 36.70A.130 [\[LINK\]](#)

89 Management Act requires the delineation of urban lands by establishment of the urban growth
90 area (UGA), and of rural and natural resource lands by designation pursuant to comprehensive
91 land use and zoning. While the Growth Management Act requires coordination of local plans,
92 and population and employment projections are tacitly inclusive of tribal growth, Indian tribes
93 have historically not been included in discussions about allocating urban growth within King
94 County. King County recognizes that urban, rural, and natural resource lands are inclusive of
95 certain lands held and governed by Indian tribes, and King County will coordinate with Indian
96 tribes as a part of County and countywide planning processes.

97
98 The 1992 Countywide Planning Policies established a framework UGA for King County. The
99 County initially designated the UGA in its 1994 Comprehensive Plan based on this framework.
100 Each city or town within King County is responsible for determining, through its comprehensive
101 plan, land use within its borders, including accommodating the broad range of residential and
102 nonresidential uses associated with urban growth. King County is responsible for establishing
103 land use in the unincorporated portion of the UGA through its comprehensive plan.

104
105 Key factors used in setting the UGA size include population and employment projections,
106 growth targets, and land capacity. Population and employment projections are predictions about
107 likely future growth based on past trends. Growth targets are a jurisdiction's policy statement on
108 the quantity of net new housing units and jobs it plans to accommodate over the 20-year
109 planning period based on projections and the jurisdiction's role with the regional growth
110 strategy. Land capacity is derived from an estimate of vacant land plus the redevelopment
111 potential of land already partially developed or underutilized. Discount factors are applied to the
112 estimate of land capacity to account for probable constraints and likelihood of developing the
113 land over the 20-year planning period.

114
115 Population and employment projections are useful as an indicator of the potential future demand
116 for land capacity. Growth targets follow the development of specific goals and objectives for
117 future growth, and under the Growth Management Act (GMA), they must be supported by
118 commitments of funds, incentives, and regulations. Discounted capacity is a market-constrained
119 estimate of how much growth may be accommodated in a geographic area.

120
121 Under the GMA, each county is required to plan to accommodate 20 years of population growth
122 in its comprehensive plan. Counties are to establish a UGA "within which urban growth shall be
123 encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature."⁴ Further,
124 based on OFM population projections, the GMA requires the UGA to "include areas and
125 densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the
126 succeeding twenty-year period."⁵ As part of the county's planning, it must accommodate
127 housing and employment growth targets, including institutional and other nonresidential uses.
128 All cities are places for urban growth and, by law, must be included within the UGA.⁶ In addition,
129 unincorporated areas may be included within the UGA "only if such territory already is
130 characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban
131 growth."⁷ The UGA must also include greenbelt and open space areas. Several GMA goals,
132 such as those dealing with affordable housing, economic development, open space, recreation,
133 and the environment, also have an important bearing on these UGA requirements. These goals

⁴ RCW 36.70A.110(1) [\[LINK\]](#)

⁵ RCW 36.70A.110(2) [\[LINK\]](#)

⁶ RCW 36.70A.110(1) [\[LINK\]](#)

⁷ RCW 36.70A.110(2) [\[LINK\]](#)

134 need to be balanced with those which encourage efficient urban growth and discourage urban
135 sprawl.

136
137 The concurrency goal for public facilities and services in the GMA directs jurisdictions to ensure
138 that "those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to
139 serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy without
140 decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards."⁸ Ensuring
141 adequate land capacity for industrial and commercial development and providing enough land
142 capacity to allow for choices in where people live can help advance economic development and
143 maintain housing affordability. If the UGA is adequately sized, then pressures to develop on
144 environmentally constrained land and on areas set-aside for open space are reduced.

145 III. Size of the Urban Growth Area


146

147 A. Growth to be Accommodated

148 As shown in Figure 1 below, establishing the amount of population, housing, employment
149 growth to be accommodated countywide and in individual King County jurisdictions begins with
150 countywide and regional forecasts. Growth is allocated to King County and to groups of
151 jurisdictions called "Regional Geographies" via VISION 2050's Regional Growth Strategy, and
152 population growth is then converted to housing growth. Finally, jurisdictions grouped by
153 Regional Geography collaboratively determine jurisdictional-level housing and employment
154 growth targets based on local factors and input.

