

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 1 n/a	Substantive	n/a	Findings		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally, the Findings capture the requirements of the Growth Management Act and Shoreline Management Act, and state the reasoning behind the Four-to-One Program changes, middle housing, Vashon-Maury Island map amendments, residential density incentives. As Councilmembers are considering amendments to the Executive's transmittal, additional or different Findings may be needed.
Section 2 n/a	Substantive	n/a	Adopts portions of the ordinance and its attachments as amendments to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive Plan - Shoreline Master Program - Vashon Maury Island Subarea Plan - Land use and zoning controls - Retitles previously adopted Comprehensive Plan appendices 	Establishes the various elements of the proposed 2024 update to the Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 27 20.12.010	Clarification	Codifies adoption of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, as amended	Replaces the 2016 plan with the 2024 plan	Reflects adoption of 2024 Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 28 20.12.200	Clarification	Codifies adoption of the Shoreline Master Program enacted as of March 25, 2021 This section identifies which Code sections of Code constitute the regulations of the Shoreline Master Program.	Replacements enactment date with that of this proposed ordinance Technical correction	Reflects updated version of the Shoreline Master Program as amended by the 2024 Update. Other proposed changes to reflect accurate "shoreline jurisdiction" terminology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.C.C. 21A.24.070 should be included in its entirety (not just subsections A., D, and E.), as sections B. and C. affect the shoreline jurisdiction. Additional changes may be proposed under the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO). See the CAO matrix.
Section 3 2.16.055	Substantive	Establishes requirements for subarea planning and Community Needs Lists (CNLs), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reporting on performance of each subarea plan 2 years after adoption of the applicable subarea plan - CNLs must be developed using at least the "County engages in dialogue" and "County and community work together" levels of engagement as outlined in the Office of Equity and Racial and Social Justice's Community Engagement Guide - CNLs for each subarea must be submitted to the Council both 1) with each biennial budget, and 2) with the applicable subarea plan for that geography Establishes the duties of the Permitting Division of the Department of Local Services, including a requirement to process urban planned development permits	For subarea planning and CNLs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reporting on performance of all adopted subarea plans occurs at the same time, once every two years - CNLs must be developed using at least the "County and community work together" level of engagement - CNLs must be submitted with each biennial budget - Other changes to remove outdated language Removes requirement to process Urban Planned Development permits	Updates reporting requirements for subarea plan performance metrics so that reporting on all adopted subarea plans will be due at the same time/consistent basis moving forward (rather than the current staggered timelines based on when each plan is adopted) CNL engagement is proposed to be updated to reflect the following 2024 scope item: Review the requirements and process for developing community needs lists, including evaluating whether and how community engagement could occur at the "county and community work together" level of engagement as outlined in the OERSJ Community Engagement Guide. The proposed Code and development of CNLs moving forward would align with this higher level of engagement. Proposed changes would remove the requirement to submit CNLs with subarea plans in addition to biennial budgets. Submitting with the subarea plan itself along with biennial budgets will cause either 1) two versions of a CNL to be open in front of the Council at the same time, or 2) a CNL to be adopted and then updated/readopted a couple of months later. This is both confusing and a great deal of additional process without much, if any, additional gain. Subarea planning engagement will still route related public input to updates of CNLs as appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The change to level of community engagement (page 3) for development of community needs lists is a policy choice. The main difference between these two levels of engagement is that "County and community work together" gives community members more decision-making power, in partnership with the County. There is one higher level of community engagement, "Community directs action" which is usually initiated by the community and the County only offers technical assistance, giving a larger share of decision-making power to Community members. The level of community engagement for subarea plans, and for the CSA work plans, is not proposed to change, and will maintain the minimum "County engages in dialogue" level of engagement. This is a policy choice. Executive staff indicate this is because the scope of work only directed the review of levels of engagement for CNLs. The proposed change to when Community Needs Lists are transmitted to the Council is also a policy choice. The Executive's proposal would require CNLs to be transmitted to the Council only with the biennial budget (beginning in 2025 for the 2026-2027 biennial budget). This sets up a scenario when the subarea plans that are adopted in non-budget review years (even years), the subarea plan and associated community engagement would occur, and then in the following year, the CNL development would require additional community engagement. Council may wish

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<p>to consider whether and how the CNL development and subarea plan development should work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are components of the existing language in this section that are not currently part of DLS's activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Subsection D.2. requires a work plan for each CSA geography to be completed by DLS. Executive staff indicate that this is due to COVID-related changes in DLS operations and that DLS is reviewing the best way to support the CSA geographies.. ○ Subsection F. was adopted as part of 18791 in 2018 (the Ordinance that created DLS). This required a follow-up ordinance to be transmitted by January 1, 2020, to address some inconsistencies identified in Ordinance 18791 that couldn't be resolved before adoption. That follow-up ordinance has never been transmitted to the Council. Executive staff indicate they understand this requirement exists but that there are not currently resources to accomplish it. ○ In G.1.f. regarding the regulation of taxicabs and for-hire drivers and vehicles, Council staff recommend incorporating TNC drivers and vehicles to reflect the County's role in its regulation. "f. regulating the operation, maintenance, and conduct of county-licensed businesses, except taxicab, and for-hire, and transportation network company drivers and vehicles" or to keep it simpler "f. regulating the operation, maintenance, and conduct of county-licensed businesses, except ((taxicab and for-hire)) drivers and vehicles relating to the for-hire vehicle industry"
K.C.C. 2.100	Policy staff flag				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hearing Examiner's annual report highlights that director's code interpretation decisions, not associated with a permit application or code enforcement action, are not currently appealable to the Hearing Examiner. This creates issues for regulatory interpretations not part of a permit and early in the code enforcement process.
Section 4 6.70.010	Technical	Regulates licensing standards for marijuana retail activities and businesses licensed by the Washington state Liquor and Cannabis Board and located in unincorporated King County	Changes "marijuana" to "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 5 6.70.020	Technical	Regulates licensing standards for marijuana retail activities and businesses licensed by the Washington state Liquor and Cannabis Board and located in unincorporated King County	Changes "marijuana" to "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 6 6.70.030	Technical	Regulates licensing standards for marijuana retail activities and businesses licensed by the Washington state Liquor and Cannabis Board and located in unincorporated King County	Changes "marijuana" to "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 7 6.70.040	Technical	Regulates licensing standards for marijuana retail activities and businesses licensed by the Washington state Liquor and Cannabis Board and located in unincorporated King County	Changes "marijuana" to "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 8 6.70.060	Technical	Regulates licensing standards for marijuana retail activities and businesses licensed by the Washington state Liquor and Cannabis Board and located in unincorporated King County	Changes "marijuana" to "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 9 6.70.070	Technical	Regulates licensing standards for marijuana retail activities and businesses licensed by the Washington state Liquor and Cannabis Board and located in unincorporated King County	Changes "marijuana" to "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 58 21A.06.040	Technical	Defines "agricultural product sales," which excludes marijuana products	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 61 21A.06.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.06.7341 to follow K.C.C. 21A.06.162	Proposed reordering of existing definition to reflect to reflect proposed changes to replace "marijuana" with "cannabis"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 62 21A.06.7341	Technical	Defines "marijuana"	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 63 21A.06.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.06.7342 to follow recodified K.C.C. 21A.06.7341	Proposed reordering of existing definition to reflect to reflect proposed changes to replace "marijuana" with "cannabis"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 64 21A.06.3742	Technical	Defines "marijuana greenhouse"	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 65 21A.06.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.06.7344 to follow recodified K.C.C. 21A.06.7342	Proposed reordering of existing definition to reflect to reflect proposed changes to replace "marijuana" with "cannabis"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 66 21A.06.7344	Technical	Defines "marijuana processor"	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 67 21A.06.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.06.7346 to follow recodified K.C.C. 21A.06.7344	Proposed reordering of existing definition to reflect to reflect proposed changes to replace "marijuana" with "cannabis"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 68 21A.06.7346	Technical	Defines "marijuana producer"	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 69 21A.06.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.06.7348 to follow recodified K.C.C. 21A.06.7346	Proposed reordering of existing definition to reflect to reflect proposed changes to replace "marijuana" with "cannabis"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 70 21A.06.7348	Technical	Defines "marijuana retailer"	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 95 21A.06.1013	Substantive	Defines "rural equestrian community trail"	Replaces nonmotorized" with "active transportation"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding the possible uses to include active transportation opens the possibility of e-bikes and scooters on rural equestrian trails. This wouldn't be guaranteed since it is just that they "may...be suitable," but whether to open this possibility is a policy choice. The code could be updated to remove "within the Equestrian Community" as that is not a location. The existing definition defines a rural equestrian community trail as "existing," meaning that new trails

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
					cannot meet the definition. The standards for rural equestrian community trails in 21A.14.380 reference "new" trails. Executive staff indicate that the intent of "new" in that section is improvements to existing trails. That language could be changed to match that intent.
Section 101 21A.06.1285	Substantive	Defines "trails"	Replaces "nonmotorized" with "active transportation"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The language could be clarified to state that a trail is intended for <u>one or more forms of</u> active transportation, since the Executive proposes to prohibit certain types of active transportation on some trails through the Title 7 update (PO 2024-0007).
Section 11 14.01.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 14.01 adopting a definition of "Active transportation" for the purposes of K.C.C. Title 14 (Roads and Bridges)	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology. New definition matches definition in the Comprehensive Plan Glossary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last two sentences are policy/regulation language likely not appropriate for a definition.
Section 12 14.01.360	Substantive	Defines "transportation facilities" for the purposes of K.C.C. Title 14 (Roads and Bridges)	Changes "nonmotorized travel" to "active transportation" and clarifies intent for facilities.	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology. Adds additional clarifying language, consistent with the definition for active transportation in the Comprehensive Plan Glossary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final sentence is policy/regulation language likely not appropriate for a definition.
Section 13 14.40.0104	Substantive	Establishes standards for review of road vacation petitions, including that considerations should be made for whether all or portions of the right-of-way should be preserved for the county transportation system	Changes "transportation system" to "road system"	<p>State law defines a county road as a highway open as a matter of right to public vehicular travel. See RCW 36.75.010(6) and (11). Most road right-of-way dedicated to the County was exclusively for use as a future County Road. Accordingly, the proper criteria for the County Road Engineer to evaluate whether road right-of-way should be vacated is whether it advisable to preserve it for the future County Road system, not for a future transportation system.</p> <p>King County Code 14.40.0104 requires the King County Road Engineer to produce a report regarding a proposed road vacation that "complies with the requirements in RCW 36.87.040." In determining whether a county road should be vacated and abandoned, the County Road Engineer is required to determine "whether it would be advisable to preserve it for the county road system in the future." See RCW 36.87.040. Since K.C.C. 14.40.0104 adopts the requirements of RCW 36.87.040, a determination by the County Road Engineer whether it would be advisable to preserve the road right-of-way for "the county transportation system of the future" conflicts with the requirements of RCW 36.87.040.</p> <p>Most property deeded for right-of-way and dedicated to the County in plats is for one purpose, the use of the property for a future County Road. RCW 36.87.040, which the County code incorporates in its road vacation ordinance, requires the County Road Engineer to determine "whether it would be advisable to preserve it for the county road system in the future." By expanding the road vacation criteria to require the County Road Engineer to determine if it is advisable to preserve the right-of-way for County facilities other than County roads, the County would be claiming more property rights than were granted to it by the party that executed the dedication.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed change at B.4. could have the effect of narrowing the County Road Engineer's (and Hearing Examiner's) analysis of a petition to vacate all or a portion of a right of way to whether the right-of-way may be used as part of the traditional road system and thereby excluding other potential transportation uses (i.e., active transportation uses and/or trails not associated with a road). Executive staff note that B.9. may still allow the County to deny a road vacation for these purposes. The Hearing Examiner suggests that, if the language is kept, to say "county transportation system of the future," to add "including potential use as a trail" so that it is clear to those who petition for road vacation what standard the Examiner will use.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 14 14.56.020	Substantive	Establishes framework for King County's nonmotorized transportation program	Changes "nonmotorized" to "active transportation"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing and proposed language is unclear as to what the lettered list applies to. If Councilmember intent is that any active transportation policies in the KCCP and functional plans, and any active transportation project needs in a capital improvement program are part of the active transportation program, the policy could be clarified that these are not limited by the criteria in the list, and that the list only limits the types of operational activities that are part of the program. The list uses "and," meaning all four things are required in order for something to be considered part of the active transportation program. Executive staff indicate that the intent is "or."
Section 15 14.56.030	Substantive	Establishes nonmotorized program requirements for the Department of Local Services	Changes "nonmotorized" to "active transportation"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 48 20.36.100	Substantive	Establishes criteria for eligibility for open space classification under the Public Benefit Rating System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes reference to "citizen" Replaces "nonmotorized" with "active transportation" 	<p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "nonmotorized" to "active transportation," consistent with current terminology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.1 –The proposed Title 7 update (PO 2024-0007) would prohibit some motorized forms of active transportation, such as e-scooters and some e-bikes, from regional trails unless special dispensation is given by the Parks director. This Code section would require PBRS applicants using this credit to allow all active transportation as part of a linkage to a regional trail, even if that trail does not allow all active transportation. This is not necessarily a conflict, but it does require to property owner to commit to more intensive use than the County might actually allow. C.5. – The terms for this credit state that use of motor vehicles are prohibited on an equestrian-pedestrian-bicycle trail linkage. However, Executive staff indicate that the intent is not to prohibit motorized micromobility devices. The language could be updated to clarify this. Flag for CAO update (rural stewardship plans)
Section 121 21A.14.180	Technical	Establishes space requirements for on-site recreation for certain types of residential developments	Removes reference to "citizens"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.C.C. 21A.14.180 and .190 could be combined into one section.
Section 122 21A.14.190	Technical	Establishes play-area requirements for on-site recreation for certain types of residential developments	Removes reference to "citizens"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.C.C. 21A.14.180 and .190 could be combined into one section.
Section 127 21A.16.030	Technical	Categorizes different land uses subject to the landscaping and water standards in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes references to "citizens" Replaces "churches, synagogues and temples" with "religious facilities" 	<p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>"Religious facilities" is proposed to be used as more inclusive language and to reflect proposed changes to the definition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes are not included in the list of land uses. A division of residential lots for the purposes of constructing duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses and apartments should be considered "single-family development", however the construction of these housing types without division is considered "attached/group residence." This is a policy choice whether they should be treated differently.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 16 16.82.020	Substantive	Establishes definitions for the purposes of K.C.C. Chapter 16.82 (clearing and grading), including: - the definition for "grading and clearing permit"	Changes "grading and clearing permit" to "clearing and grading permit" Adds new definitions for "habitable space," "pruning," "tree crown," and "wildfire risk assessment certification"	Clarifying change to align with nomenclature in the rest of the Code New definitions are proposed to be added to support clearing and grading code changes related to wildfire preparedness later in this proposed ordinance, consistent with new policy direction in the Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Habitable space" excludes bathrooms, hallways, closets, and similar areas. This term is used in context of vegetation clearing to protect residences from wildfires. These non-habitable areas in a home are interconnected with habitable spaces like living and sleeping areas. Councilmembers may wish to consider whether vegetation clearing distances should be from the exterior edge of a house or whether it should be from certain living areas The Hearing Examiner's annual report highlights an inconsistency between grading code and zoning code definitions (21A.06.565 K.C.C. versus 16.82.020.O) for "grading." A simple fix would be to update the zoning code definition to match the grading code. Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix.
Section 17 16.82.051	Substantive	Establishes development activities that are exempt from clearing and grading permits, including exempting: - Cumulative clearing of less than 7,000 square feet - "Construction or maintenance of utility corridors or facility within the right of way" subject a to franchise permit - Habitat restoration or enhancement project if sponsored/cosponsored by a public agency or federally recognized tribe	<p>Adds new guidance on how to read and implement the exceptions table</p> <p>Adds new permit exemption for "clearing" and "construction or maintenance of utility corridors or facility outside of the right of way" for tree and vegetation clearing and pruning for the purposes of wildfire preparedness when meeting certain standards.</p> <p>Existing standards are proposed to change as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing exemption for cumulative clearing of less than 7,000 square feet is limited to a single site since January 2005 "Franchise permit" is changed to "right of way construction permit" "public agency" or "federally recognized tribe" is changed to "government agency" 	<p>New guidance is proposed to be added for clarity and alignment with other tables in K.C.C. Title 21A</p> <p>Additional exemptions are proposed to reduce barriers for vegetation management to improve wildfire preparedness, consistent with new policy direction in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>For existing standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date is proposed to be added for cumulative clearing calculation for clarity and enforcement purposes; uses the effective date of the Critical Areas Ordinance, when this exemption went into place. Change to "right of way construction permit" would reflect existing intent and current practice. Change to "government agency" is proposed for clarity and to capture existing listed agencies and others as applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Hearing Examiner's annual report highlights an issue with how "cumulative" clearing and grading are administered (16.82.051.C.1, .C.3. & C.8). This issue will be further evaluated with the CAO. Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix.
Section 18 16.82.060	Technical	Establishes requirements for clearing and grading permit applications	Removes references to K.C.C. 16.82.150 and 16.82.152	Reflects proposed repeals later in this proposed ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At B.3., the Executive proposed to change the citation, but this changes the meaning. The old citation was to a restoration plan, while the new citation is to a reclamation plan. This could be clarified, or removed, as the reclamation plan is already required for mineral extraction-related permits. Executive staff note that this section will be updated as part of the Ordinance being drafted to respond to SB 5290 (regarding local permit review processes).
Section 21 18.25.010	Substantive	Establishes required elements for the Strategic Climate Action Plan, including goals, strategies, measures, targets, and priority actions consistent with the following countywide greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal: - 25% by 2020 - 50% by 2030 - 80% by 2050	Changes emissions reduction goals to: - 50% by 2030 - 75% by 2040 - 95%, including net-zero emissions through carbon sequestration and other strategies, by 2050	To align with Comprehensive Plan policy E-209 and the Countywide Planning Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff indicate Code changes may be sent along with the 2025 SCAP that alter the requirements for the SCAP. If the 2025 SCAP is developed in line with those proposed Code changes, rather than the current Code, the Council will not have an opportunity to weigh in on those changes prior to the 2025 SCAP being developed.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A.1.b.2. – Executive staff indicate that they may propose changes to this section as part of the potential future Code changes referenced above. A.1.b.2.f – This section is broader than just green jobs and could be made its own subsection. A.1.e. – This cost effectiveness assessment was not included in the 2020 SCAP, and it is unknown if it will be included in the 2025 SCAP. The Council could choose to remove this requirement or provide further direction. A.2. The reference to the strategic planning cycle is outdated and could be removed. A.4.; This language is more appropriate as a finding than as regulatory language. It could be reworked or removed. The terminology "best available science" could be changed to "science-based evidence" to avoid confusion with GMA terminology. A.6. – For the past two SCAP cycles, the SCAP progress report has not been transmitted biennially as required by this section. As the SCAP is transmitted every five years, having a biennial report creates an irregular interval between the two. The Executive has instead transmitted progress reports with the SCAP, and at the midpoint between five-year SCAP updates. The Council could choose to amend the code to match this practice. A.7. – This section requires creation of a SCAP labor advisory council or for the Executive to seek input from specific organizations. Such a council has not been created. Executive staff suggest removing this requirement. Whether to remove or provide further direction is a policy choice.
Section 219 18.17.010	Substantive	Establishes definitions for the purposes of K.C.C. Chapter 18.17 (green building program)	Adds definition for "social cost of carbon"	The new definition is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policy E-207 (now E-205). This was adopted in the policies in 2016, but necessary implementing code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate. Provisions for social cost of carbon are proposed in K.C.C. 18.17.050, and this proposed definition is needed to support that change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues Identified.
Section 220 18.17.050	Substantive	Establishes green building requirements for County capital projects	Adds consideration of the social cost of carbon in life-cycle assessments and decision making related to facility construction and resource efficiency projects	The new definition is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policy E-207 (now E-205). This was adopted in the policies in 2016, but necessary implementing code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in F-217 and F-217a, the regulations here only require "certification through an applicable alternative green building rating system," not <i>highest</i> certification level. As the policy would change to a "shall" policy, the Code or policy could be changed so they match. Executive staff note that the Code is more up-to-date than the policies.
Section 22 19A.08.070	Substantive	Establishes standards for recognizing legal lots, lots created before June 9, 1937, if they were served by one of the following before January 1, 2000: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an approved sewage disposal; - an approved water system; or - a road meeting certain standards 	Removes option to demonstrate legal lot status using service by a road	This subsection outlines how the County recognizes whether a property is considered a legal lot. One of the categories of lot recognition is subdivided lots that were created prior to June 9, 1937, when the state's first subdivision regulations went into effect. A pre-1937 lot can be recognized as a legal lot if a property owner can	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff were not able to provide information on the number of legal lot determination applications this would have impacted in the past. Making this change is a policy choice.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				demonstrate that prior to 2000 the lot was served by sewage disposal, a water system, or certain kinds of roads. Due to a lack of reliable records, recognition of pre-1937 lots based on road standards in effect at the time the lot was created is unworkable for permit applicants and the department. As such, the recommendation is to delete that allowance. Such lots could then be recognized based on the remaining Code provisions, which are demonstration of available water or sewer, which is straightforward to apply and has a tie to health, safety, and infrastructure considerations.	
Section 23 19A.12.020	Clarification	Establishes timelines preliminary approval of subdivisions, including for Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities	Removes references to, and standards for, Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities Removes language that expired in 2014	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. and E. allow for longer preliminary plat approval timeframes than allowed by state law. They could both be deleted, and the provisions in A. (5-year approval) would still apply. Executive staff indicate that plats under E. are not known to occur. There are provisions in RCW 58.17.140 that allow for <i>extensions</i> of preliminary plat approvals past 5 years that the Council could consider adopting, in place of the outright allowance in D. and E.
Section 24 19A.28.020	Clarification	Establishes standards for adjustments of boundary lines between adjacent lots, including: - ensuring that adjustments do not circumvent other standards or procedures in K.C.C. Title 19A - standards for adjustments for Urban Planned Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds that adjustments also do not circumvent other standards or procedures in K.C.C. Title 21A Removes reference Urban Planned Developments 	K.C.C. Title 21A is proposed to be added in addition to Title 19A for clarity and consistent with existing intent. Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At D.1., a boundary line adjustment is not allowed to create more than one additional building site. A building site is a defined term in the Code, and would allow for a home to be built. This means that even if there are two or more <i>legal lots</i>, if they do not meet the requirements for <i>building sites</i>, they could not be reconfigured to allow for two new homes. The Council may want to consider whether this meets the Council's policy goals. <p>K.C.C. 19A.04.060 defines "Building site" to mean: an area of land, consisting of one or more lots or portions of lots, that is: A. Capable of being developed under current federal, state, and local statutes, including zoning and use provisions, dimensional standards, minimum lot area, minimum lot area for construction, minimum lot width, shoreline master program provisions, critical area provisions and health and safety provisions; or B. Currently legally developed.</p>
Section 25 20.08.037	Clarification	Defines "area zoning and land use study" for the purposes of K.C.C. Title 20 (planning)	Updates definition to remove a comparison of area zoning and land use study to a subarea study	"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and the Code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are proposed to be replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition proposed to be removed, as it is no longer necessary. In this case, reference to subarea studies is proposed to be removed, and clarity about the scope of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				zoning and use studies is added to reflect existing intent. This aligns with changes in the Comprehensive Plan Glossary.	
Section 26 20.08.060	Clarification	Defines "subarea plan" for the purposes of K.C.C. Title 20 (planning)	Removes references to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - community plans, neighborhood plans, basin plans, and other plans addressing multiple areas having common interests; and - K.C.C. 20.12.015 	Proposed to update definition to align with current context and practice, and to align with changes in the Comprehensive Plan Glossary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 222.F 20.08.175	Clarification	Adopts the definition of "subarea study"	Repealed	"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and the Code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are proposed to be replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition proposed to be removed, as it is no longer necessary. This reflects an associated change in the Comprehensive Plan Glossary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 29 20.18.030	Substantive	Establishes procedures for amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, including for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emergencies; - Annual updates(non-substantive changes only, with some specific exceptions); - 8-year updates (statutorily-required updates, allowing substantive changes); and - Midpoint updates (optional update occurring halfway through the 8-year planning cycle, allowing for some substantive changes if approved by motion) - Timelines for the 2024 update - Requirements for consistency with Comprehensive Plan policy I-207 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifies when and how emergency updates can occur - Relocates exceptions for annual updates to the Comprehensive Plan - Changes 8-year updates to 10-year updates - Timelines for adopting the authorizing motion for midpoint updates are shifted up by 3 months - Removes 2024 update requirements - Requirements for consistency with policy I-207 are updated to only apply to policy changes, remove requirements for analysis of financial costs and public benefits, and remove allowance to address requirements via environmental review documents 	<p>Standards for emergency updates are proposed to be added to reflect existing intent per guidance from Washington State Commerce, consistent with King County Charter 230.30, and to reflect requirements in WAC 365-196-640.</p> <p>The list of the limited instances of substantive changes that can be considered during an annual update proposed to be moved to the Comprehensive Plan for clarity, consistency, and to remove redundancies.</p> <p>Global edits are proposed to be made throughout the Code to reflect recent changes in state law to move the periodic comprehensive planning update schedule from once every 8 years to once every 10 years.</p> <p>Midpoint updates are proposed to be initiated 3 months earlier, so that the Executive has sufficient time (a full year, rather than 9 months) for plan development after the scope is adopted</p> <p>The 2024 update requirements are proposed for removal because they would be obsolete by the time this proposed ordinance would be adopted.</p> <p>Requirements for consistency with policy I-207 are proposed to be updated to align with changes in the policy in the 2024 Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving the list of types of changes that would be allowed with an annual KCCP update to Chapter 12 of the KCCP is a policy choice; moving the language to the KCCP may limit when the list can be changed to only as part of a midpoint or 10-year update. • At D.3., the Executive proposes to move up the timeframe for the midpoint scope of work by 3 months, which would give the Executive more time to develop the midpoint update. This is a policy choice. • The sections that describe the Comprehensive Planning process and cycle were written a long time ago, and some of the provisions are not as clear as they could be (for example, the requirement to provide a public schedule is in the section on the docket process). The Council may want to consider reorganizing these sections so they are clearer.
Section 30 20.18.040	Substantive	Establishes procedures for consideration of site-specific land use map or Shoreline Master Program map amendments, including for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8-year Comprehensive Plan updates - Four-to-One proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes 8-year updates to 10-year - Removes allowance for consideration of Four-to-One proposals through the site-specific land use map amendment process 	Global edits are proposed to be made throughout the Code to reflect recent changes in state law to move the periodic comprehensive planning update schedule from once every 8 years to once every 10 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is also being reviewed as part of the Four-to-One Program updates and can be found in that review matrix. • In Sections 30 and 31, there are references to two types of shoreline map amendments (SMP map amendment and SMP shoreline environment

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				The proposed Four-to-One change is substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations. Four-to-One proposals are discretionary; this is not consistent with the role of the Hearing Examiner. Four-to-One proposals are significant land use changes, processed as land use map amendments, and should be considered in the Comprehensive Plan update process, not a quasi-judicial process.	redesignation). Because they are amending the Shoreline Master Program, when these sections are changed, they require Department of Ecology approval, even though the changes usually do not impact the SMP language. The Council could move the references to the SMP into Section 31, maintain Section 30 to only cover site-specific land use map amendments, to streamline.
Section 31 20.18.056	Clarification	Establishes procedures for consideration of Shoreline Master Program redesignations, including limiting them to 8-year Comprehensive Plan updates	Changes 8-year updates to 10-year	Global edits are proposed to be made throughout the Code to reflect recent changes in state law to move the periodic comprehensive planning update schedule from once every 8 years to once every 10 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Sections 30 and 31, there are references to two types of shoreline map amendments (SMP map amendment and SMP shoreline environment redesignation). Because they are amending the Shoreline Master Program, when these sections are changed, they require Department of Ecology approval, even though the changes usually do not impact the SMP language. The Council could move the references to the SMP into Section 31, maintain Section 30 to only cover site-specific land use map amendments, to streamline.
Section 32 20.18.060	Clarification	Establishes procedures for 8-year Comprehensive Plan updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes 8-year updates to 10-year, and associated specific date changes Adds performance measures requirements Moving up the timelines for establishing the scope of work Remove 2024 update-specific requirements Update scope and timing of updates to the Transportation Needs Report 	<p>Global edits are proposed to be made throughout the Code to reflect recent changes in state law to move the periodic comprehensive planning update schedule from once every 8 years to once every 10 years.</p> <p>Performance measurement requirements are proposed to be added to reflect the outcome of 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 2 "Develop a Performance Measures Program for the Comprehensive Plan"</p> <p>The 2024 update requirements are proposed for removal because they would be obsolete by the time this proposed ordinance would be adopted.</p> <p>The proposed Transportation Needs Report changes would better align with the new 10-year Comprehensive Plan schedule and provide additional clarity on requirements for changes between 10-year updates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sections that describe the Comprehensive Planning process and cycle were written a long time ago, and some of the provisions are not as clear as they could be (for example, the requirement to provide a public schedule is in the section on the docket process). Council may want to consider reorganizing these sections so they are clearer. The change to move up the timeframe for the 10-year scope of work by 3 months, which would give the Executive more time to develop the midpoint update, is a policy choice. There are references to "biennial budget" that could be updated to reflect the newer option for annual budgets.
Section 33 20.18.070	Clarification	Establishes procedures for annual Comprehensive Plan updates, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for Comprehensive Plan elements adopted outside of the standard Comprehensive Plan process as part of the County budget (Capital Improvement Program, Transportation Needs Report, and school capital facility plans) Requiring annual updates changes that would require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be included in a future plan update (such as an 8-year update) when an EIS can be completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes detailed timelines and instead references codified timelines for the budget in K.C.C. 20.18.060.B Changes 8-year update to 10-year 	<p>Edits for clarity, consistency, and streamlining</p> <p>Global edits are proposed to be made throughout the Code to reflect recent changes in state law to move the periodic comprehensive planning update schedule from once every 8 years to once every 10 years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sections that describe the Comprehensive Planning process and cycle were written a long time ago, and some of the provisions are not as clear as they could be (for example, the requirement to provide a public schedule is in the section on the docket process). The Council may want to consider reorganizing these sections so they are clearer.
Section 34 20.18.110	Clarification	Establishes requirements for public hearings for changes to the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations	Changes "will" to "shall"	Clarifying edit to reflect existing intent. "Will" is predictive but "shall" is directive; regulations should be directive, not statements of what is anticipated to happen.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.C.C. 20.18.110 and .120 could be combined.
Section 35 20.18.120	Technical	Establishes requirements for public hearings for changes to area zoning, including posting notices in the official county newspaper and a newspaper of general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes "official county newspaper" to "newspaper of general circulation" 	To reflect current practice and the evolution of print news media. King County does not have an official county newspaper. Additionally, not all communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.C.C. 20.18.110 and .120 could be combined.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
		circulation in the community that the zoning change would occur in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replaces "newspaper" of general circulation in the community that the zoning change would occur in to "publication," and adds "if available" 	have either 1) actual print newspaper (some only have online editions or community blogs) and 2) not all communities have local publications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At B., could require that notice be provided to those who have requested it of Regional Planning and Council, in addition to those who requested it of DLS.
Section 36 20.18.140	Clarification	Establishes procedures for the Comprehensive Plan docket	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifying edits and restructuring throughout - Removes reference to "citizens" - Removes requirement for separate docket processes by individual departments and consolidates into one docket process for all departments - Encourages, rather than requires, publicizing the docket as part of all public engagement activities for the Comprehensive Plan - Clarifies process for docket request that only apply to development regulations - Redirects docket requests received during midpoint and 10-year updates to the standard process for all input received during the plan update - Removes requirement for the Executive to post docket reports online - Redirect requirements for providing opportunities for general public comment on the Comprehensive Plan (outside of the docket) to the existing code requirements for general public comment on the Comprehensive Plan 	Various revisions are proposed to provide clarity, align with current practice, and streamline redundant processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sections that describe the Comprehensive Planning process and cycle were written a long time ago, and some of the provisions are not as clear as they could be (for example, the requirement to provide a public schedule is in the section on the docket process). The Council may want to consider reorganizing these sections so they are clearer. • The proposed change to how docket requests are processed during midpoint and 10-year updates, means that there would not be a docket report or specific letters to docket requestors. The result of this change means that these requestors wouldn't necessarily receive the Code required notification from the Council at B.8. that they can petition the Council regarding their change. Executive staff indicate that this is being done for equity reasons, as the docket process isn't as obvious to the general public as it is to those who have historically participated in the planning process. This is a policy choice.
Section 37 20.18.160	Substantive	Establishes procedures for "early and continuous public participation"(as required by the GMA) in the development and amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and implementing development regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes one annual posting of public participation opportunities and replaces with posting upcoming opportunities as they are available - Removes requirement for a formal guide to the comprehensive planning process and replaces with providing various resources and information online - Removes references to "citizens" - Updates list of methods to provide information to the public - Encourages providing notices in nontechnical language - Ensures public meetings are appropriately noticed - Clarifies requirements for documenting meetings - Removes prioritization of input from technical persons and 3rd parties, consistent with state law - Ensures public notice and comment opportunity for emergency Comprehensive Plan amendments, consistent with state law 	This Code section has not been amended since 1998. It is updated throughout to align with current practice. Additional revisions to advance equity goals are proposed to be evaluated in the future as part of proposed 2024 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The description of subarea plan in Title 2 has a required minimum level of community engagement. A level of engagement requirement could be added here. There is also a Work Plan action in Chapter 12 of the KCCP regarding public engagement.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 41 20.18.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 20.18, establishing that Comprehensive Plan amendments that add land to the Urban Growth Area, removes land from the Agricultural Production District or Forest Production District, or removes land from the mineral resources map would be effective either 60 days after publication of notice of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan or, if appealed, after issuance of the Growth Management Hearings Board's final order	Proposed changes would align with new requirements in 2022 Senate Bill 5042. The Bill requires certain impactful land use changes to not go into effect until after the 60-day Comprehensive Plan amendment appeal period window closes or, if an appeal is filed, after completion of the appeal proceedings (typically within 180 days). This ensures that no permanent, on-the-ground conversion of rural or resource lands to more intensive levels of development would occur until it is guaranteed that the land use designation change will not be undone due to a successful appeal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 38 20.18.170					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section is being reviewed as part of the Four-to-One Program updates and can be found in that review matrix.
Section 39 20.18.180					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section is being reviewed as part of the Four-to-One Program updates and can be found in that review matrix.
Section 40 20.18.XXX					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section is being reviewed as part of the Four-to-One Program updates and can be found in that review matrix.
Section 43 20.20.035	Technical	Establishes community meeting requirements for certain types of development permits, including allowing citizens to propose alternative sites for the development proposal	Removes reference to "citizen"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At A., the language assumes that community meetings are only required by K.C.C. Chapter 21A.08, which is not the case. This could be clarified. At B., the language includes two different types of requirements, and could be separated.
Section 45 20.20.120	Clarification	Requires development of a citizen's guide to the permit process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes reference to "citizen" Adds requirements for the guide to be available in both print and electronic format 	<p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>Other changes align with similar recent changes in the Hearing Examiner code</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 46 20.22.150	Substantive	Establishes criteria for Hearing Examiner review of proposed rezones, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring consistency with the Comprehensive Plan Allowing for realization of potential zoning Allowing for rezoning based on recommendations in a subarea plan, subarea study, or area zoning Allowing for rezoning based on changed conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifies which elements of the Comprehensive Plan the rezone must be consistent with Clarifies what potential zoning means, consistent with existing code in K.C.C. 21A.04.170 Removes subarea study and area zoning, and adds area zoning and land use study Clarifies what changed conditions entails, including changes in: the availability of public facilities or infrastructure, development patterns on surrounding parcels, or the quantity or quality of environmentally sensitive areas Requiring that the rezone will not negatively impact the surrounding area 	<p>The proposed changes intend to provide additional clarity for the various standards to ensure consistent and appropriate implementation.</p> <p>"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and the Code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are proposed to be replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition proposed to be removed, as it is no longer necessary. In this case, subarea plans and area zoning and land use studies can both do this. Additionally, "area zoning" is old terminology; updated to current "area zoning and land use study" defined term.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 49 20.62.040	Technical	Establishes criteria for eligibility for historic designation	Removes reference to "citizen"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 50 21A.02.070	Substantive	Establishes guidance on how to read and implement the land use tables	Adds a new subsection requiring essential public facilities uses not already listed in the use tables to be processed as a special use permit	To ensure consistency with Growth Management Act requirements to: 1) not preclude the siting of essential public facilities and 2) have a process for how such proposed facilities will be reviewed. Given the nature and scale of essential public facilities (large and typically difficult to site), the special use permit process is the most appropriate level of review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new language regarding Essential Public Facilities would be better placed in the Regional land use table, rather than in the section about how to read the land use tables.
Section 51 21A.04.060	Substantive	Establishes the purposes of the Rural Area (RA) zone, including criteria for applying the RA-5, RA-10, and RA-20 zones, such as consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominant lot size patterns in the area Environmental constraints and critical areas in the area Proximity to nearby resource lands for RA-10 lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominant lot size is changed to consideration of impacts of the density on surrounding areas and infrastructure Clarifies what's considered in environmental constraints and critical areas Adds proximity to nearby resource lands to RA-5 lands Adds consideration of RA-20 zoning when rezoning a large Natural Resource Land parcel to Rural Area zoning 	Proposed changes would align with existing and proposed policy requirements in the Comprehensive Plan; see policies R-304 through R-308.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B.2.b. and B.3.a.2.– this language may need to be updated if the corresponding language is changed in Ch 3 of the KCCP. A and F zones (outside of APDs and FPDs) are not included in the purpose of the RA section. Executive staff indicate this is intentional, to meet GMA requirements for lands of long-term commercial significance that are required to be designated and protected under the Growth Management Act.
Section 52 21A.04.070	Clarification	Establishes the purposes of the Urban Reserve (UR) zone, including use of the zone in rural city expansion areas and areas designated for potential Urban Planned Developments or Fully Contained Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replaces "rural city expansion areas" the "Urban Growth Area for Cities in the Rural Area" Removes references to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities 	To align with current terminology in the Comprehensive Plan Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section identifies urban areas and rural towns as a location for UR zoning. This is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which identifies this zone for only Cities in the Rural Area. This section could be revised to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
Section 53 21A.04.080	Substantive	Establishes the purposes of the urban Residential (R) zone, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing for a mix of predominantly single detached homes and other development types in the R-1 through R-8 zones Applying R-1 zoning on lands designated as wildlife habitat network Applying R-12 through R-48 zoning on lands next to Unincorporated Activity Centers (UACs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes predominantly single detached homes to only apply to the R-1 zone; and the R-4 through R-8 zones would provide for a mix of single detached homes and duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes Clarifies standards for designated wildlife habitat networks Allows R-12 through R-48 zoning on lands in UACs, in addition to lands next to a UAC 	Proposed revisions to the R-1 through R-8 zones would align with other amendments in this proposed ordinance to incentivize development of middle housing. The proposed wildlife habitat network change would remove unclear language about clustering, and instead rely on the existing siting requirements addressed elsewhere in K.C.C. Title 21A, including clustering requirements K.C.C. 21A.08.030. The proposed changes for R-12 through R-48 zoning would align with existing allowances in the Comprehensive Plan and current zoning in UACs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The R-4 through R-8 and R-12 through R-48 zone descriptions could be modified to use more precise terms instead of "urban density" such as "moderate" or "higher densities".
Section 54 21A.04.090	Substantive	Establishes the purposes of the Neighborhood Business (NB) zone, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing for mixed-use developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits mixed use development to the urban area and rural towns Allows NB zoning in areas designated as UACs, community business 	The proposed limitation on mixed-use development is part of a suite of changes that reflect that mixed use densities for townhouses and apartments in commercial zones is not appropriate in the rural area. Commercial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive proposes to limit mixed-use development in the NB zone to urban areas and rural towns. Councilmembers may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allowing NB zoning in areas designated as urban neighborhood business centers, rural towns, or rural neighborhood centers 	<p>centers, neighborhood business centers commercial outside of centers, rural towns, and rural neighborhood commercial centers</p>	<p>zoning applies to both urban and rural areas. Multifamily housing (apartments, townhouses, and group residences) are currently allowed in the commercial zones if part of a mixed-use development. The current allowed residential densities of these type of developments in the commercial zones range from 8 to 96 dwelling units per acre, regardless of whether the property is in the urban or rural area. As directed by the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, those are urban levels of development that are not appropriate for the rural area, where the general growth pattern and established density limits range from one home per 5-20 acres (depending on the applicable rural zoning classification).</p> <p>The areas where NB zoning is allowed is updated to align with current terminology and existing allowances in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers (examples are Preston or outside of Maple Valley).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At A.4. there is a reference to industrial uses, which is not defined by the County. The Council may wish to clarify what is intended.
<p>Section 55 21A.04.100</p>	<p>Substantive</p>	<p>Establishes the purposes of the Community Business (CB) zone, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allowing for mixed-use developments - Allowing CB zoning in areas designated as urban and community centers and rural towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limits mixed use development to the urban area and rural towns - Allows CB zoning in areas designated as UACs, community business centers, commercial outside of centers, and rural towns 	<p>The proposed limitation on mixed-use development is part of a suite of changes that reflect that mixed use densities for townhouses and apartments in commercial zones is not appropriate in the rural area. Commercial zoning applies to both urban and rural areas. Multifamily housing (apartments, townhouses, and group residences) are currently allowed in the commercial zones if part of a mixed-use development. The current allowed residential densities of these type of developments in the commercial zones range from 8 to 96 dwelling units per acre, regardless of whether the property is in the urban or rural area. As directed by the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, those are urban levels of development that are not appropriate for the rural area, where the general growth pattern and established density limits range from one home per 5-20 acres (depending on the applicable rural zoning classification).</p> <p>The areas where CB zoning is allowed is updated to align with current terminology and existing allowances in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Executive proposes to limit mixed-use development in the CB zone to urban areas and rural towns. Councilmembers may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers (examples are Preston or outside of Maple Valley).
<p>Section 56 21A.04.110</p>	<p>Substantive</p>	<p>Establishes the purposes of the Regional Business (RB) zone, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allowing for mixed-use developments - Allowing RB zoning in areas designated as urban and community centers and rural towns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limits mixed use development to the urban area and rural towns - Allows RB zoning in areas designated as commercial outside of centers 	<p>The proposed limitation on mixed-use development is part of a suite of changes that reflect that mixed use densities for townhouses and apartments in commercial zones is not appropriate in the rural area. Commercial zoning applies to both urban and rural areas. Multifamily housing (apartments, townhouses, and group residences) are currently allowed in the commercial zones if part of a mixed-use development. The current allowed residential densities of these type of developments in the commercial zones range from 8 to 96 dwelling units per acre, regardless of whether the property is in the urban or rural area. As directed by the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, those are urban levels of development that are not appropriate for the rural area, where the general growth pattern and established density limits range from one</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Executive proposes to limit mixed-use development in the RB zone to urban areas and rural towns. Councilmembers may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers (examples are Preston or outside of Maple Valley).