155

156 *Figure 1: Growth Targets Development Process*



157

158 *PAA means Potential Annexation Area*

159

160 1. Projected Countywide Growth

161 The GMA requires Washington State counties to accommodate forecasted population growth, to
162 allocate that growth among and in consultation with their jurisdictions, and to designate urban
163 and rural areas. In King County, the allocation takes the form of "growth targets" for housing unit
164 and job growth over an approximately 20-year planning period. The first set of growth targets
165 was enacted by King County through the Countywide Planning Policies in 1994.

166

167 Forecasted population growth is generally sourced from the most recent OFM growth
168 management population projections, which are prepared at a countywide level. The OFM
169 projections from 2017 were the most current forecast available during the target setting process
170 in 2020 and 2021. The OFM projections contain "high," "medium," and "low" series of projected
171 growth. King County has planned for the medium-series population growth projections in past
172 Comprehensive Plan updates. In December 2022, OFM published a new population projection
173 based on updated Census data and forecast assumptions. The 2022 medium series is

⁸ RCW 36.70A.020(12) [\[LINK\]](#)

174 approximately 1,000 persons greater from the 2017 medium series in the year 2044 (the last
175 year in the planning period). Because of the limited differences between the 2017 and 2022
176 projections, the current countywide growth allocations adopted in the Countywide Planning
177 Policies and the Comprehensive Plan are consistent with the 2022 projections.

178
179 In 2017, in preparation of VISION 2050, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) produced a
180 regional forecast for its jurisdiction, which includes King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish
181 Counties, forecasting population and employment through 2050. This forecast was used as the
182 source for projected employment growth in past Comprehensive Plan updates. The PSRC
183 forecasted population is comparable to the 2017 OFM population projection medium series for
184 the four-county PSRC region. Because of the similar population projection, the use of the PSRC
185 employment forecast for determining employment growth targets, and the primacy of VISION
186 2050's Regional Growth Strategy in allocating growth within the region, King County utilized the
187 PSRC forecast as the source for countywide growth allocations in developing 2019-2044 growth
188 targets.

189
190 As the PSRC forecast is at a regional scale, countywide shares of population and employment
191 growth are applied to the regional totals to project growth for King County alone. These shares
192 derive from VISION 2050's Regional Growth Strategy.⁹ The resulting population and job growth
193 form King County's projected countywide growth allocations for the 2019-2044 period. Figure 2
194 below shows how countywide growth allocations were determined.

195
196 *Figure 2: Countywide Population and Employment Projections*

Scale	Step	Calculation	Population	Employment	Explanation and Sources	
Regional	A	2019 Estimate	N/A	4,203,400	2,295,608	Base year estimates <i>Sources: OFM Population Estimates, PSRC Total Employment Estimates</i>
	B	2044 Projection	N/A	5,525,074	3,180,060	Horizon year projections <i>Source: PSRC Macroeconomic Forecast</i>
	C	2019-2044 Projection	A - B	1,321,674	884,452	Regional projection for the planning period
Countywide	D	Regional Growth Strategy Share of King County Growth	N/A	50%	59%	<i>Source: PSRC VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy for King County</i>
	E	2019-2044 Initial Countywide Growth	C * D	660,837	520,756	Regional Growth Strategy shares are applied to regional projection to create King County projection
	F	Share of Construction/Resource jobs	N/A	N/A	5.7%	Construction/Resource employment are removed from total as jobs generally do not have fixed worksites <i>PSRC Total Employment Estimates</i>
	G	2019-2044 Countywide Growth	E * (1-F)	660,837	490,854	Countywide population projection

197
198 VISION 2050's Regional Growth Strategy apportions 50 percent of the region's population
199 growth and 59 percent of the region's employment growth to King County. For comparison, in
200 2020, King County housed 53 percent of the region's population and 67 percent of the region's
201 jobs.¹⁰ The Regional Growth Strategy shares reflect King County's role within the region and
202 includes policy choices aimed to improve the regional balance of jobs and housing among the

⁹ Puget Sound Regional Council, VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy [\[LINK\]](#)

¹⁰ US Census Bureau, Decennial Census 2020; Puget Sound Regional Council, Covered Employment Estimates, 2020 [\[LINK\]](#)

203 four PSRC counties. The Regional Growth Strategy disperses employment growth traditionally
204 concentrated in King County but retains a similar share of population growth.
205

206 Finally, before sub-county allocations are made, the countywide employment growth number is
207 adjusted to remove construction and resource sector employment. While the contributions from
208 these sectors are essential to King County’s economy, construction and resource jobs are less
209 likely to have a fixed worksite, e.g., an office or storefront, and resource sector jobs are
210 generally less urban. These jobs are removed from the countywide allocation.