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				home per 5-20 acres (depending on the applicable rural zoning classification). The areas where RB zoning is allowed is updated to align with current terminology and existing and proposed allowances in the Comprehensive Plan.	
Section 57 21A.04.120	Substantive	Establishes the purposes of the Office (O) zone, including: - Allowing for mixed-use developments - Allowing O zoning in areas designated as activity centers	- Limits mixed use development to the urban area and rural towns - Allows O zoning in areas designated as UACs, community business centers, neighborhood business centers, commercial outside of centers, and rural towns	The proposed limitation on mixed-use development is part of a suite of changes that reflect that mixed use densities for townhouses and apartments in commercial zones is not appropriate in the rural area. Commercial zoning applies to both urban and rural areas. Multifamily housing (apartments, townhouses, and group residences) are currently allowed in the commercial zones if part of a mixed-use development. The current allowed residential densities of these type of developments in the commercial zones range from 8 to 96 dwelling units per acre, regardless of whether the property is in the urban or rural area. As directed by the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, those are urban levels of development that are not appropriate for the rural area, where the general growth pattern and established density limits range from one home per 5-20 acres (depending on the applicable rural zoning classification). The areas where O zoning is allowed is updated to align with current terminology and existing allowances in the Comprehensive Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive proposes to limit mixed-use development in the O zone to urban areas and rural towns. Councilmembers may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers (examples are Preston or outside of Maple Valley).
Section 72 21A.06.260	Technical	Defines "critical facility"	Removes reference to "citizen"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 75 21A.06.333	Substantive	Defines "drainage subbasin"	Removes references to basin plans	To reflect the proposed repeal of basin plans in this proposed ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This definition uses the term within the definition 2 or 3 times. It could be clarified.
Section 86 21A.06.540	Technical	Defines "general business service"	Replaces "churches and places of worship" with "places where religious services are conducted"	To align with other changes in this proposed ordinance to the definition of churches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The terminology used in the KCCP and the Code is different when referring to religious facilities. Executive state that "religious facilities" is preferred. That could be updated here.
Section 93 21A.06.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies 21A.06.185 to follow K.C.C. 21A.06.980	Proposed reordering of existing definition to reflect to reflect proposed changes to replace "church, synagogue or temple" with "religious facility"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 94 21A.06.185	Technical	Defines "church, synagogue or temple"	Replaces "church, synagogue or temple" with "religious facility"	To update to more inclusive language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 97 21A.06.1060	Technical	Defines "senior citizen"	Removes reference to "citizen"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 98 21A.06.1062	Technical	Defines "senior citizen assisted housing"	Removes reference to "citizen"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	
Section 59 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 for a definition of " at imminent risk of becoming homeless"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 60 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 for a definition of " at risk of chronic homelessness"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 81 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "emergency housing"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 82 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "emergency shelter"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 83 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "emergency supportive housing"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 84 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "experiencing chronic homelessness"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 87 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "interim housing"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 88 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "microshelter"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 89 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "microshelter village "	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 91 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "permanent supportive housing"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 92 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "recuperative housing"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	
Section 96 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "safe parking"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This definition supports those changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 76 21A.06.355	Substantive	Defines "dwelling unit, apartment," including being a building consisting of 2 or more dwelling units	Increases to 5 or more dwelling units	To align with proposed Code amendments related to middle housing throughout this ordinance. These updated and new definitions clarify the "middle" form and scale between single detached residences and high-rise multifamily buildings, differentiating duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes from townhouse and apartment development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See the separate housing matrix for a discussion on all PO changes related to middle housing.
Section 77 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "dwelling unit, duplex"	To align with proposed Code amendments related to middle housing throughout this ordinance. These updated and new definitions clarify the "middle" form and scale between single detached residences and high-rise multifamily buildings, differentiating duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes from townhouse and apartment development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See the separate housing matrix for a discussion on all PO changes related to middle housing
Section 78 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "dwelling unit, fourplex"	To align with proposed Code amendments related to middle housing throughout this ordinance. These updated and new definitions clarify the "middle" form and scale between single detached residences and high-rise multifamily buildings, differentiating duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes from townhouse and apartment development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This term could be "fourplex", rather than "fourplex dwelling unit." See the separate housing matrix for a discussion on all PO changes related to middle housing
Section 79 21A.06.370	Substantive	Defines "dwelling unit, townhouse," including being a building consisting of 1 or more dwelling units attached to 1 or more other townhouses	Increases to 5 or more dwelling units attached to 1 or more other townhouses	To align with proposed Code amendments related to middle housing throughout this ordinance. These updated and new definitions clarify the "middle" form and scale between single detached residences and high-rise multifamily buildings, differentiating duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes from townhouse and apartment development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See the separate housing matrix for a discussion on all PO changes related to middle housing
Section 80 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "dwelling unit, triplex"	To align with proposed Code amendments related to middle housing throughout this ordinance. These updated and new definitions clarify the "middle" form and scale between single detached residences and high-rise multifamily buildings, differentiating duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes from townhouse and apartment development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See the separate housing matrix for a discussion on all PO changes related to middle housing

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 85 21A.06.450	Clarification	Defines "family" as various forms of people living together as a single housekeeping unit	Removes limitations on number of people living as a "family" except for short term rentals and as regulated by the building code	To align with state law under 2022 Senate Bill 5235	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subs A. and B. are regulatory and prescribe limitations on occupant load/limits. They could be removed from the definition.
Section 102 21A.08.030	Substantive	Establishes allowed residential land uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Townhouses and apartments - Senior Citizen Assisted Housing - Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) - Accessory Living Quarters (ALQs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as allowed uses, subject to current and new conditions - Removes conditional use permit requirements for townhouses and apartments in R-1 through R-8 zones - Adds permanent supportive housing, emergency shelters, emergency supportive housing, interim housing, micro shelter villages, recuperative housing, and safe parking as allowed uses subject to new conditions - Removes references to "citizens" - Limits mixed-use developments in commercial zones to urban areas and rural towns and in the rural area on historically designated sites - Removes certain limitations on and adds more allowances for ADUs in the urban area - Removes certain allowances for ADUs and ALQs in the rural area and natural resource lands 	<p>Middle housing (duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes) are currently allowed in all residential and commercial zones under the current definition of apartments and townhouses (two or more units). The proposed changes would regulate middle housing types as permitted uses separate from apartments and townhouses. This is because apartments and townhouses have higher standards, which can discourage development of middle housing. These middle density housing types offer alternatives to apartment living and options for housing that are less dense than mid-rise apartments and denser than single-detached homes, which can often be naturally more affordable than new single detached homes. More development of middle housing helps to increase housing options affordable at all income levels, as required by the GMA and the Countywide Planning Policies. Additional changes to remove Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requirements for apartments and townhomes in lower density zones also support these goals.</p> <p>Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall.</p> <p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>The proposed limitation on mixed-use development is part of a suite of changes that reflect that mixed use densities for townhouses and apartments in commercial zones is not appropriate in the rural area. Commercial zoning applies to both urban and rural areas. Multifamily housing (apartments, townhouses, and group residences) are currently allowed in the commercial zones if part of a mixed-use development. The current allowed residential densities of these type of developments in the commercial zones range from 8 to 96 dwelling units per acre, regardless of whether the property is in the urban or rural area. As directed by the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, those are urban levels of development that are not appropriate for the rural area, where the general growth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive proposes to limit mixed-use development in the urban area and Rural Towns. Councilmembers may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers (examples are Preston or outside of Maple Valley). <p><u>Middle Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to separate housing matrix for a discussion on all Ordinance changes related to middle housing. <p><u>ADUs and ALQs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to separate housing matrix for a discussion on all Ordinance changes related to ADUs. <p><u>Emergency Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up. <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are uses in this table that are not "residential uses" the way that the zoning code treats them. Council may want to break out the uses in this table (some emergency housing uses, temporary lodging) into a new table. The definition of "family" as proposed by the Executive, includes regulations regarding group homes that could be moved to the residential land use table. Flag for CAO update

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				<p>pattern and established density limits range from one home per 5-20 acres (depending on the applicable rural zoning classification).</p> <p>ADU changes for urban areas reflects new requirements in state law as adopted in 2023 House Bill 1337. ADU and ALQ changes for rural areas and natural resource lands consistent with mandates for rural residential densities under the Growth Management Act and Comprehensive Plan and recent case law for substandard rural lots.</p>	
Section 73 21A.06.290	Substantive	Defines "destination resort"	Changes allowed accessory services that can be provided as part of a destination resort	To provide more clarity on the purpose of, and uses in, destination resorts, as well as to align with terms in the use tables in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.08.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 90 21A.06.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06 to define "outdoor resource-based recreation activities"	To support new destination resort regulations proposed in K.C.C. 21A.08.040	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 103 21A.08.040	Substantive	Establishes allowed recreational and cultural land uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> destination resorts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds new conditions for destination resorts Removes allowance for designation resorts in UR and RB zones Repeals language around basin plans Conditions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring a pre-application community meeting Requiring structures to be 100 feet back from roadways, 300 feet from R, RA, or resource zones, Minimum site area of 10 acres, and minimum 5 miles from the UGA Limiting the number of lodging units to 2 per acre, maximum 100, at an appropriate size and scale and have availability to recreation opportunities Be within 10 miles of 3 outdoor resource-based recreation activities Provide 2 outdoor resource-based recreation activities on-site Allow some accessory uses Maintain the viability for forestry-based uses. 	<p>New proposed conditions clarify where and how destination resorts would be allowed in the rural area and forest lands, consistent with County policies that support protection of the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands, and in acknowledgment of the infrastructure limitations in such areas.</p> <p>Removes allowance of destination resorts in the UR zone, which is generally used in the Potential Annexation Areas for Cities in the Rural Area with the intent of providing low-density zoning that phases growth and demand for urban services and reserves large tracts of land for possible future growth once annexed. These areas are not the appropriate places for this type of large facilities.</p> <p>Removes allowance of destination resorts in the RB zone, as this zoning is only allowed in North Highline and East Renton Plateau on lands with the commercial outside of center (co) land use designation. This is not consistent with the definition for destination resort, which is for resource-based recreation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work stated "Evaluate existing and establishing new regulations for resorts in the rural area." The Council may want to consider whether the changes meet the Council's policy goals.
Section 104 21A.08.050	Technical	Establishes allowed general services land uses, including various uses as part of or near a church	Replaces "church" with "religious facility"	To update to more inclusive language and reflect proposed changes to the definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council is currently considering the Crisis Cares Center Levy implementation plan. Executive staff state that a crisis care center would be considered both a social service use and nursing and personal care facility. These uses are both in the General Services land use table. This means that a crisis care center would be permitted with a CUP in the R-12 through R-48 zones, and outright in the CB and RB zones. The Council may

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 105 21A.08.060	Substantive	Establishes allowed government/business land uses, including: - Self-service storage - Utility facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes self-service storage as permitted use in the R-12 through R-48 zones - A new condition is added to the utility facility use to require an equity impact review as part of an application for: 1) an addition, expansion, or upgrade of electric transmission and distribution lines or 2) the siting new gas or hazardous liquid transmission pipelines 	<p>The current self-service storage allowance was originally intended to allow on-site storage for apartment units. This is not needed to be listed as a separate accessory use in order to provide onsite storage for apartment residents; this would occur as part of the underlying apartment use. Further, the standalone self-service storage use is not appropriate in a residential zone; existing allowances for commercial and industrial zones would be maintained.</p> <p>The equity impact review requirement is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policies F-325a and F-332a (both now F-303a). This was adopted in the policies in 2016, but necessary implementing code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate.</p>	<p>want to consider whether this meets the Council's policy goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility facilities are required, under the Executive's proposal, to complete an equity impact review as part of the permit review. It is unclear how the equity impact review would be used in the permitting process, and particularly when a utility facility is a Permitted use (and SEPA isn't required), how any conditions could be added to address any impacts identified. The Council may want to consider whether this requirement should be further clarified, or removed. If it is removed, policy updates may also be needed. • Further, a Permitted use only requires applicable construction permits, and if no construction is needed, no permit would be required. There would have to be a connection between the impacts of the <i>construction</i> of a utility facility (not location or other impacts) and the conditions applied to the permit. It seems unlikely that equity impacts would be connected only to the construction of the facility.
Section 106 21A.08.070	Substantive	Establishes allowed retail land uses, including: - Various uses in the Industrial (I) zone - Retail nursery, garden center, and farm supply stores - Food stores - Drug stores - Marijuana retailers - Pet shops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes condition currently applying to all uses in the I zone - Adds a new condition for the following uses in the NB zone Retail nursery, garden center, and farm supply stores; food stores; drug stores; and pet shops - Adds a new condition for food stores in the RA zone - Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis" 	<p>I zone change removes a condition inadvertently added in 2004 without legislative direction; there is no current condition 30 in subsection-B below, and the conditions in 2004 only went up to 25. This was likely an accidental carryover of a similar condition in the Government/Business Services table.</p> <p>The new condition proposed for certain uses in the NB zone is in response to current Comprehensive Plan policy requirements for Rural Neighborhood Commercial Centers in policy R-501, which requires these commercial uses to small-scaled businesses.</p> <p>The new condition for food stores in the RA zone is in response to a docket request, and to support creative reuse and associated preservation of otherwise unused grange halls in a manner that serves the local community.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed square footage limit for some retail land uses, in the NB zone in RNCCs, of 10,000 square feet, would not apply to all retail uses. Executive staff indicate that the rationale is that the uses proposed to be subject to the limitation are the types of land uses that typically result in "big box" or larger-footprint structures that would be out of scale with rural character. The excluded uses are not typically developed with large footprints so they were not included. <p>Council staff would note that this condition applies in the NB zone in the rural area, outside of Rural Towns. The Council may wish to uniformly apply the square footage limitation to retail uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed change for food stores to allow former grange halls to be used as a food store is a policy choice. There do not appear to be any former grange halls that currently meet all the requirements.
Section 107 21A.08.080	Substantive	Establishes allowed manufacturing land uses, including: - Wood products - Leather and leather goods as a permitted use - Motor vehicle and bicycle manufacturing - Materials processing - Marijuana processor I and Marijuana processor II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes condition use permit (CUP) requirements for wood products (to remove a limitation on wood product manufacturing in the F zone regarding limitations on board feet per year, distance from R and RA zones, hours of operation, and outside light and glare. The transmittal also removes the option for a CUP) - Adds new condition for leather and leather goods as a permitted use and adds a new conditional use (by prohibiting leather tanning and 	<p>Streamlines permitting process for wood products to align with existing Comprehensive Plan support in policy R-627 to "ensure that regulations applying to Rural Area and forest areas do not discourage the establishment of sawmills and other wood product businesses and services."</p> <p>The leather and leather goods use is proposed to be limited in response to direction in the 2024 update scope of work to review Code provisions for manufacturing and regional land use uses allowed in the Industrial zone. Resulting from this analysis, it was determined that a leather tannery is not something appropriate for the rural</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There proposed changes in this section are policy choices. Council staff would note that it may be difficult to enforce conditions on where materials are generated from, for materials processing. • The adopted scope of work asked the Executive to: "Review code provisions for manufacturing and regional land use uses allowed in the Industrial zone and evaluate whether the restriction on uses requiring a CUP/SUP is necessary or could be revised to remove the prohibition outside the UGA or revise the uses that require a CUP/SUP, consistent with existing or revised Comprehensive Plan policies." As noted by

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
			<p>finishing as a permitted use (and only allow it as a CUP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes motor vehicle and bicycle manufacturing and adds the following uses subject to conditions: motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment; and motorcycles, bicycles, and parts (prohibiting gasoline powered motorcycles as a permitted use (and only allow it as a CUP).) - Adds new conditions for materials processing use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Prohibit on-site retail sale of processed materials in the F, M, and RA zones (as a permitted use); o Limit the distance where materials can originate in the M zone (as a permitted use); o Limit the amount of onsite storage of fill materials in the RA zone (as a permitted use); and o Limit the area where fill material can be generated from in the RA zone (as a permitted use). - Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis" 	<p>industrial zones, but there are concerns with making all leather uses in Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code 31 a conditional use in the urban area. This is instead proposed to be split into a Conditional Use Permit for Leather Tanneries, and then permitted for all the other SIC 31 uses.</p> <p>The motor vehicle and bicycle manufacturing use is proposed to be limited response to direction in the 2024 update scope of work to Review code provisions for manufacturing and regional land use uses allowed in the Industrial zone. Resulting from this analysis, it was determined that it was unnecessary to have the "Motor vehicle and bicycle manufacturing" use as a County-specific defined use in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06. So, the proposed changes in the use table would align with existing SIC codes 371 and 375 and separates the two uses into their own rows with unique conditions.</p> <p>Changes to the conditions for materials processing use are proposed in response to a docket request. Materials processing uses, which can include both organic and mineral processing, often source materials from resource and rural areas. Generally, it is, and can be, beneficial, both economically and environmentally for these types of facilities to be in the rural area when properly regulated and mitigated. By locating closer to the resources, these uses can avoid unneeded increased transportation costs and related emissions impacts by reducing the number of truck and vehicle trips and miles travelled. So, no changes are proposed to limit the locations of these sites. However, various changes are proposed to impose additional regulations for materials processing uses, such as disallowing retail sales of the materials on the site; as an accessory to a mineral use, only allow processing of onsite and/or nearby (within 3 miles of the site) materials; and additional requirements for sites in the rural area, including storage limitations (up to 3,000 cubic yards), ensuring Code compliance requirements (landscaping, nonresidential land use standards, and grading permits), and requiring materials to primarily be from rural and resource lands to ensure it is a rural-dependent use.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.</p>	<p>the Executive, limited changes were made in the Ordinance, and the Council may wish to further review the list of uses allowed in the Industrial zone to create greater consistency in allowed uses with similar impacts.</p>
Section 222.Ee 21A.06.780	Substantive	Adopts definition of "motor vehicle and bicycle manufacturing"	Repealed	<p>Repeal is proposed in response to direction in the 2024 update scope of work to review Code provisions for manufacturing and regional land use uses allowed in the Industrial zone. Resulting from this analysis, it was determined that it was unnecessary to have the "Motor vehicle and bicycle manufacturing" use as a County-specific defined use in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.06. So, the proposed changes in the use table would align with existing Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified. If changes are made to this use in the Manufacturing land use table by the Council, this repeal will need to be revisited.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 108 21A.08.090	Substantive	Establishes allowed resource land uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growing and harvesting crops - Agricultural activities - Marijuana producer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expands the zones growing and harvesting crops and agricultural activities are allowed in to include R-1 through R-48 zones and commercial zones (NB, CB, RB, and O), subject to conditions - As a primary or accessory use, with development conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Accessory use is limited to 4,000 square feet; o In the R-1 zone, on cleared lots; o With a water supply, and to prevent runoff onto adjacent properties; o Compost must be 20' from interior lot lines and minimize odor and visual impacts; o With a farm management plan; o In the R zones, limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Household mechanical equipment; ▪ Retail sales and public use only between 7am and 7pm ▪ One commercial delivery a day; ▪ Maximum two motor vehicles; ▪ Maximum one sign; ▪ Limitations on structures to those accessory to agricultural activities; ▪ When there is no other principle structure, size is limited to 1,000 square feet, 12' in height, and any other requirements for accessory structures. • The Executive also proposes to allow agricultural activities as a conditional use in the R-1 zone only, with development conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o On cleared lots; o With a water supply, and to prevent runoff onto adjacent properties; o Compost must be 20' from interior lot lines and minimize odor and visual impacts; o With a farm management plan; - Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis" 	<p>371 and 375. Given this this definition is no longer needed.</p> <p>Expansion of the areas that growing and harvesting crops and agricultural activities are allowed in is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policy U-132a (now U-111a), which requires allowance of community gardens and urban agricultural throughout urban residential and commercial areas. This policy was adopted in 2016, but necessary implementing Code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate. The proposed changes for both uses would apply to zones in both urban and rural areas. The policy mandate to allow this is for urban only, but it was determined that these uses would also be appropriate in rural areas. Most of the proposed conditions were modeled after urban agriculture regulations in the City of Seattle.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed throughout the code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes in this section are a policy choice. • The related allowance for agricultural activities in the R-1 zone with a conditional use permit is not clear, and Permitting may not add conditions that are intended by the Executive. The Council may wish to add further clarity on the types of conditions intended to be added, such as size, access, setbacks, and/or critical area protection. • 29.g.7. has requirements for structures on a lot "with no principal structure." If a lot has a structure(s) on it, at least one of them must be considered the principal structure. The language could be clarified to apply the conditions of 29.g.7 when farming is not accessory to another use on site.
Section 109 21A.08.100	Substantive	Establishes allowed regional land uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hydroelectric generation facilities - Non-hydroelectric generation facilities - Fossil fuel facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new condition is added to the hydroelectric generation facility, non-hydroelectric generation facility, and fossil fuel facility uses to require an equity impact review as part of an application for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) an addition, expansion, or upgrade of 	<p>The equity impact review requirement is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policies F-325a and F-344g (both now F-303a). This was adopted in the policies in 2016, but necessary implementing Code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydroelectric generation facilities are required, under the Executive's proposal, to complete an equity impact review as part of the permit review, only for additions, expansions or upgrades to lines, and only when the project falls below the threshold requiring a special use permit (SUP). Equity impact review would not be

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
			<p>electric transmission and distribution lines; or 2) new, modified, or expanded fossil fuel facilities</p>	<p>directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate.</p>	<p>required for larger additions, expansions or upgrades to transmissions lines requiring a special use permit, and it would not be required for location of new facilities or other types of other additions, upgrades, or expansions not related to transmission lines. This is a policy choice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All non-hydroelectric generation facilities and fossil fuel facilities that require a SUP are required to complete an equity impact review. Because non-hydroelectric generation facilities relating to waste management processes do not require a special use permit, they would not be required to complete an equity impact analysis. This is a policy choice. It is unclear how the equity impact review would be used in the permitting process. Council may want to consider whether this requirement should be further clarified or removed. The adopted scope of work asked the Executive to: "Review code provisions for manufacturing and regional land use uses allowed in the Industrial zone and evaluate whether the restriction on uses requiring a CUP/SUP is necessary or could be revised to remove the prohibition outside the UGA or revise the uses that require a CUP/SUP, consistent with existing or revised Comprehensive Plan policies." No changes to regional land uses were made in the Ordinance, and the Council may wish to further review the list of uses allowed in the Industrial zone to create greater consistency in allowed uses with similar impacts.
<p>Section 110 21A.12.030</p>	<p>Substantive</p>	<p>Establishes density and dimensional standards for residential and rural zones, including for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum densities Minimum interior setbacks Maximum heights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replaces allowance for achieving maximum densities through the Residential Density Incentive (RDI) program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.34 with the inclusionary housing program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.48. Relocates the existing mobile home density bonus in the RDI program to in this Code section. Expands regulations that currently only apply to Skyway and North Highline to all properties developed under the Inclusionary Housing program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.48. Limits heights in Vashon Rural Town. Adds ability to develop a duplex on a substandard lot where a single detached home and an ADU could otherwise be built, if appropriate TDRs are purchased Adds density bonus for duplex, triplex, fourplex, or townhouse developments with 9 or fewer units and when located within a ½ mile of high-capacity or frequent transit Adds setbacks for safe parking sites 	<p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition. Specific changes are adopted for Vashon Rural Town to ensure compatibility with existing development.</p> <p>Middle housing (duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and townhouses) offer alternatives to apartment living and options for housing that are less dense than mid-rise apartments and denser than single-detached homes, which can often be naturally more affordable than new single detached homes. More development of middle housing helps to increase housing options affordable at all income levels, as required by the GMA and the Countywide Planning Policies. Given this, changes are proposed to create more flexibly for developing duplexes</p>	<p>Emergency Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe Parking: safe parking sites would require a 10-foot setback from adjacent residential uses. Parking spaces often seem to abut a property line, so this could minimize the number of spaces available. <p>Middle Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See the separate housing matrix for a discussion on all Ordinance changes related to middle housing <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile home parks may exceed the base density, up to the maximum density, if a mobile home unit is provided for each unit that is relocated from a closed mobile home park. This was an allowance when residential density incentive program was utilized. Councilmembers may wish to allow more density for mobile home parks by establishing a maximum density without a relocation requirement. The change Vashon Rural Town (R-1 through R-12 zones) to limit height to 35' and require a step back of 10' after the second story, is a policy choice. The Council may want to consider whether this provision is appropriate for all buildings, including those that don't front a street.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes references to community plans 	<p>on substandard lots and to allow for a new density bonus for middle housing near transit.</p> <p>Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This proposed setback standard for safe parking supports those changes.</p> <p>References to community plans are proposed to be removed throughout the Code to reflect that all community plans have since been repealed and that this is no longer current County practice.</p>	
Section 111 21A.12.040	Substantive	<p>Establishes density and dimensional standards for commercial and industrial zones, including for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Base densities - Maximum densities - Base heights - Maximum heights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adds base density for NB zoned properties - Removes references to the r properties in Potential Annexation Areas of rural cities in the RB zone - Replaces allowance for achieving maximum densities through the Residential Density Incentive (RDI) program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.34 with the inclusionary housing program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.48. Expands regulations that currently only apply to Skyway and North Highline to all properties developed under the Inclusionary Housing program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.48. - Limits heights in Vashon Rural Town. - Limits mixed use development to the urban area and rural towns - Adds setbacks for safe parking sites 	<p>Change for NB zone is proposed to reflect existing intent of the residential land use table in K.C.C. 21A.08.030, which allows the construction of a single detached home in the NB zone, subject to conditions.</p> <p>Change for RB zone is proposed to reflect that all RB zoned properties for PAAs for rural cities have been annexed, making the reference obsolete.</p> <p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition. Specific changes are adopted for Vashon Rural Town to ensure compatibility with existing development.</p> <p>The proposed limitation on mixed-use development is part of a suite of changes that reflect that mixed use densities for townhouses and apartments in commercial zones is not appropriate in the rural area. Commercial zoning applies to both urban and rural areas. Multifamily housing (apartments, townhouses, and group residences) are currently allowed in the commercial zones if part of a mixed-use development. The current allowed residential densities of these type of developments in the commercial zones range from 8 to 96 dwelling units per acre, regardless of whether the property is in the urban or rural area. As directed by the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Executive proposes to limit mixed-use development in the urban area and Rural Towns. Councilmembers may wish to allow limited mixed-use development in some instances in the rural area, such as in rural neighborhood commercial centers (examples are Preston or outside of Maple Valley). • Safe Parking: safe parking sites would require a 10 foot setback from adjacent residential uses. Parking spaces often seem to abut a property line, so this could minimize the number of spaces available. • In the RB zone, the base density is changed so that it is 36 du/ac for mixed-use development in urban areas and rural towns is or 48 du/ac for all development. Executive staff indicate the intent was to remove the 36 du/ac standard and applying the 48 du/ac instead. • In the NB zone on property in the urban area designated commercial outside of center, standalone townhouses would be allowed with a maximum density of 12 du/acre. Executive staff indicate that this maximum density should only be allowed with inclusionary housing or purchase of TDRs. This is a policy choice. • The change Vashon Rural Town (NB, CB, RB, O and I) to limit height to 35' and require a step back of 10' after the second story, is a policy choice. The Council may want to consider whether this provision is appropriate for all buildings, including those that don't front a street.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				<p>Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, those are urban levels of development that are not appropriate for the rural area, where the general growth pattern and established density limits range from one home per 5-20 acres (depending on the applicable rural zoning classification).</p> <p>Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This proposed setback standard for safe parking supports those changes.</p>	
Section 113 21A.12.180	Technical	Exempts certain structures from the height limits in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.12, including churches	Replaces "church" with "religious facility"	To update to more inclusive language and reflect proposed changes to the definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 114 21A.12.200	Substantive	Establishes standards properties that have split zoning (two or more zoning classifications on the same property), including for apartment and townhouse developments requiring a conditional use permit for exceeding base density	Removes reference to apartment and townhouse developments requiring a conditional use permit for exceeding base density	This standard is no longer needed because the conditional use permit (CUP) requirement is proposed to be removed in this proposed ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 115 21A.12.220	Technical	Establishes standards for nonresidential uses in the RA, UR, and R zones	Replaces "church" with "religious facility"	To update to more inclusive language and reflect proposed changes to the definition	
Section 71 21A.06.196	Clarification	Defines "clustering"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replaces using clustering for preservation of "parks and permanent open space" with "resource land for forestry or agriculture" Removes using clustering for "a reserve for future development" 	Updates to align with current regulations in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This definition could be modified to better reflect how the term is used in the zoning code. The current definition does not address the concept of placing residences closer together, through the use of smaller lots, in order to protect open spaces. It also incorrectly limits clustering to subdivisions, rather than all land divisions. Executive staff note that the code provisions do address these things. Clustering is used for other purposes, not just for preservation of critical areas or resource land. The definition could be modified to reflect this.
Section 116 21A.14.040	Technical	Establishes standards for lot clustering, including for resource tracts created under K.C.C. 16.82.152	Removes reference to K.C.C. 16.82.152	To reflect proposed repeal of K.C.C. 16.82.152 in this proposed ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Code provides dimensional standards how lot clustering would occur but does not limit when lot clustering is allowed. Councilmembers may wish to add in criteria for when clustering is permitted, such as to preserve open space or critical areas. Councilmembers may also wish to add limitations on if open space tracts can also be used as stormwater or large on-site septic system (LOSS) uses. Sub B.6. could be clarified. The addition of serial commas makes it unclear what types of recreation are allowed and not allowed.
Section 117 21A.14.070	Substantive	Establishes standards for of new residential development with 5 or more dwelling units and expansions of existing development with 4 or more dwelling units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes reference to apartments and townhouses Changes expansions of existing development to 5 or more dwelling units 	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in this proposed ordinance. As part of those changes, the definitions of apartments and townhouses are proposed to now only apply to developments of 5 or more dwelling units. Therefore, the existing reference to 5 or more dwelling units in this section automatically includes apartments and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As proposed, this section would apply to all developments with 5 or more dwelling units, including single detached residences. This section could be clarified that this applies to attached housing, or this section could be repealed and language on expansions could be added to K.C.C. 21A.14.080 and 090. K.C.C. 21A.14.080 and 090 already identify the housing types