211 2. Allocation of Population, Housing, and Job Growth within King County

212 With the countywide population and employment growth allocations established, the next step is
213 to allocate population, housing, and jobs to jurisdictions within King County. Growth is allocated
214 to VISION 2050 Regional Geographies before being allocated to individual jurisdictions.
215 Regional Geographies are groups of cities and urban unincorporated areas that have similar
216 characteristics, such as designated regional growth centers or high-capacity transit
217 infrastructure.¹¹
218

219 The policy goals of VISION 2050 and the 2021 Countywide Planning Policies define how growth
220 is allocated to Regional Geographies. Metropolitan and Core Cities have regional growth
221 centers and existing or planned high-capacity transit investments, and collectively are planned
222 to accommodate the greatest share of projected growth. High Capacity Transit Communities are
223 cities and urban unincorporated areas with planned high-capacity transit investments that will
224 allow these jurisdictions to accommodate a larger share of future growth.¹² Cities and Towns
225 and the Urban Unincorporated areas accommodate the least amount of projected growth as
226 they lack high-capacity transit and growth centers or are surrounded by the rural area. Rural
227 King County is included in the countywide distribution but does not receive a growth target.
228 Figure 3 lists the six Regional Geography categories and their associated growth shares from
229 VISION 2050 that were used to sub-allocate the countywide growth allocations.
230
231

Figure 3: Share of Growth by Regional Geography

Regional Geography	Share of Countywide Population	Share of Countywide Employment
Metropolitan Cities	44%	46%
Core Cities	40%	45%
High Capacity Transit Communities	11%	6%
Cities and Towns	5%	3%
Urban Unincorporated	0.5%	0.1%
Rural	0.7%	0.4%

232
233 The shares in Figure 3 were applied to the 2019-2044 countywide growth from Figure 2 to
234 create Regional Geography level population and employment growth. Population was then
235 converted to housing units to support the development of housing targets. The conversion used
236 household assumptions (share of group quarters population, household size, and vacancy

¹¹ Puget Sound Regional Council, VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy [\[LINK\]](#)

¹² In King County, the High Capacity Transit Communities regional geography includes the Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs) for Federal Way, Renton, and Seattle (North Highline). These areas were selected because a portion of each PAA falls within a ½-mile of a future light rail station or contains an existing or planned bus rapid transit stop.

237 rates) created for each regional geography from jurisdiction-level 2018 American Community
238 Survey and OFM population estimates, averaged to regional geography, and then adjusted to
239 reflect forecasted trends in reduced household size and longer-term vacancy rates. Figure 4
240 shows the housing, employment, and population initially allocated to Regional Geographies.
241

242 *Figure 4: Allocated Growth by Regional Geography*

Regional Geography	2019-2044 Population Growth	2019-2044 Housing Growth	2019-2044 Employment Growth
Metropolitan Cities	288,407	134,500	223,508
Core Cities	261,912	112,859	222,789
High Capacity Transit Communities	69,641	29,933	28,747
Cities and Towns	33,307	13,985	12,936
Urban Unincorporated	3,028	1,292	719
Rural	4,542	4,211	2,156
Urban King County	656,295	292,569	488,698
King County Total	660,837	296,780	490,854

243

244 3. Allocation of Projected Growth to Cities and Urban Unincorporated King County

245 The final phase of the growth target setting process allocated growth to cities and potential
246 annexation areas in urban unincorporated King County. This was a two-step process. First,
247 Regional Geography allocations were apportioned into an initial range of growth target
248 scenarios for individual cities and PAAs. Each scenario within the range is based on a
249 proportional allocation of Regional Geography growth to cities and potential annexation areas
250 based on relevant data, including existing capacity from the Urban Growth Capacity Report,
251 existing development and recent growth, the number of regional growth centers, and number of
252 transit station areas.