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				townhouses, which now no longer need to be called out separately. Relatedly, expansions for existing developments are proposed to be increased from 5 or more units for consistency with the existing standard for new developments and the new definitions for apartments and townhouses.	<p>that these provisions are subject to, and the language in this section is duplicative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group residences category now includes additional uses (e.g., emergency supportive houses, interim housing, microshelters, etc.). Executive staff note that it is intended that K.C.C. 21A.14.080 and 090 apply to these new uses as well. This could be updated. K.C.C. 21A.14.070, .080. and .090 could be combined into one section.
Section 118 21A.14.080	Substantive	Establishes standards for alleys, including for apartments and townhouses	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in this proposed ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section would apply to emergency housing created in K.C.C. 21A.08.030. This is a policy choice. K.C.C. 21A.14.070, .080. and .090 could be combined into one section.
Section 119 21A.14.090	Substantive	Establishes standards for building facades, including for apartments and townhouses	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in this proposed ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section would apply to emergency housing created in K.C.C. 21A.08.030. This is a policy choice. The Council may wish to establish building façade standards in all zones, rather than when these housing types abut R-1 through R-4 zones. Community Residential Facilities-I (CRF-I) are excluded from the provisions in K.C.C. 21A.14.080, but not in this section. This same exclusion could be added to this section. K.C.C. 21A.14.070, .080. and .090 could be combined into one section.
Section 120 21A.14.160	Substantive	Establishes standards for new mobile home parks, including a density bonus for accommodating displaced mobile homes under the RDI program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.34	Replaces refence to RDI program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.34 with K.C.C. 21A.12.030	As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition. In this specific instance, the existing density bonus for accommodating displaced mobile homes under the RDI program is proposed to be retained and relocated to the densities and dimensions table in K.C.C. 21A.12.030.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobile home parks may exceed the base density, up to the maximum density, if a mobile home unit is provided for each unit that is relocated from a closed mobile home park. Councilmembers may wish to allow more density for mobile home parks by establishing a maximum density without a relocation requirement.
Section 123 21A.14.225	Substantive	Establishes requirements for hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines	Requires an equity impact review as part of an application for the siting new gas or hazardous liquid transmission pipelines	The equity impact review requirement is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policy F-332a (now F-303a). This was adopted in the policies in 2016, but necessary implementing code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council staff would note that the County is usually preempted from regulating transmission pipelines, and no permit would be required from the County. It's unclear how the equity impact review would be required, or any conditions added to the transmission pipeline construction to address equity impacts. Policy F-337 strictly prohibits any structures designed for human occupancy within hazardous liquid and gas transmission right-of-way. However, 21A.12.140 allows human-occupied structures that are not "normally" occupied within pipeline setbacks within regional utility corridors, and also allows any human-occupied structures to potentially locate there if meeting certain conditions. That Code section is

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
					<p>further contradicted by this section, which states first that utility structures not "normally" occupied are allowed, and then states that structures designed for human occupancy are never allowed.</p> <p>This policy could be changed to "should," or the Code could be amended to eliminate the allowances therein, or the policy could be removed if the policy intent is covered in the Code.</p>
Section 124 21A.14.280	Clarification	Establishes standards for rural industry development	Limits uses locating in the I zone in the rural area to those that would not require substantial investments in infrastructure, such as water, sewers, or transportation, or facilities that generate substantial volumes of heavy gross weight truck trips	To implement existing requirements in subsection-f of Comprehensive Plan policy R-514	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The KCCP language requires that industrial uses "be sized" to not require substantial investments in infrastructure. "Be sized" is not included in the Code language. "Be sized" potentially excludes other methods of reducing needs for infrastructure, such as energy efficiency or other types of efficiencies. Councilmembers could consider whether to add "be sized" here or remove it from the corresponding KCCP policy. The new language also may not be needed, given the other conditions that already exist, such as the limitations on floor area/lot ratio, impervious surface, landscaping, etc.
Section 125 21A.14.330	Clarification	Requires subdivisions and short subdivisions in the RA zone to be recorded with a condition prohibiting any covenant the keeping of horses or other livestock	Replaces " keeping of horses or other livestock" with "agricultural and forestry activities"	To align with existing direction in subsection-a of Comprehensive Plan policy R-204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The corresponding policy language says "farming and forestry," while this language is "agricultural activities and forestry activities." The Code allows for more uses as part of agricultural activities than the policy calls for.
Section 128 21A.16.100	Substantive	Establishes alternative landscaping standards	Adds allowance for crops to replace required Type II or Type III landscaping in commercial, residential, or institutional developments	New allowance is proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policy U-132a (now U-111a), which requires allowance of community gardens and urban agricultural throughout urban residential and commercial areas. This policy was adopted in 2016, but necessary implementing Code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. This change is proposed in response to that mandate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency housing uses would be considered group residences as the Executive proposes them. They will be required to meet the requirements for "Attached/Group residences," which includes 10" of Type III landscaping along street frontages, 5-10' of Type II on interior lot lines, and 20 square feet of landscaping per parking stall. This is a policy choice. Any changes to where uses are located in the land use tables will result in changes in this section as well. Councilmembers may wish to expand the allowance for growing crops in landscaping areas, for instance by allowing crop growing in Type I landscaping or expanding the limit to more than 25%.
Section 129 21A.18.030	Substantive	Establishes requirements for off-street parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds standards for duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes Removes reference to "citizens" Adds standards for permanent supportive housing, recuperative housing, emergency supportive housing, interim housing, and micro shelter villages 	<p>Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes are proposed to be added to reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.</p> <p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>Permanent supportive housing, recuperative housing, emergency supportive housing, interim housing, and micro shelter villages are proposed to be added to reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes require 1 parking stall per unit; whereas, apartments are required to provide between 1.2 and 2 parking stalls per unit, depending on bedroom number, and single detached/townhouses are required to provide 2 stalls. It is a policy choice whether to change the number of stalls to be consistent between these housing types. Councilmembers may wish to consider whether the proposed parking standards for emergency housing is appropriate. At E.6. there is a substantive change, where indoor bicycle storage would only be required to be provided if there were more than 5 dwelling units, rather than 2 dwelling units at it applies today. This is a policy choice.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 130 21A.18.050	Technical	Establishes exceptions for parking standards for certain types of development	Removes references to "citizens"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section covers Community Residential Facilities and senior assisted housing. Sub A.1. could be revised to cover residents in both facilities, rather than only CRF residents.
Section 131 21A.18.100	Substantive	Establishes requirements for pedestrian and bicycle circulation and access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires bicycle facilities in all permitted nonresidential uses Requires sidewalks, walkways, and bicycle facilities to be accessible for all ages and abilities Replaces "non-motorized" with "pedestrian and bicycle" Clarifies that the standards can be waived for sites in the rural area or natural resource lands 	<p>Bicycle, sidewalk, and walkway standards are proposed to align with existing Comprehensive Plan requirements in policy U-171. This was adopted in the policies in 2016, but necessary implementing Code changes were not developed at the time. So, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 5 directed additional work to resolve the issue. These changes are proposed in response to that mandate.</p> <p>Other changes are proposed to align with current terminology, consistent with existing intent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At A.3, there is a new requirement for bicycle facilities to be provided at a level to "support anticipated bicyclist volumes..." (in part). The Executive indicates that volume this is determined by planning documents and the road standards, although it is not clear whether any of the documents and standards require an applicant to submit information on "anticipated bicycle volumes." This could be clarified.
Section 132 21A.18.110	Substantive	Establishes standards for off-street parking design	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes to the standards for single detached homes, except for tandem or end-to-end parking where they are added to the standards for apartments and townhouses	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance. In this case, the off-street parking requirements are proposed to align with that of single detached homes, rather than for apartments or townhouses (which is what they're currently regulated as), except for tandem or end-to-end parking. This is intended to be a reduced standard to provide an incentive to develop these middle housing times.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 133 21A.18.130	Substantive	Establishes requirements for compact car parking	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes to the standards for apartments and townhouses	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 135 21A.22.060	Substantive	Establishes site design standards for mining	Limits uses, buildings, structures, storage of equipment, and stockpile of materials to only those directly related to an approved mineral extraction use, reclamation plan, or materials processing use	In response to a 2022 Docket request and to help reduce impacts of mining operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This chapter also applies to fossil fuel facilities. Because the new conditions would prohibit any uses, buildings, etc. not directly related to a mineral extraction use, reclamation plan, or materials processing use, this would de facto prohibit all fossil fuel facilities. If the intent is to continue to allow fossil fuel facilities, they could be added to this list.
Section 136 21A.24.045	Substantive	Establishes allowed alterations in critical areas, including removal of vegetation for fire safety in critical area buffers if in accordance with best management practices (BMPs) approved by the County	Replaces BMPs with standards in K.C.C. Chapter 16.82	To align with related to proposed clearing and grading code changes elsewhere in the ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 137 21A.24.133	Substantive	Establishes standards for off-site mitigation for adverse impacts to critical areas	Removes reference to basin plans	To reflect the proposed repeal of basin plans in the ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 138 21A.24.220	Clarification	Establishes standards for development in erosion hazard areas	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 139 21A.24.230	Substantive	Establishes areas regulated as flood hazard areas	Removes reference to basin plans	To reflect the proposed repeal of basin plans in the ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 140 21A.24.240	Clarification	Establishes standards for development in the zero-rise flood fringe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes references to Urban Planned Developments - Replaces "manufactured homes" with "mobile homes" 	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. <p>Other changes to reflect current terminology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 141 21A.24.300	Substantive	Establishes standards for development in volcanic hazard areas, including limitations on apartments and townhouses	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 142 21A.24.385	Clarification	Establishes applicability of the wildlife habitat network	Removes references to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 143 21A.24.386	Clarification	Establishes standards for development in the wildlife habitat network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes references to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities - Removes reference to K.C.C. 16.82.150 	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. <p>Other changes to reflect the proposed repeal of K.C.C. 16.82.150 in the ordinance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional changes are proposed under the CAO; this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix
Section 99 21A.06.1082C	Substantive	Defines "shoreline stabilization"	Distinguishes between structural and nonstructural stabilizations	The existing definition does not acknowledge nor define hard and soft shorelines. This distinction is important to clarify, because these two types of stabilization measures are regulated differently under State and County laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition could be broken out into bullets to better identify the distinguish between "nonstructural" and "structural" shoreline stabilization.
Section 144 21A.25.080	Substantive	Establishes sequencing of shoreline mitigation measures	Adds standards for a critical area report, when required by K.C.C. Chapter 21A.25	To align with similar requirements in K.C.C. 21A.24.100, which does not currently apply to shoreline regulations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This new language concerns critical area reports, whereas this section concerns the prioritization of actions in the shoreline. This proposed language could be moved to a new section for critical areas reporting in the shoreline. • The critical area report requirements in this section do not match the requirements in K.C.C. 21A.24.100. These requirements only require the documentation of wetlands and aquatic areas, rather than all critical areas. Councilmembers may wish to make these