253

254 The initial growth target ranges provided the foundation for the second step of this stage of the
255 process, where planning staff representing the 39 cities and unincorporated King County were
256 convened by their VISION 2050 Regional Geography to negotiate the set of draft growth
257 targets. Each Regional Geography group met approximately five times. Groups discussed the
258 preliminary target ranges created in the previous step, weighing the merits and relevancy of
259 capacity, existing development, transit and transportation connections, growth rates, and other
260 supplied data to allocate growth targets within their Regional Geography. Groups worked
261 iteratively, collectively identifying a baseline set of housing and employment targets from the
262 preliminary target ranges as a starting place for negotiation, and then individually working with
263 other jurisdictional staff and elected officials to develop a jurisdictional position on the baseline.
264 King County staff then assembled the individual positions from jurisdictions and convened the
265 Regional Geography groups again to collectively review and attempt to close any gap between
266 the individual growth target positions and the Regional Geography growth allocation.
267

268 The ultimate result of this process are the growth targets adopted by the King County Council
269 and ratified by the cities in the 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policies.¹³ Figure 5
270 displays the adopted housing and employment growth targets for 2019-2044.

271
272 *Figure 5: King County Jurisdiction Growth Targets 2019-2044*

		Net New Units and Jobs	
Jurisdiction		2019-2044 Housing Target	2019-2044 Jobs Target
Metro Cities	Bellevue	35,000	70,000
	Seattle	112,000	169,500
Metropolitan Cities Subtotal		147,000	239,500
Core Cities	Auburn	12,000	19,520
	Bothell	5,800	9,500
	Burien	7,500	4,770
	Federal Way	11,260	20,460
	Issaquah	3,500	7,950
	Kent	10,200	32,000
	Kirkland	13,200	26,490
	Redmond	20,000	24,000
	Renton	17,000	31,780
	SeaTac	5,900	14,810
	Tukwila	6,500	15,890
Core Cities Subtotal		112,860	207,170
High Capacity Transit Communities	Des Moines	3,800	2,380
	Federal Way PAA*	1,020	720
	Kenmore	3,070	3,200
	Lake Forest Park	870	550
	Mercer Island	1,239	1,300
	Newcastle	1,480	500
	North Highline PAA*	1,420	1,220
	Renton PAA* - East Renton	170	0
	Renton PAA* – Fairwood	840	100
	Renton PAA* - Skyway/West Hill	670	600
	Shoreline	13,330	10,000
	Woodinville	2,033	5,000
High Capacity Transit Communities Subtotal		29,942	25,570
Cities and Towns	Algona	170	325
	Beaux Arts	1	0
	Black Diamond	2,900	680
	Carnation	799	450

¹³ GMPC Motion 21-1 initially adopted by Ordinance 19384 [\[LINK\]](#), and amended in 2022 by GMPC Motion 22-1 adopted by Ordinance 19553 [\[LINK\]](#)

		Net New Units and Jobs	
Jurisdiction		2019-2044 Housing Target	2019-2044 Jobs Target
	Clyde Hill	10	10
	Covington	4,310	4,496
	Duvall	890	990
	Enumclaw	1,057	989
	Hunts Point	1	0
	Maple Valley	1,720	1,570
	Medina	19	0
	Milton	50	900
	Normandy Park	153	35
	North Bend	1,748	2,218
	Pacific	135	75
	Sammamish	2,100	728
	Skykomish	10	0
	Snoqualmie	1,500	4,425
	Yarrow Point	10	0
Cities and Towns Subtotal		17,583	17,891
Urban Unincorporated	Auburn PAA*	12	0
	Bellevue PAA*	17	0
	Black Diamond PAA*	328	0
	Issaquah PAA*	35	0
	Kent PAA*	3	300
	Newcastle PAA*	1	0
	Pacific PAA*	134	0
	Redmond PAA*	120	0
	Sammamish PAA*	194	0
	Unaffiliated Urban Unincorporated	448	400
Urban Unincorporated Subtotal		1,292	700
Urban Growth Area Total		308,677	490,831