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
					reporting requirements account for the presence of all critical areas.
Section 145 21A.25.100	Substantive	Establishes allowed uses in the shoreline areas, including townhouses and apartments	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes would be treated the same as townhouses, apartments, mobile home parks, and cottage housing under the shoreline environment use table. This is a policy choice. Condition 23 is about a water-dependent shoreline mixed-use development in the high intensity shoreline environment. It seems unlikely that plexes would be part of such a development. The Council may want to consider whether this condition should apply to all middle housing types. Emergency housing created under K.C.C. 21A.08.030 would be allowed in the high intensity and residential shorelines. This is a policy choice.
Section 146 21A.25.160	Substantive	Establishes standards for shoreline modifications, including for new shoreline stabilizations	Adds replacement shoreline stabilizations to the standards for new shoreline stabilizations	To add clarity of existing intent, consistent with state guidance and current practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 147 21A.25.170	Substantive	Establishes standards for shoreline stabilizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifies that non-water dependent uses alone do not merit shoreline protection by shoreline stabilization Adds relocation of structures and utilities as an action preferable to protection by shoreline stabilization Removes lists of examples of structural and non-structural shoreline stabilization Clarifies which types of development shoreline stabilization can be used (namely primary structures, new or existing water-dependent development or projects restoring ecological functions or remediating hazardous substance discharges) Clarifies what kind of documentation needs to be provided to the County in order to show that shoreline stabilization is needed. Clarifies that less impactful stabilization measures (like revegetation) are required to be used before more impactful stabilization measures (like bulkheads) can be used. Clarifies that if a site already has a stabilization (like a bulkhead) and it is being replaced, the old stabilization structure has to be removed. Clarifies standards for replacement shoreline stabilization Clarifies that shoreline stabilizations should only be used to provide slope stabilization, not to create new lands. Prohibits additional other common materials use in shoreline stabilization 	To improve clarity and better align with state guidance and reflect current practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section could be clearer on the policy intent, which is to avoid and then minimize the amount of shoreline stabilization used to the extent possible. The transmittal includes a list of when shoreline stabilization can be used, which covers nearly every type of development possible, making it appear that shoreline stabilization is almost always permitted. This section could be clarified to more easily identify that each item in this list has its own set of standards spelled out. State law (WAC 173-26-231) separates out the different instances when shoreline stabilization is permitted: 1) for existing primary structures, 2) for new water-dependent structures, 3) for nonwater-dependent structures, 4) restoration projects for ecological function/hazardous substance remediation projects, and 5) replacement shoreline stabilization. This section could include language on how new development should avoid the use of shoreline stabilization where possible, consistent with state law and the Comprehensive Plan.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
			- Corrects the list of documents used to set standards for shoreline stabilization		
Section 148 21A.27.010	Technical	Establishes requirements for preapplication community meetings for new transmission support structures	Removes references to "citizens"	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff indicate that there are not currently resources to update K.C.C. 21A.26 and 21A.27, and staff follow the federal guidance. If the Council wished to require an update to this section of Code, that could be done through a Work Plan action. The Council could also remove the changes to this section, so as not to make piecemeal changes.
Section 149 21A.27.110	Clarification	Establishes standards for placement of antenna on existing or replacement structures within street, utility, or railroad rights-of-way, including standards for the rural area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifies the meaning of rural area Adds Natural Resource Lands 	To align with current terminology and changes made in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, consistent with existing intent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See comment at Section 148.
Section 155 21A.28.140	Substantive	Establishes applicability of school concurrency standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments Removes application of concurrency standards to requests for multifamily zoning Removes reference to timing of vesting Removes references to "citizens" Removes outdated provisions 	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. <p>Multifamily zoning is proposed to be removed because, according to WAC 365-196-840, "Concurrency describes the situation in which adequate facilities are available when the impacts of development occur, or within a specified time thereafter." An application for a rezone is too soon to meet this definition, and multifamily development projects are addressed later in section.</p> <p>Vesting timing is proposed to be removed because it is inconsistent with the vesting standards clarified in Potala Village Kirkland, LLC, v. City of Kirkland (2014).</p> <p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>Other non-substantive changes made for clarity, consistency, and current context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive has proposed to add Binding Site Plans (BSPs) as an equivalent to preliminary plats. Under state law, they are not the same. BSPs do not provide any entitlement rights, unlike a preliminary plat. The Council may want to consider whether it is appropriate to include this. Executive staff note that emergency housing should be added to the list of exemptions from school concurrency, at C.1. and 3.
Section 156 21A.28.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.28.160 to follow K.C.C. 21A.28.140	To improve clarity by grouping related Code sections together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 157 21A.28.160	Clarification	Establishes school concurrency standards	Non-substantive changes throughout	For clarity and consistency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 158 21A.28.XXX	Technical	n/a	Recodifies K.C.C. 21A.28.150 to follow K.C.C. 21A.28.160 as recodified by this ordinance	To improve clarity by grouping related Code sections together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 159 21A.28.150	Substantive	Establishes standards for findings., recommendations, and decisions for school concurrency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments - Removes "multifamily zoning" - Adds "binding site plans" 	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. <p>Multifamily zoning is proposed to be removed because, according to WAC 365-196-840, "Concurrency describes the situation in which adequate facilities are available when the impacts of development occur, or within a specified time thereafter." An application for a rezone is too soon to meet this definition, and multifamily development projects is addressed later in the section.</p> <p>Binding site plans would also be applicable in this case.</p> <p>Vesting timing is proposed to be removed because it is inconsistent with the vesting standards clarified in Potala Village Kirkland, Llc, v. City of Kirkland (2014).</p> <p>Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.</p> <p>Other non-substantive changes made for clarity, consistency, and current context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Executive has proposed to add Binding Site Plans (BSPs) as an equivalent to preliminary plats. Under state law, they are not the same. BSPs do not provide any entitlement rights, unlike a preliminary plat. The Council may want to consider whether it is appropriate to include this.
Section 160 21A.28.152	Substantive	Establishes requirements for submittal of school district capital facility plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifies elements of a school district's standards of service - Adds requirements for accounting reports on impact fees - Non-substantive changes throughout 	Edits throughout for clarity and to reflect current practice and/or existing intent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 161 21A.28.154	Substantive	Establishes requirements for review of school district capital facility plans by the School Technical Review Committee (STRC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires that the chair of the STRC is the representative from the Department of Local Services - Establishes requirements for public noticing of STRC meetings - Establishes requirements for reporting on: 1) the outcomes of STRC meetings; and 2) analysis of school district capital facility plans, as required by this Code section - Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments - Non-substantive changes throughout 	<p>Edits throughout for clarity and to reflect current practice and/or existing intent.</p> <p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STRC includes a position for Council staff. As this committee makes recommendations to the Executive, it may be more appropriate for the position to be shifted to a position in the Executive branch. The Executive has suggested that the Council position become an ex-officio position that isn't part of making any recommendations. • Sub-I would have a new report requirement added that would be transmitted as part of the school impact fee ordinance.
Section 162 21A.28.156	Clarification	Establishes requirements for Council adoption of school district capital facility plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments - Non-substantive changes throughout 	Edits throughout for clarity and to reflect current practice and/or existing intent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	
21A.30.020	Policy staff flag				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note: The Hearing Examiner annual report highlights an issue with the number of chickens allowed on a property, and whether roosters should be allowed.
Section 163 21A.30.075	Clarification	Requires an interdisciplinary team to support review of livestock standards and management plans	Removes reference to basin plans	To reflect the proposed repeal of basin plans in the ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional changes may be proposed under the CAO. If so, this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix.
Section 164 21A.30.080	Technical	Establishes requirements for home occupations in R, UR, NB, CB, and RB zones	Replaces "marijuana" with cannabis	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 165 21A.30.085	Substantive	Establishes requirements for home occupations in Agricultural (A), Forest (F), and RA zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes allowance for nonresident employees who report to the site but primarily provide services off-site - Updates references to North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes to SIC codes - Replaces "marijuana" with cannabis 	<p>Change to employee standards is proposed as the current provision is not enforceable.</p> <p>NAICS codes are proposed to be removed to be consistent with the use tables in K.C.C. 21A.08 (which uses SIC codes).</p> <p>Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to remove a limitation on home occupations that limited the number of employees who work off-site is a policy choice. • The conversion of NAICS to SIC codes are not a direct match. The Executive has suggested that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At 5.a. SIC 55 be used instead of references to 551, 552, and 553. This would still exclude SIC 573 and 501. ○ At 5.b. SIC 504, 506, 5734, and 5946 be added; This would exclude: SIC 762, 506, 609, 5735, 594, 5999, 737, 762. ○ At 5.c., 50, 76, 51 would still be excluded.
Section 166 21A.30.090	Technical	Establishes requirements for home industries	- Replaces "marijuana" with cannabis	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 100 21A.06.1275	Substantive	Defines "temporary use permit" (TUP)	Prohibits use of a TUP to construct or establish any permanent use, alteration, or structure	Clarifying edit to reflect existing intent; aligns with current requirement in K.C.C. 21A.44.020 that the TUPs are only for uses that are not otherwise allowed in the zone in which the use is proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a policy choice whether to prohibit site improvements and could be further clarified in the regulations.
Section 167 21A.32.100	Substantive	Establishes when a TUP is required, including for uses not otherwise permitted in the zone and that can be made compatible for a period of up to 60 days per year	Replaces 60 days with 24 days	<p>The proposed reduction 24 days is intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Align with existing parking requirements (K.C.C. 21A.18.120) for hard surfacing for any parking area used 30 or more days. More than 30 days, and drainage, impervious surface, parking lot standards for lighting, landscaping would get triggered, which would turn it into permanent improvements, inconsistent with the intended temporary nature of these uses. - Reflect that TUPs are already limited to 30-days or less due to other requirements, rural compatibility, and mitigating impacts. - Be consistent with the current 24day limit for winery, brewery, distillery uses under K.C.C. 21A.32.120.B.3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed change to lower the number of days a temporary use may be permitted for, from 60 to 24 days per year, is a policy choice.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 168 21A.32.110	Substantive	Establishes exemptions from TUP requirements, including uses that do not exceed 2 days per calendar year	Limits exempt uses that occur 2 days out of the year to also not exceed 500 attendees and employees per day	To help manage the scale of and reduce impacts from uses exempt from TUPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive proposes to limit temporary uses that don't exceed 2 days per year (and therefore don't require a TUP), to a maximum of 500 guests and employees. This exceeds the number of guests proposed to be allowed for a permitted temporary use, which would be limited to 250 guests. This is a policy choice. Council staff would also note that without a permit, it could be difficult to enforce this provision. The Council may want to consider whether a temporary use could be allowed for up to 3 days without a permit, so that it could operate Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.
Section 169 21A.32.120	Substantive	Establishes standards for temporary uses, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limiting events to no more than 60 days per 365-day period - Allowing for annual renewals of TUPs for 5 consecutive years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes 60 days to 24 days - Limits uses to no more than 4 days per month and no more than 3 days per week - Limits uses to only occur six months out of the year. - Annual TUP renewals are reduced to up to 4 years, and requires the use to demonstrate compliance with current development regulations with each renewal 	<p>The proposed reduction to 24 days is intended to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Align with existing parking requirements (K.C.C. 21A.18.120) for hard surfacing for any parking area used 30 or more days. More than 30 days, and drainage, impervious surface, parking lot standards for lighting, landscaping would get triggered, which would turn it into permanent improvements, inconsistent with the intended temporary nature of these uses. - Reflect that TUPs are already limited to 30-days or less due to other requirements, rural compatibility, and mitigating impacts. - Be consistent with the current 24-day limit for winery, brewery, distillery uses under K.C.C. 21A.32.120.B.3. <p>Changes for the number uses allowed per month and per week are intended to limit grouping of multiple events in short amount of time, such as having a use that occurs non-stop over the course of 24 consecutive days. This change would help limit intensity of events and associated impacts.</p> <p>Changes on number months per year that uses are allowed in is to limit, for example, an event that happens at the same time each month, every month of the year, for 5 years (as allowed for annual TUP renewals elsewhere in the chapter), which is more akin to a permanent use than a temporary one.</p> <p>Changes to renewal requirements are intended to increase oversight, to ensure impacts are appropriately accounted for, and ensure any applicable new regulatory requirements adopted after initial TUP approval are met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The changes in this section are a policy choice. The new requirement that a renewal of a TUP meet current development regulations ignores the requirements of vested rights to an approved TUP. This language could be softened to recognize the requirements of D.3., which determines whether conditions have changed – if they have, then new conditions may be able to be applied.
Section 170 21A.32.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.32 requiring temporary uses to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be scaled based upon building occupancies, site area, access, and environmental considerations - Be limited to no more than 250 guests - Comply with building setback requirements 	To further condition temporary uses to ensure impacts are appropriately considered and limited, and to consolidate K.C.C. 21A.32.130 (parking) and K.C.C. 21A.32.140 (traffic control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive proposes to limit temporary uses that don't exceed 2 days per year (and therefore don't require a TUP), to a maximum of 500 guests and employees. This exceeds the number of guests proposed to be allowed for a permitted temporary use, which would be limited to 250 guests. This is a policy choice. Executive staff indicate that the intent was that there is no limit currently on size of the two exempt events or uses.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
			- Adequately provide for temporary sanitary facilities; potable water; vehicle parking, access, and traffic control; accessibility for persons with disabilities, and noise compliance		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff also note that "non-resident employees" should be added to the 250-person limitation in this section.
Section 171 21A.32.180	Substantive	Allows for temporary real estate offices in new residential developments, including apartments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes Adds townhouses 	<p>To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.</p> <p>Townhouses are added for consistency as fee simple townhouse development can also be permitted through a formal subdivision or binding site plan process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.Gg 21A.32.130	Substantive	Adopts parking standards for TUPs	Repealed	Standards are consolidated in new proposed section in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues with this repeal, provisions are covered in Section 170.
Section 222.Hh 21A.32.140	Substantive	Adopts traffic control standards for TUPs	Repealed	Standards are consolidated in new proposed section in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified with this repeal, provisions are covered in Section 170.
Section 172 21A.32.220	Substantive	Establishes standards for conversion of historic buildings, including for apartments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes Adds townhouses 	<p>To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in this proposed ordinance.</p> <p>Townhouses are added to align with an existing allowance in K.C.C. 21A.08.030 for townhouses to occur in historic buildings in certain circumstances</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 173 21A.32.250	Technical	Requires an odor management plan for recreational marijuana production and processing facilities	Replaces "marijuana" with "cannabis"	Amendments are proposed throughout the Code to change "marijuana" to "cannabis" to help reduce the historic and racist stigmatization of cannabis use and to align with recent changes in state law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 174 21A.37.010	Substantive	Establishes the purpose of the TDR program, including to incentivize preservation of rural, resource, and urban separator lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds other eligible urban lands to lands incentivized for preservation Clarifies that when "conservation easement" is used throughout the chapter, it also includes other similar encumbrances 	<p>Proposed changes would reflect that urban sites, other than just urban separators, are also currently eligible in certain conditions.</p> <p>Clarification of conservation easement is intending to capture existing intent, where the current code inconsistently includes "other similar encumbrances" along with "conservation easements." This statement would both streamline the repetitive references and correctly apply it in all instances.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 175 21A.37.030	Substantive	Establishes standards for TDR receiving sites, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing density increases up to maximum densities for short subdivisions Requiring a subarea study to evaluate impacts for formal subdivisions using TDRs to go above base density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifies that both short subdivisions and formal subdivisions can increase density up to maximum densities Replaces subarea study requirement with review and determination by the Hearing Examiner 	<p>Applying maximum densities to both short and formal subdivisions reflects existing intent.</p> <p>"Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and the Code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition will be removed, as it is no longer necessary. In this case, of TDRs, the study requirement is redundant to existing reviews that occur as part of departmental review of subdivision applications. So, the additional study requirement is proposed for removal. However, the Code is also proposed be updated to ensure that review of the subdivision application by the Hearing Examiner would</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snoqualmie Pass should be added here as an eligible receiving site to match the Executive's intent. Rural towns meeting the requirements of inclusionary housing chapter should be added as a receiving site to match the Executive's intent.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 176 21A.37.040	Substantive	Establishes standards for calculating TDRs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deducting areas associated with existing development - Not including fractional development rights in final development rights available for transfer - Allowing determinations of square footage or acreage by the Assessor's Office or by a survey paid for by the applicant and prepared by a licensed surveyor - Requiring the Department of Local Services to calculate the square footage or acreage - Allowing sites designated as urban separator and with R-1 zoning to have a base density of 4 dwelling units per acre for TDR sending site purposes - Setting calculations for F zoned sites - Allowing certain RA, A, and F zoned lands to send 1 TDR for every legal lot larger than 5,000 square feet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires that, when deducting areas for existing development, this is only when the development is allowed to remain as established in the TDR conservation easement for the site - Removes reference to "other similar encumbrances" - Allows for fractional development rights next largest whole number if the calculation results in a fraction of 0.5 or greater or shall be rounded down to the next smallest whole number if the calculation results in a fraction less than 0.5 - Adds using geographic information system (GIS) mapping for determinations of square footage or acreage - Clarifies that TDR program staff calculate, and the Department of Local Services confirms, the square footage or acreage - Allows for either sites designated as urban separator or sites with R-1 zoning to have a base density of 4 dwelling units per acre for TDR sending site purposes - Allows a bonus TDR for F zoned sites if participating in the County's carbon credit program - Allows for a bonus TDR for vacant marine shoreline sites without armoring or bulkheads - Clarifies that a RA, A, and F zoned sending site with existing or proposed dwelling unit would not get the allowed 1 TDR 	<p>need to include a finding that the use of TDRs doesn't create additional, unmitigated impacts.</p> <p>Standards for existing development that can remain are proposed to improve clarity and align with existing practice.</p> <p>"Other similar encumbrances" is proposed to be removed to align with standard language proposed in K.C.C. 21A.37.010.</p> <p>Fractional changes are proposed to more closely align TDR allocation with density allocations. Under current TDR calculations, a RA-5 zoned 19.9 acre site would get 3 TDRs. But, if developed under the base densities established in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.12, the site could get 4 dwelling units. The proposed new calculation would allow for as many TDRs as there are possible developable dwelling units; in this example, the site would now be eligible for 4 TDRs.</p> <p>GIS proposed to be added as another applicable tool to determine site size, consistent other existing allowances elsewhere in this section.</p> <p>Proposed clarifications for departmental roles would align with current practice.</p> <p>The proposed R-1 base density allowance would align with existing allowance in Comprehensive Plan policy U-120.</p> <p>The bonus TDR proposed for F zoned lands intends to encourage enrollment in the County's carbon credit program, which has co-beneficial outcomes consistent with the goals of the TDR program and further advances climate change and greenhouse gas reduction goals.</p> <p>The bonus TDR proposed for marine lands is intended to incentivize the protection of shoreline that is in a more natural state, which have benefits for salmonids and in turn endangered orcas.</p> <p>TDRs calculations for RA, A, and F zoned sites are proposed to be clarified to align with existing intent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal includes allowing an additional TDR per legal lot for vacant marine shoreline sending sites without armoring or bulkheads. "Armoring or bulkheads" could be revised to use a defined term, "hard shoreline stabilization". • Currently, KCCP policy R-316, a "shall" policy, only allows R-1 properties to be sending sites if they are designated Urban Separator. KCCP policy U-120, a "should" policy, states that R-1 properties designated "urban residential low" should allow for a certain TDR density, although this is not currently allowed under R-316 or this Code section. The change to allow R-1 properties designated "urban residential, low" to be TDR sending sites is a policy choice. • There is a proposed new bonus TDR for F zoned sites if participating in the County's carbon credit program. While not explicitly stated in the program's regulations (K.C.C 18.35), the program is tailored to, and currently only is used on, King County-owned properties, though Executive staff indicate that the program may be expanded to private properties in the future. Generally, publicly owned properties are prohibited from being sending sites. Executive staff have requested the Code be changed to allow public properties participating in the carbon credit program to be allowed sending sites.
Section 177 21A.37.050	Substantive	Establishes development limitations for TDR sending sites, including requiring areas reserved for residential development be equal to minimum lot size requirements	Limits the reserved residential area to no more than the minimum lot size	To allow the reserved residential areas to be sized for maximizing conservation benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed change could be interpreted to allow rural properties to be below the minimum lot size in exchange for a larger conservation easement as part of the TDR program. Executive staff indicate this is not the intent. • The density and dimensions table could be updated to clarify that minimum lot size does not apply when this provision is applicable.
Section 178 21A.37.060	Substantive	Establishes documentation requirements for TDR sending sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes requirement for a notice on title - Removes prohibition on imposing standards that exceed Title 222 WAC 	<p>Proposed notice change reflects current practice and that conservation easements is not used in all instances.</p> <p>Title 222 WAC is the Forest Practices Act. This is proposed to be removed from the TDR standards to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				retain the ability to purchase conservation easements that from F zone properties that increase carbon sequestration benefit and habitat values by implementing restrictions such as extended rotations, bigger buffers, etc.	
Section 179 21A.37.070	Substantive	Establishes the Interagency Review Committee for qualification of TDR sending sites	Removes reference to "other similar encumbrances"	"Other similar encumbrances" is proposed to be removed to align with standard language proposed in K.C.C. 21A.37.010.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsections A and B are about very different aspects of the TDR program and as such potentially could be separate sections.
Section 180 21A.37.080	Clarification	Establishes the transfer process for TDRs	Non-substantive changes throughout	Changes are proposed to improve clarity and consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 181 21A.37.100	Substantive	Establishes the purpose of the TDR bank, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Listing eligible sending sites - Limiting use of TDR bank purchases to receiving sites in cities and the urban unincorporated area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replaces listing of rural, agricultural, forest, and some urban areas as sending sites with a reference K.C.C. 21A.37.020 - Clarifies that limitations on receiving sites using TDR bank purchases do not apply to TDRs used for affordable housing developments in K.C.C. 21A.37.130 - Adds Snoqualmie Pass Rural Town to the areas eligible as receiving sites for TDR bank purchases 	<p>The proposed cross reference to K.C.C. 21A.37.020 would remove redundant language and improve consistency with existing allowances.</p> <p>Applicability to use of TDRS in affordable housing developments reflects existing intent.</p> <p>The proposed Snoqualmie Pass Rural Town addition would reflect a related proposed change in K.C.C. 21A.08.030.B.19 to allow use of Transfer of Development Rights to develop a duplex on a substandard lot that could otherwise build a single-detached home and a detached ADU.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 182 21A.37.110	Technical	Addresses TDR bank purchases and expenditures	Technical correction	Technical clean-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 183 21A.37.120	Clarification	Addresses administration of the TDR bank	Removes reference to "fee simple acquisitions"	"Fee simple acquisitions" is proposed to be removed to align with standard language proposed in K.C.C. 21A.37.010.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 184 21A.37.130	Substantive	Addresses TDR bank sales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes requirement that the bank only sell TDRs in whole increments - Removes requirement for a 10% down payment - Non-substantive changes throughout 	<p>The whole increment requirement is proposed to be removed to address situations where the bank would need to sell a half of a rural TDR to add an increment of one unit to a project. The removal would have no detrimental effect, aside from the bank being stuck with a 0.5 rural TDR, which can only be used in this way.</p> <p>The down payment requirement is proposed to be removed to reflect current practice.</p> <p>Changes are proposed throughout to improve clarity and consistency.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the proposed inclusionary housing changes, inclusionary housing would cover all urban R-4 through R-48 sites, as well as R-4 through R-48 sites in Snoqualmie Pass Rural Town, thus superseding the TDR for affordable housing program in those areas. A.2.c.(2) of this section should be deleted accordingly as there would no longer any sites meeting that description.
Section 185 21A.37.140	Clarification	Establishes requirements for use of TDRs sold from the bank for incorporated receiving sites	Non-substantive changes throughout	Changes are proposed to improve clarity and consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 186 21A.37.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.37 allowing the TDR bank to collect a fee-in-lieu of selling TDRs from the TDR bank when TDR inventory is unavailable	Proposes to allow for payment to the TDRs bank in-lieu of TDR purchase when sufficient TDR inventory is not available. Fee-in-lieu TDRs would allow the TDR bank to bridge gaps when inventory is low and eliminate the risk of turning away developers with desires to build more homes, particularly as the inclusionary housing program (with associated TDR elements) is proposed to be expanded to other geographies as part of this proposed ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 187 21A.37.XXX	Clarification	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.37 requiring biennial reporting on the TDR program	As part of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, all of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan action items are proposed to be removed and replaced with the 2024 Work Plan. One of the 2016 Work Plan actions required review of the TDR program and associated annual reporting. With the proposed removal of the annual reporting requirement as part of just the 2016 Work Plan, this code change would make regular reporting on the TDR program permanent. The due dates and frequency of reporting is proposed to be updated to better align with current resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.Qq 21A.37.055	Substantive	Allows urban TDR receiving site projects to count the "reduction" of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the purchase of the rural TDRs to be deducted from the calculation of the sending site's greenhouse gas emissions	Repealed	New scientific analysis suggests this is very variable and isn't necessarily a carbon positive scenario in all cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 47 20.22.180	Substantive	Establishes requirements for Hearing Examiner review of proposed preliminary plats	Adds a new condition for subdivisions using Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) to exceed base density, requiring confirmation that the additional density would not create unmitigated impacts beyond those created by development at base density	Aligns with proposed change in K.C.C. 21A.37.030, which currently requires a subarea study to analyse impacts of subdivisions using Transfer of Development Rights to exceed base density. "Subarea studies" is a term that has inconsistent definitions and usage throughout the Comp Plan and the Code. Upon review of the references to subarea studies, it was determined that the "subarea study" requirements could either be met via an area zoning and land use study and/or a subarea plan (depending on the case) in current practice or were not applicable in the instance it was being referenced. Subarea study references are proposed to be replaced by area zoning and land use studies and/or subarea plans, or removed, to reflect existing intent. The subarea study definition proposed to be removed, as it is no longer necessary. In this case of TDRs in subdivisions, the study requirement is redundant to existing reviews that occur as part of departmental review of subdivision applications. So, the additional study requirement is proposed for removal. However, the TDR regulations in K.C.C. 21A.37.030 are also proposed to be updated to ensure that review of the subdivision application by the Hearing Examiner would need to include a finding that the use of TDRs doesn't create additional, unmitigated impacts. This proposed change in K.C.C. 20.22.180 would reflect that requirement in the Hearing Examiner Code as well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 188 21A.38.030	Clarification	Establishes general provisions for property-specific development standards	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 189 21A.38.050	Clarification	Establishes the pedestrian-oriented Special District Overlay (SDO)	Non-substantive changes throughout	Changes are proposed to improve clarity and consistency and to align with other non-substantive changes elsewhere in the ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 190 21A.38.120	Substantive	Establishes the wetland management area SDO (SO-180)	Removes references to basin plans	To reflect the proposed repeal of basin plans in the ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional changes may be proposed under the CAO. If so, this section will be reviewed as part of the CAO matrix.
Section 191 21A.38.150	Substantive	Establishes the groundwater protection SDO, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setting standards for commercial and industrial development within the SDO, and listing which uses are considered commercial and industrial development - Prohibiting certain uses from being permitted in the SDO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updates uses that are considered commercial and industrial development - Removes many of the uses listed as commercial and industrial development 	<p>Updates uses that are considered commercial and industrial development to align with current terminology in the use tables and other related proposed changes in the ordinance.</p> <p>Other amendments are proposed to align with the recommendations in the Vashon-Maury Island P-Suffix Conditions Report transmitted as part of the supporting materials to the ordinance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vashon-Maury Island does not have any RB zoned parcels. Therefore, any prohibited uses in the SDO that are only permitted in the RB zone can be removed. - According to K.C.C. 21A.08.080.B.11 and 21A.08.100.B.15, I zoned sites located outside the Urban Growth Area, uses shown as a conditional or special use are prohibited. Vashon-Maury Island is located outside of the Urban Growth Area. Due to these uses already being prohibited on the Island, the regulations are redundant and can be removed from the SDO. - Other changes are made to align with current allowed terminology in the use tables. - None of these changes have any substantive effect on what uses are allowed within the SDO. They improve clarity and consistency with the rest of the Code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 192 21A.43.030	Substantive	Establishes standards for calculating impact fees, including for apartments and townhouses	Adds duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes	To reflect new middle housing uses proposed to be created elsewhere in the ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councilmembers may wish to add "cottage housing" along with duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as a multifamily housing type. Additional changes may be made to this section with changes needed as a result of SB 5258.
Section 193 21A.43.050	Clarification	Establishes standards for assessment of impact fees	Removes references to Urban Planned Developments and "PUDs"	<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. <p>PUDs is outdated language.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 194 21A.43.070	Clarification	Establishes standards for adjustments, exceptions, and appeals of impact fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes references to "citizens" - Removes references to Urban Planned Developments and "PUDS" 	Amendments propose removing references to the term "citizen" from the development regulations are proposed to be consistent with changes made with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that reflect that the County serves all members of the public, regardless of citizenship status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive staff note that "emergency housing" should be added to A.3.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				<p>Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. <p>PUDs is outdated language.</p>	
21A.43.080	Policy staff flag	Establishes exemption or reduction of school impact fees for affordable housing			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive staff note that permanent supportive housing should be added to A. • The language in this section is not consistent with the RCW requirements. It could be updated to be consistent. • This section may be updated as part of changes in SB 5258. The Executive is planning to transmit those changes separately.
Section 195 21A.44.020	Substantive	Establishes decision criteria for TUPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires temporary uses in resource zones to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies addressing rural character, natural resource lands, and compatibility - Requires temporary uses in the rural area to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies addressing rural character, natural resource lands, and compatibility - Requires temporary uses to be with open space taxation or Farm and Agricultural Current Use taxation requirements for applicable sites 	New conditions are proposed to ensure consistency with: 1) Comprehensive Plan mandates to protect the rural area and natural resource lands; and 2) requirements for site enrolled in the open space taxation or Farm and Agricultural Current Use taxation programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 196 21A.44.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 21A.44 regulating developments using a community on-site sewage system (OSS) or large on-site sewage system (LOSS) in the Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands	These proposed provisions are needed to implement existing and proposed requirements in Comprehensive Plan policy F-262 and ensure protection of rural character and natural resource lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section would limit the construction of new large/community on-site septic systems to areas where individual septic systems are failing and would require they serve existing structures and lots. Large/community on-site septic systems would also be required to be managed by a public agency, could not be used as a basis to exceed base density, and commercial and residential systems would have to serve their respective uses, meaning a residential system could not serve new commercial uses and commercial systems could not serve a non-commercial zone. Under this proposal, new construction would not have the option of building a shared system and would have to rely on individual systems. This is a policy choice.
Section 197 21A.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new chapter in K.C.C. 21A governing emergency housing uses	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	
Section 198 21A.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 21A.XX establishing the purpose of this new emergency housing chapter	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 199 21A.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 21A.XX establishing permit application requirements for emergency housing uses	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 200 21A.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 21A.XX establishing requirements for safe parking sites	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 201 24.08.010	Substantive	Establishes general standards for the definitions adopted in K.C.C. Chapter 24 (Housing and Community Development)	Incorporates definitions from K.C.C. 21A.06	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods This proposed addition supports those changes by allowing for applicable new emergency housing definitions proposed in K.C.C. 21A.06 to apply in K.C.C. Title 24.	
Section 202 24.08.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.08 adopting a definition for "rotating shelter"	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. This proposed definition supports those changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 203 24.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new chapter in K.C.C. 24 governing emergency housing uses	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 204 24.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.XX establishing the purpose of this new emergency housing chapter	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 205 24.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.XX establishing standards for recuperative housing	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 206	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.XX	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
24.XX.XXX			establishing standards for emergency shelters	Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	
Section 207 24.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.XX establishing standards for emergency supportive housing and interim housing	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 208 24.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.XX establishing standards for microshelters	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 209 24.XX.XXX	Substantive	n/a	Adds a new section in K.C.C. 24.XX establishing standards for safe parking sites	Under the GMA, King County must complete a Housing Needs Assessment for periodic Comprehensive Plan updates. The assessment for the 2024 update found that that there is sufficient zoning capacity for housing available for all income segments in unincorporated King County except for emergency housing. Code changes are proposed throughout the ordinance that would explicitly allow various emergency housing types in the development regulations to create the zoned capacity to address the shortfall. These new proposed provisions would ensure proper standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Emergency and Supported Housing Write-Up.
Section 210 21A.48.010	Substantive	Establishes the purpose and applicability of inclusionary housing regulations, including to provide requirements and voluntary incentives for affordable housing development in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline	Expands the voluntary provisions of the inclusionary housing regulations to sites in unincorporated areas served by sewers and with R-4 through R-48, NB, CB, RB, and O zoning	As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B.3. could be updated to reflect that 21A.48.070 will only apply in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline, and 21A.48.080.A.2. only applies to mandatory inclusionary housing areas.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				<p>in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition. The geographies and proposed zones that this is proposed to apply to are the same as in the current RDI program; this would include all urban unincorporated areas and the Rural Towns of Vashon and Snoqualmie Pass. Fall City Rural Town would not be included because it is not served by sewers.</p> <p>The current Inclusionary Housing program in K.C.C. 21A.48.010 and 21A.48.020 includes mandatory inclusionary housing elements for the UAC portions of Skyway-West Hill and North Highline. These proposals would not expand the mandatory elements of the program to elsewhere in Skyway-West Hill, North Highline, or the other new proposed eligible communities; this is intended to reflect the higher displacement risk in UAC areas of Skyway-West Hill and North Highline as documented in the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-Displacement Strategies Report. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan proposes a new Work Plan action item that would evaluate whether to expand the mandatory inclusionary housing elements to any of these other areas. These Code sections may be amended further in the future, pending on the outcome of that evaluation.</p>	
Section 211 21A.48.030	Substantive	Establishes the affordable housing requirements for the voluntary portion of the Inclusionary Housing program, including applying to the areas of Skyway-West Hill and North Highline outside of their respective UACs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expands the voluntary provisions of the inclusionary housing regulations to sites served by sewers and with R-4 through R-48, NB, CB, RB, and O zoning - Limits the density bonuses in Vashon Rural Town to developments that provide 100% affordable developments and prohibits the use of the additional density bonus if TDRs are purchased 	<p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition. The geographies and proposed zones that this is proposed to apply to are the same as in the current RDI program; this would include all urban unincorporated areas and the Rural Towns of Vashon and Snoqualmie Pass. Fall City Rural Town would not be included because it is not served by sewers. The limitations on density bonuses for Vashon Rural Town are proposed to: 1) align with the current 100% affordable project requirements to receive density bonuses under in SDO SO-270 that is also proposed for repeal as part of this transition; 2) ensure better compatibility with existing development; and 3) support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council may want to consider whether the Vashon Rural Town provisions, which only allows for bonus density if the project is 100% affordable, meets the Council's policy goals. The existing SDO (being repealed by this ordinance) had this same requirement and did not result in any affordable units being constructed.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				the most critical housing needs, in response to with public input.	
Section 212 21A.48.040	Substantive	Establishes standards for calculating affordable units for the purposes of the Inclusionary Housing program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifies that base density may also be set in p-suffixes and/or SDOs - Clarifies that maximum density may also be set in p-suffixes and/or SDOs 	Clarifying edits to reflect existing intent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council may want to consider whether the changes here meet the Council's policy goals. There are a few P-suffix conditions that have limitations on density that could be impacted by this new language. A lower density requirement in a property-specific development condition could lead to less affordable housing being constructed than would be allowed under the inclusionary housing provisions.
Section 213 21A.48.050	Substantive	Establishes standards for affordable dwelling units and dimensional standards for the purposes of the Inclusionary Housing program, including height limits for properties in North Highline subject to p-suffix NH-P04	Adds height limitations for Snoqualmie Pass (65 feet) and Vashon (30 feet) Rural Towns.	<p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition.</p> <p>As part of the expanded Inclusionary Housing program to other areas of the County, this includes the Rural Towns of Snoqualmie Pass and Vashon, in addition to urban unincorporated communities. The current Inclusionary Housing program offers height bonuses, in addition to density bonuses, when affordable housing is provided. The proposed height limitations for the Rural Towns reflect that it is not appropriate to have the same height bonuses as urban areas. Vashon also has property-specific development conditions for CB zones that already limit heights in the Rural Town, which this change is intended to be align with and apply more broadly for consistency throughout the Rural Town.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are other P-suffix and SDO conditions that may differ from the height allowances in this section and have unintended consequences when trying to apply the inclusionary housing requirements. The Council may want to consider whether to address those differing height allowances as part of this update.
Section 214 21A.48.060	Substantive	Establishes requirements for permit issuance for projects under the Inclusionary Housing program, including requirements for community preference and affirmative marketing reports	Limits community preference and affirmative marketing reports only to developments as applicable in K.C.C. 21A.48.070	<p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition.</p> <p>As part of the expanded Inclusionary Housing program to other areas of the County, this includes the Rural Towns of Snoqualmie Pass and Vashon, in addition to urban unincorporated communities. The current</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the inclusionary housing program is proposed to expand to the R-4 through R-48 zones, NB, CB, RB, and O zones in the urban area and rural town, community preference and affirmative marketing reports would not be required in these new areas. They would only be required for only developments within Skyway-West Hill and North Highline. This is a policy choice. • There is a Work Plan action to look at mandatory inclusionary housing and community preference requirements countywide.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				<p>Inclusionary Housing program in K.C.C. 21A.48.070 requires community preference and affirmative marketing plans. This ordinance proposes to limit that requirement to only Skyway-West Hill and North Highline and to not expand the requirement to the other communities eligible for the program as proposed by this ordinance, to reflect the higher displacement risk in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline as documented in the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-Displacement Strategies Report. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan proposes a new Work Plan action item that would evaluate whether to expand the community preference and affirmative marketing elements to the other communities. This Code section may be amended further in the future, pending on the outcome of that evaluation.</p>	
<p>Section 215 21A.48.070</p>	<p>Substantive</p>	<p>Establishes requirements community preference and affirmative marketing plans</p>	<p>Limits community preference and affirmative marketing plans to developments only in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline</p>	<p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition.</p> <p>As part of the expanded Inclusionary Housing program to other areas of the County, this includes the Rural Towns of Snoqualmie Pass and Vashon, in addition to urban unincorporated communities. The current Inclusionary Housing program in K.C.C. 21A.48.070 requires community preference and affirmative marketing plans. This ordinance proposed to limit that requirement to only Skyway-West Hill and North Highline and to not expand the requirement to the other communities eligible for the program as proposed by this proposed ordinance, to reflect the higher displacement risk in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline as documented in the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-Displacement Strategies Report. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan proposes a new Work Plan action item that would evaluate whether to expand the community preference and affirmative marketing elements to the other communities. This Code section may be amended further in the future, pending on the outcome of that evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the inclusionary housing program is proposed to expand to the R-4 through R-48 zones, NB, CB, RB, and O zones in the urban area and rural town, community preference and affirmative marketing reports would not be required in these new areas. They would only be required for only developments within Skyway-West Hill and North Highline. This is a policy choice.
<p>Section 216 21A.48.080</p>	<p>Substantive</p>	<p>Allows for alternative compliance to Inclusionary Housing regulations, including allowing for payment to the County in lieu of constructing affordable housing units, which would then be used to create affordable housing units within the same community service area subarea geography that the development occurs in</p>	<p>Limits the fee-in-lieu allowance to developments subject to the mandatory inclusionary housing provisions of this chapter</p>	<p>The proposed change would allow for alternative compliance for development proposals that would not otherwise be able to be developed unless affordable housing is provided as required by the Inclusionary Housing program. This is not appropriate for developments subject to the voluntary provisions of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed changes would limit the ability to use in-lieu fees for affordable housing to only those properties in the mandatory inclusionary housing areas (the unincorporated activity centers in North Highline and Skyway-West Hill). Those in the voluntary areas would not be able to pay in-lieu fees. This is a policy choice.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				chapter, which would still be able to develop under base densities and would only be subject to the requirements of the Inclusionary Housing program if they <i>choose</i> to go above base density.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed changes to the four-to-one program in section 40 would allow for off-site alternative compliance by reference to this section. The public rule called for under D. of this section has not been completed. Executive staff indicate is under development.
Section 221 21A.55.101	Substantive	Adopts the Sustainable Communities and Housing demonstration project, including adoption of the following eligible sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> White Center Workshop in North Highline Brooks Village in Skyway-West Hill Kit's Corner in East Federal Way 	Removes Kit's Corner as an eligible site	Consistent with recommendations of a related Area Zoning and Land Use Study, Kit's Corner is not appropriate for affordable housing development and thus should not be part of the demonstration project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Code section was first adopted in 2009 and has language that could be difficult to administer. Executive staff indicate that there is interest in this demonstration project, at a project called Brooks Village. The Council may want to consider whether the language is clear enough to easily administer.
Section 222.Qqq n/a	Substantive	Adopts Kit's Corner as an eligible site for the Sustainable Communities and Housing demonstration project	Repealed	Consistent with recommendations of a related Area Zoning and Land Use Study, Kit's Corner is not appropriate for affordable housing development and thus should not be part of the demonstration project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.A 14.70.300	Clarification	Exempts determinations of concurrency from SEPA review	Repealed	This is inconsistent with state law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.B 16.82.150	Technical	Establishes clearing standards for individual lots in the rural zone	Repealed	Reflects court rulings and current case law, as directed by 2016 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.C 16.82.151	Technical	Addressing relocation of undeveloped area in adjacent lots	Repealed	Reflects court rulings and current case law, as directed by 2016 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.D 16.82.152	Technical	Establishes clearing standards for subdivisions and short subdivisions in the rural residential zone	Repealed	Reflects court rulings and current case law, as directed by 2016 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.E 16.82.154	Technical	Addresses modification of clearing limits through farm management and rural stewardship plans	Repealed	Reflects court rulings and current case law, as directed by 2016 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.G 20.12.090	Technical	Adopts park development policies	Repealed	This is not a current, active plan; it was last updated in 1985. The Comprehensive Plan provides the official policy guidance, along with the Open Space Plan that is adopted as a functional plan of the Comp Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.H 20.12.150	Technical	Adopts the Affordable housing capital facilities plan as a functional plan of the Comprehensive Plan	Repealed	This is not a current, active plan; it was last updated in 1992. A replacement functional plan is no longer needed. The Comprehensive Plan provides the official policy guidance, and implementation occurs via a variety of agency plans. Housing needs are addressed in Appendix B Housing, and any applicable County six-year financing occurs as part of the biennial budget.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.I 20.12.433	Technical	Adopts the King County Nonmotorized Transportation Plan as a functional plan of the Comprehensive Plan	Repealed	This is not a current, active plan; it was adopted in 1994 and has not been updated since. A replacement functional plan is no longer needed. The Comprehensive Plan provides the official policy guidance, and implementation occurs via a variety of agency plans. Transportation needs planning are addressed in Appendices C, C1, and C2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.J 20.12.435	Technical	Adopts the King County Arterial HOV Transportation Plan as a functional plan of the Comprehensive Plan	Repealed	This is not a current, active plan; it was adopted in 1994 and has not been updated since. A replacement functional plan is no longer needed. The Comprehensive Plan provides the official policy guidance, and implementation occurs via a variety of agency plans. Transportation needs planning are addressed in Appendix C and C1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222 K Through Cc 20.14.010 20.14.020 20.14.025	Substantive	Adopts various basin plans as an amplification and augmentation of the Comprehensive Plan for King County and official County policy for the area	Repealed	These are not a current, active plans; none of them have been substantive updated since the 1990s, except for one new plan that was adopted in 2001 with no updates since. Replacement plans are not needed. The basin plans predominantly focus on prescribing customized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
20.14.030 20.14.040 20.14.050 20.14.060 20.14.070 20.14.080				<p>land use regulations for individual basin areas. Since adoption of the original basin plans, there have been a variety of subsequent updates to regulations driven by the GMA, adoption of the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements, etc.</p> <p>The best available science review and 2004 adoption of the CAO in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.24 established regulations to ensure protection of environmental resources; many of these regulatory protections function to protect the resources in ways envisioned by the basin plans. While the Basin Plans had value in establishing context and identifying important features and attributes of various geographies, the current regulations in Code provide protection in and of themselves, and the basin plans are not adding necessary protection. The protection of natural resources in specific geographies occurs through existing Code and may be updated further based on proposals for policy and code changes in the 2024 Comprehensive Plan based on review of best available science.</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many of the p-suffixes originally adopted as a result of the basin plans remain in place; - Codes related to Regionally and Local Significant Resource Areas originally cited in basin plans remain in place; - Implementation of Water Resource Inventory Area plans results in capital projects to restore salmon habitat along rivers and streams; - NPDES permits have required updates to the surface water design manual and associated regulations for managing stormwater, addressing many of the same issues in the basin plans; - The King County Flood Hazard Management plan, adopted as a functional plan of the Comprehensive Plan, guides flood risk reduction efforts, often through floodplain restoration projects with co-benefits of habitat protection and restoration; and - The Clean Water Healthy Habitat Strategic Plan and the Land Conservation initiative drive landscape-scale conservation and wholistic, coordinated management of environmental resources covering all geographies of King County. 	
Section 222 li Through Pp 21A.34.010 21A.34.020 21A.34.030 21A.34.040 21A.34.050 21A.34.060 21A.34.070 21A.34.080	Substantive	Adopts the RDI Program	Repealed	<p>As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repealing the Residential Density Incentive Program is a policy choice. The program has not been well utilized, but it does allow for density and other dimensional standard modifications for improvements <i>other</i> than provision of affordable housing (unlike the inclusionary housing program).

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. These proposed repeals effectuate that transition.	
Section 112 21A.12.070	Substantive	Establishes criteria for calculating permitted number of units, lots, or floor areas	Removes reference to the RDI program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.34	As part of requirements to review and update the RDI program in the 2020 and 2024 Comprehensive Plans, it was determined that the program should focus on affordable housing density incentives. Within this narrowed focus of the program, it was determined that alignment with the affordable housing density incentives in the voluntary Inclusionary Housing regulations recently adopted for Skyway and North Highline would be more clear, consistent, and effective in achieving and implementing affordable housing goals. Given this, the RDI program is proposed to be repealed and replaced by an expanded version of the Inclusionary Housing program. The changes in this proposed ordinance effectuate that transition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.Ss 21A.38.270	Substantive	Adopts the Vashon Rural Town affordable housing Special District Overlay (SDO)	Repealed	The proposed repeal SDO is proposed in order to rely on proposed expanded voluntary Inclusionary Housing program in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.48 instead. The SDO was not successful in producing any affordable units, and the new Inclusionary Housing program is anticipated to more effectively support the improved affordable housing access intended by the SDO.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.Dd 21A.06.533	Clarification	Adopts definition of "fully Contained Communities"	Repealed	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.Ff 21A.06.1340	Clarification	Adopts definition of "Urban Planned Developments"	Repealed	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222 Tt Through Ggg 21A.39.010 21A.39.020 21A.39.030 21A.39.040 21A.39.050 21A.39.060 21A.39.070 21A.39.080 21A.39.090	Clarification	Adopts general provisions for Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities	Repealed	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
21A.39.100 21A.39.110 21A.39.120 21A.39.130 21A.39.200					
Section 222 Hhh And Iii 21A.44.070 21A.44.080	Clarification	Adopts decision criteria for Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities	Repealed	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 222.Rr 21A.38.080	Clarification	Adopts the Urban Planned Development implementation SDO	Repealed	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 10 9.04.020	Clarification	Establishes definitions for the purposes of K.C.C. Chapter 9.04 (stormwater runoff and surface water and erosion control)	Definitions for "development" and "large project drainage review" are updated to remove references to urban plan developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are additional changes that could be made to the definitions throughout this section to reflect current terminology. Executive staff indicate that changes would also need to be made in the County's surface water design manual, which was not contemplated as part of this update. The Council could choose to remove this section and deal with the updates included here when Title 9 is next updated. The Council could also direct that Title 9 be updated on a certain timeframe.
Section 19 17.04.200	Clarification	Establishes types of interpretations the fire marshal is authorized to make, including procedures for reviewing Urban Planned Developments	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 20 17.04.280	Clarification	Establishes permit requirements under the fire code, including those for Urban Planned Developments	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				- the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	
Section 42 20.20.020	Clarification	Classifies land use permit decision types, including classifying Urban Planned Developments as Type 4 decisions	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 44 20.20.100	Clarification	Establishes timelines for review of land use permits, including for Fully Contained Communities and Urban Planned Developments	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section will likely need to be updated as part of the SB 5290 update.
Section 74 21A.06.305	Clarification	Defines "development agreement"	Removes references to Urban Planned Development's	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 126 21A.16.020	Clarification	Requires certain development to comply with landscaping standards in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.16, including Urban Planned Developments	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 134 21A.20.190	Clarification	Establishes standards for community identification signs, including for Urban Planned Developments		Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
				have expired and are now under King County zoning.	
Section 150 21A.28.020	Clarification	Requires new development to be adequately served by facilities and services	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 151 21A.28.030	Clarification	Establishes standards for facilities and services for new development - sewer	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the sections on provisions for sewer and the section on the provisions for water is different. When different words are used, this is seen to be purposeful, when in practice it may not be intentional. These could be cleaned up.
Section 152 21A.28.040	Clarification	Establishes requirements for water service for new development - water	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the sections on provisions for sewer and the section on the provisions for water is different. When different words are used, this is seen to be purposeful, when in practice it may not be intentional. These could be cleaned up.
Section 153 21A.28.050	Clarification	Establishes requirements for surface water management systems for new development	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.
Section 154 21A.28.130	Clarification	Establishes requirements for fire protection for new development	Removes reference to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues identified.