273

274 4. 2019-2044 Urban Unincorporated Growth Targets

275 As shown in Figure 5, growth targets for urban unincorporated King County are divided across
276 two Regional Geographies. Growth targets for the Federal Way PAA, North Highline, and
277 Renton PAA are in the High Capacity Transit Communities Regional Geography, reflecting the
278 planned transit investments in these areas.¹⁴ Targets for other PAAs and unaffiliated urban
279 areas are included in the Urban Unincorporated Regional Geography. Per the Countywide
280 Planning Policies, growth targets were allocated to PAAs in the Urban Unincorporated Regional

¹⁴ The Puget Sound Regional Council assigned the entirety of an affiliated PAA to its VISION 2050 Regional Geographies. While Fairwood and East Renton do not have planned high-capacity transit investments during this planning period, they are in the High Capacity Transit Communities geography because the Renton PAA was assigned to it.

281 Geography proportionately based on their relative capacity.¹⁵ Growth targets for the PAAs in the
282 High Capacity Transit Communities geography were also allocated relative to their existing
283 capacity to be consistent with the intent of the Countywide Planning Policies, but not directly
284 proportional to the capacity of urban unincorporated King County given the other jurisdictions in
285 the group.
286

287 **B. Land Capacity in the UGA**

288 1. Countywide

289 The GMA requires King County and the cities in King County to include land area and densities
290 sufficient to accommodate projected growth over the 20-year planning period within the UGA.¹⁶
291 Through the review and evaluation program, King County ensures that sufficient urban capacity
292 for growth persists during the planning period and beyond, ensuring a stable UGA boundary. In
293 2021, King County completed the Urban Growth Capacity Report, its fourth edition of the
294 required evaluation.¹⁷ King County's previous reports have consistently reported sufficient
295 capacity within the UGA for projected growth.
296

297 The Urban Growth Capacity Report assesses patterns of development within the UGA and uses
298 assumptions to estimate a more "market-based" capacity for growth, to test whether capacity is
299 realistically available for future development.¹⁸ Available land supply is identified by its likeliness
300 to re-develop. Densities used to calculate capacity are informed by recent development in a
301 zone, rather than the base or maximum densities expressed in zoning. A "market factor" is
302 applied to the calculated capacity to discount capacity unlikely to develop during the planning
303 period. Therefore, capacity calculated under the Urban Growth Capacity Report is generally a
304 more conservative estimate than the total amount allowed by zoning.
305

306 The Urban Growth Capacity Report found that King County had capacity for over 400,000
307 housing units and 600,000 jobs within the UGA.¹⁹ This was ample capacity to accommodate the
308 remaining projected growth from the previous, 2006-2035 growth targets, and sufficient to
309 accommodate the projected growth under the 2019-2044 growth targets, as reported in Figure
310 5.
311

312 Amendments to the GMA in 2017 ushered in new requirements for the review and evaluation
313 program.²⁰ The amendments formalized how assumptions about infrastructure gaps and market
314 factors should be considered and expanded the purview for when "reasonable measures" would
315 be required to correct for measured inconsistencies to include the achievement of growth
316 targets and urban densities. The Urban Growth Capacity Report reported on these additional
317 indicators, as a part of its assessment of the patterns of development with the UGA.
318

319 The Urban Growth Capacity Report analyzed progress made by cities and urban unincorporated
320 King County towards achieving 2006-2035 growth targets. Because past reports had not
321 focused on this specific outcome before, the 2021 report examined growth since 2006 and
322 through 2018. Over this period, urban King County grew at a rate to achieve its adopted growth
323 targets. Approximately 41 percent of the previous target period had elapsed between 2006-

¹⁵ 2021 King County Countywide Planning Policy DP-12g [\[LINK\]](#)

¹⁶ RCW 36.70A.110 [\[LINK\]](#)

¹⁷ King County, 2021 King County Urban Growth Capacity Report, ratified 2022 [\[LINK\]](#)

¹⁸ Patterns of development analysis required by RCW 36.70A.130 [\[LINK\]](#)

¹⁹ King County, 2021 King County Urban Growth Capacity Report, ratified 2022 [\[LINK\]](#)

²⁰ Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5254, 2017 [\[LINK\]](#)

324 2018. Urban King County achieved 47 percent of its housing and employment targets during the
325 period, growing slightly faster than this prorated pace.
326

327 Countywide, development trends analyzed under the Urban Growth Capacity Report showed
328 that urban densities were being achieved within the UGA. While there is not a stated definition
329 of “urban” growth stated as a density goal, 70 percent of residential development during the
330 period analyzed by the report was developed at densities of at least 48 dwelling units per acre,
331 and about 17 percent of development occurred at densities less than 10 dwelling units per acre.
332 98 percent of residential development was over four dwelling units per acre.
333

334 While the Urban Growth Capacity Report found that sufficient capacity was available in the UGA
335 for projected growth, that urban densities were being achieved, and that urban King County was
336 on track to achieve its 2006-2035 growth targets, a small number of cities lacked sufficient
337 capacity for projected growth or were not growing at a rate to achieve their targets. The Urban
338 Growth Capacity Report noted the cities where inconsistencies were identified and
339 recommended that the cities evaluate whether reasonable measures were required to be taken
340 in the 2024 periodic update to comprehensive plans to correct for the inconsistency. Figure 6
341 lists these cities and the observed inconsistencies. Some inconsistencies may have been
342 corrected by adopting revised growth targets for the 2019-2044 planning period. The observed
343 inconsistency for the City of Sammamish related to an infrastructure deficiency that has since
344 been resolved. Following the adoption of comprehensive plans in 2024, each jurisdiction will be
345 required to monitor progress toward resolving the inconsistency, with regular reporting to the
346 Growth Management Planning Council.
347
348

349 *Figure 6: Recommendations for Adoption of Reasonable Measures from the 2021 Urban Growth Capacity Report*

Jurisdiction	Inconsistency Identified
Burien	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient employment capacity • Employment growth inconsistent with target
Pacific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient employment capacity
Sammamish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient housing capacity
Shoreline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient employment capacity
Tukwila	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing growth inconsistent with target • Employment growth inconsistent with target

350

351 2. Unincorporated King County

352 The Urban Growth Capacity report found sufficient capacity for the remaining portion of the
353 previous housing growth targets, with a shortfall of capacity for the remaining employment
354 target. The evaluation revealed capacity for 7,383 housing units and 2,207 jobs, with 7,339
355 housing units and 4,343 jobs remaining of the previous period's 2006-2035 growth targets. The
356 2006-2035 urban unincorporated employment targets included a target of over 4,000 jobs for
357 the Bear Creek Urban Planned Development, a fully contained community surrounded by the
358 rural area. The target was a reflection of estimates of commercial space planned for the
359 community. As the development built out in Bear Creek in the last decade, the community
360 added 1,100 jobs between 2006 and 2020, approximately a quarter of the anticipated growth
361 there.²¹ Because of the nature of the development in a fully contained community constrained
362 by developer agreements and subdivision controls, additional growth is not expected to reach
363 the originally targeted level. The 2019-2044 growth targets reflect reduced expectations for
364 employment growth in the urban unincorporated area, more in line with the land supply and
365 capacity for employment growth, to remedy the apparent capacity shortfall.

366

367 For the 2019-2044 planning period, King County is planning for a total of 5,412 housing units
368 and 3,340 jobs in the urban unincorporated area. The land capacity analysis performed to
369 support the development of the 2024 update to the Comprehensive Plan found capacity for
370 29,600 housing units and 62,900 jobs under current zoning at base densities.

371

372 Zoned capacity is higher than the capacity calculated in the Urban Growth Capacity Report,
373 particularly for employment. This reflects the differences seen in recent development, which
374 strongly influenced the capacity calculated in the Urban Growth Capacity Report, and what is
375 allowed under the zoning code. The significant difference in non-residential capacity also owes
376 to the imprecision in estimating a job-based capacity, as the quantity of employees varies
377 across businesses and workplace types and is not directly controlled by the zoning code or land
378 use designations.

379

380

²¹ Puget Sound Regional Council, Covered Employment Estimates, 2020 [\[LINK\]](#)

381 IV. Conclusion

382

383 The UGA is sized appropriately to accommodate the projected growth in housing and
384 employment over the 2019-2044 planning period. As demonstrated in the 2021 King County
385 Urban Growth Capacity Report, patterns of development within the UGA have been urban in
386 nature and growth has been occurring at a rate to achieve growth targets. Urban unincorporated
387 King County has sufficient capacity under the current zoning to accommodate its growth targets
388 for the 2019-2044 period.

389