Proposed Ordinance Review Matrix
3/8/24

Ordinance Section K.C.C. Section	Type of Change	Current Code	Executive's Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 217 27.10.190	Clarification	Establishes permit fees for preliminary subdivisions, short subdivisions, Urban Planned Developments, and binding site plans for planning, fire flow and access, site engineering, critical area, survey, and state Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review	Removes references to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flag at H., there is a plat extension, which doesn't exist. See also comments at Section 23.
Section 218 27.10.200	Clarification	Establishes permit fees for final subdivisions, short subdivisions, Urban Planned Developments, binding site plans, subdivisional legal descriptions, and title reviews, approvals, and resubmittals.	Removes references to Urban Planned Developments	Amendments related to Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities are proposed throughout the Code to recognize that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no large undeveloped areas in the Urban Growth Area that would be appropriate for an Urban Planned Development-scale/Fully Contained Community-scale of development; and - the previous Urban Planned Development/Fully Contained Community agreements and permits have expired and are now under King County zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 222.Jjj 21A.55.060	Technical	Adopts the Low-Impact Development and Built Green Demonstration Project	Repealed	The provisions have expired	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 222 Kkk Through Ppp n/a	Technical	Adopts the Alluvial Fan Demonstration Project	Repealed	The provisions have expired	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 223 n/a	Technical	n/a	Directs the Executive to send Sections 30, 31, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147 of this ordinance and amendments to King County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 6 in Attachment A to this ordinance to the State Department of Ecology for its review and approval	These elements of this proposed ordinance amend elements of the Shoreline Master Program as adopted in K.C.C. 20.12.200. As such, these amendments are required to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Ecology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 224 n/a	Technical	n/a	Directs that Sections 30, 31, 136, 137, 138, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147 of this ordinance and amendments to King County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 6 in Attachment A to this ordinance do not go into effect until 14 days after Ecology's approval.	These elements of this proposed ordinance amend elements of the Shoreline Master Program as adopted in K.C.C. 20.12.200. As such, these amendments are required to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Ecology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.
Section 225 n/a	Substantive	n/a	Authorizes the Executive to submit an application to the Growth Management Planning Council to designate the Skyway and White Center UACs as countywide centers	The Countywide Planning Policies currently identify the Skyway and White Center Unincorporated Activity Centers as candidate centers. This action would allow the County to start the process to formalize their designation as approved countywide centers. Such a designation would allow them to be prioritized for additional infrastructure investments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section would authorize the Executive to apply to the Growth Management Planning Council to designate the Skyway and White Center Unincorporated Activity Centers as countywide centers. These areas were both designated as candidate countywide centers in 2021. This would strengthen the eligibility of these areas for PSRC's countywide, preservation, and bike/pedestrian funding programs. • It is a policy choice to move forward with the countywide center application.
Section 226 n/a	n/a	n/a	Severability	Standard King County severability language.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No issues identified.

MIDDLE HOUSING, INCLUSIONARY HOUSING, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS, VASHON HOUSING REVIEW MATRIX 3/14/24

Table 1. Definitions and Concepts

Topic	Concept	Zoning
What is missing middle?	<u>Comprehensive Plan Definition:</u> "Middle housing includes moderately scaled multi-unit or clustered housing types. Middle housing developments include more housing units than single-detached homes, but less than large apartment buildings. These housing types typically include, but are not limited to, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, multiplexes, townhouses, courtyard buildings, cottage houses, and live-work buildings"	Depends on the type of housing unit. See below.
What types of housing are considered missing middle?	"Dwelling unit, cottage housing. Dwelling unit, cottage housing: a detached single-family dwelling unit located on a commonly owned parcel with common open space."	R-1: Not allowed R-4 through R-8: Allowed R-12 through R-48: Not allowed NB: Not allowed RB: Not allowed O: Allowed
	"Dwelling unit, duplex: a dwelling unit contained in a building that is located on one legal lot or parcel, containing two dwelling units designed exclusively for occupancy by two individuals or families living independently of each other. The two units share a common roof, wall, or floor, although floorplans may vary. Individual units may be side-by-side or stacked one on top of the other. The two dwelling units and the lot are under a single ownership or may be owned through a condominium. A single-family dwelling containing an approved accessory dwelling unit is not considered a duplex."	R-1: Allowed when 50% site has critical areas R-4 through R-8: Allowed, max 18 du/acre net buildable area R-12 through R-48: Allowed NB: Allowed when mixed use RB: Allowed when mixed use O: Allowed when mixed use
	"Dwelling unit, triplex: a dwelling unit contained in a building that is located on one legal lot or parcel, containing three dwelling units designed exclusively for occupancy by three individuals or families living independently of each other. The three units share a common roof, wall, or floor, although floorplans may vary. Individual units may be side-by-side or stacked one on top of the other. The three dwelling units and the lot are under a single ownership or may be owned through a condominium."	R-1: Allowed when 50% site has critical areas R-4 through R-8: Allowed, max 18 du/acre net buildable area R-12 through R-48: Allowed NB: Allowed when mixed use RB: Allowed when mixed use O: Allowed when mixed use
	"Dwelling unit, fourplex: a dwelling unit contained in a building that is	R-1: Allowed when 50% site has critical

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 1. Definitions and Concepts

Topic	Concept	Zoning
	located on one legal lot or parcel, containing four dwelling units designed exclusively for occupancy by four individuals or families living independently of each other. The four units share a common roof, wall, or floor, although floorplans may vary. Individual units may be side-by-side or stacked one on top of the other. The two dwelling units and the lot are under a single ownership or may be owned through a condominium."	areas R-4 through R-8: Allowed, max 18 du/acre net buildable area R-12 through R-48: Allowed NB: Allowed when mixed use RB: Allowed when mixed use O: Allowed when mixed use
	"Dwelling unit, townhouse: a dwelling unit contained in a building containing ((one)) five or more dwelling units that ((occupies)) occupy space from the ground to the roof ((, and)) that is attached to one or more other townhouse dwellings by common walls."	R-1: Allowed R-4 through R-8: Allowed R-12 through R-48: Allowed NB: Allowed when mixed-use or if in the urban area in commercial outside of center standalone townhouses allowed RB: Allowed when mixed use O: Allowed when mixed use
	"Dwelling unit, apartment: a dwelling unit contained in a building consisting of ((two)) five or more dwelling units which may be stacked, or one or more dwellings with nonresidential uses."	R-1: Allowed when 50% site has critical areas R-4 through R-8: Allowed, max 18 du/acre net buildable area R-12 through R-48: Allowed NB: Allowed when mixed use RB: Allowed when mixed use O: Allowed when mixed use
Related Housing Types	"Dwelling unit, single detached: a detached building containing one dwelling unit."	R-1: Allowed R-4 through R-8: Allowed R-12 through R-48: Allowed NB: allowed in limited instances in the rural area
	"Dwelling unit, accessory: Dwelling unit, accessory: a separate, complete dwelling unit attached to or contained within the structure of the primary dwelling; or contained within a separate structure that is accessory to the primary dwelling unit on the premises."	Allowed in all zones when accessory to a primary residential use.

Table 1. Definitions and Concepts

Topic	Concept	Zoning
	<p>“Accessory living quarters: living quarters in an accessory building for the use of the occupant or persons employed on the premises, or for temporary use by guests of the occupant. Such quarters do not include an area for the preparation or storage of food and are not used as a separate dwelling unit.”</p>	Allowed in all zones when accessory to a primary residential use.
	<p>“Manufactured or mobile home: a structure, transportable in one or more sections, that in the traveling mode is eight body feet or more in width or thirty-two body feet or more in length; or when erected on site, is three-hundred square feet or more in area; which is built on a permanent chassis and is designated for use with or without a permanent foundation when attached to the required utilities; which contains plumbing, heating, air-conditioning and electrical systems; and shall include any structure that meets all the requirements of this section, or of Chapter 296-150M WAC, except the size requirements for which the manufacturer voluntarily complies with the standards and files the certification required by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. The term "manufactured home" or "mobile home" does not include a "recreational vehicle."”</p> <p>“Mobile home. See manufactured home.”</p>	
	<p>“Mobile home park: a development with two or more improved pads or spaces designed to accommodate mobile homes.”</p>	Conditional use in R-4 through R-8, permitted in R-12 through R-48.
Special Housing	<p>The Zoning Code includes uses for senior assisted housing, community residential facilities, dormitories and more.</p> <p>The Executive is proposing emergency housing options in the zoning code such as permanent supportive housing, emergency shelter, interim housing, and microshelter villages.</p> <p>These forms of housing have conditions or features that are unique from middle housing types. They are not covered in this document.</p>	
Inclusionary Housing	<p>The purpose of the inclusionary housing regulations is to provide for the creation of new affordable dwelling units, particularly in areas where there is a high risk for displacement.</p> <p>Developments that include affordable housing at the rates provided in the inclusionary housing regulations are given density incentives, such as 150% density bonus, additional height, or additional floor area ratio (FAR).</p>	<p>Inclusionary housing is required in the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline unincorporated activity centers (Skyway Business District and White Center).</p> <p>Inclusionary housing is optional in all other urban areas and rural towns served</p>

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 1. Definitions and Concepts

Topic	Concept	Zoning
	Developments can earn up to 200% density if the units are 100% affordable or if TDRs are purchased.	by sewer. Developments with fewer than 10 units do not have to meet inclusionary housing standards.

Table 2. Middle Housing Zoning, Density and Height Table

Zone	Housing Types and Base Density	Maximum Density	Height
R-1	Single detached and townhouses: - 1 du/acre Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and apartments: - Only permitted when more than half of the site has critical areas. 18 du/acre net buildable area	<u>Single detached:</u> - 1 du/acre <u>Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes:</u> - 150% of base density: o <10 units and within ½ mile of high-capacity transit - Only permitted when 50%+ of the site has critical areas. 18 du/acre net buildable area <u>Townhouses:</u> - 150% of base density: o <10 units and within ½ mile of high-capacity transit <u>Apartments:</u> - Only permitted when 50%+ of the site has critical areas. 18 du/acre net buildable area	- All housing types: o Base height: 35 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height everywhere else: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback)
R-4 to R-8	Single detached, townhouses, and cottage housing: - R-4: 4 du/acre	<u>Single detached and cottage housing:</u> - 150% of base density: o <10 units with TDRs outside Skyway-West Hill and North Highline (SWH/NH)	- <u>R-4, single detached, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, and apartments:</u> o Base height: 35 feet

Table 2. Middle Housing Zoning, Density and Height Table

Zone	Housing Types and Base Density	Maximum Density	Height
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - R-6: 6 du/acre - R-8: 8 du/acre <p>Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and apartments: 18 du/acre net buildable area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o 10+ units with inclusionary housing¹ - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project <p><u>Duplexes on small lots:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On lots over 4,500 sf, a duplex is allowed regardless of base density if a TDR credit is purchased and the site does not have an ADU <p><u>Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o <10 units and within ½ mile of high-capacity transit o 10+ units with inclusionary housing - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project - 18 du/acre net buildable area <p><u>Townhouses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o <10 units and within ½ mile of high-capacity transit o 10+ units with inclusionary housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback) o Max height if using IH: 45 feet if on a 15% slope, otherwise 35 feet <p>- <u>R-6 to R-8, single detached, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, and apartments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 35 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height everywhere else: 45 feet if site is 15% sloped o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback) o Max height if using IH: 45 feet if on a 15% slope, otherwise 35 feet <p>- <u>R-4 to R-8, cottage housing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 25 feet o Max height: 30 feet with pitched roof

¹ Use of Inclusionary housing requires that the development be either: 1) in Skyway-West Hill or North Highline, or 2) in an urban area or rural town with sewer service. This applies to all IH proposals, regardless of zone.

Table 2. Middle Housing Zoning, Density and Height Table

Zone	Housing Types and Base Density	Maximum Density	Height
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project <u>Apartments:</u> - 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o 10+ units with inclusionary housing - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project - 18 du/acre net buildable area 	
R-12 to R-48	Single detached, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and apartments - R-12: 12 du/acre - R-18: 18 du/acre - R-24: 24 du/acre - R-48: 48 du/acre	<u>Single detached:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Up to 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o 10+ units with inclusionary housing - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project <u>Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o <10 units and within ½ mile of high-capacity transit o 10+ units with inclusionary housing - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project - Duplexes only: allowed in R-4 through R-8 zones for 4,500 sf lots or greater without an ADU or ALQ when: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>R-12:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 60 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback) o Max height if using IH: 60 feet. - <u>R-18 to R-48:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 60 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback) o Max height if using IH: 80 feet o Max height if using TDR and not in SWH/NH: 80 feet

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 2. Middle Housing Zoning, Density and Height Table

Zone	Housing Types and Base Density	Maximum Density	Height
		<p>1) in Snoqualmie Pass and a TDR is purchased, or 2) when in the urban area and ½ TDR is purchased.</p> <p><u>Townhouses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o <10 units and within ½ mile of high-capacity transit o 10+ units with inclusionary housing - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project <p><u>Apartments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 150% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <10 units with TDRs outside SWH/NH o <10 units with inclusionary housing in SWH/NH o 10+ units with inclusionary housing - 200% of base density: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with inclusionary housing + TDRs o TDRs for affordable housing pilot project 	
NB	<p>8 du/acre</p> <p>Duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouses, and apartments must be mixed use development</p> <p><u>Urban area in commercial outside of center:</u></p>	<p><u>In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 du/ac with inclusionary housing - 16 du/ac with inclusionary housing + TDR <p><u>In all other urban areas or rural towns:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 12 du/acre with TDR - 16 du/acre with inclusionary housing + TDR <p><u>In the urban area in commercial outside of center:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 du/ac - standalone townhouses only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>NB:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 35 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height if mixed use: 45 feet o Max height if using IH: 65 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback) - <u>In the urban area in commercial outside of center:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 35 feet

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 2. Middle Housing Zoning, Density and Height Table

Zone	Housing Types and Base Density	Maximum Density	Height
	standalone townhouses are permitted		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Max height: 45 feet -townhouses only
CB	48 du/acre Duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouses, and apartments must be mixed use development	<u>In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline:</u> - 72 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing + TDR <u>In all other urban areas or rural towns:</u> - 72 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 72 du/acre with TDR - 96 du/ac with inclusionary housing + TDR - 96 du/ac for TDR affordable housing pilot project <u>In Snoqualmie Pass:</u> - 96 du/ac - using IH regs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>CB:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 35 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height if mixed use: 60 feet o Max height if using IH: 80 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback) - <u>Snoqualmie Pass:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 65 feet - <u>White Center (on 16th Ave SW between Roxbury and SW 100th St):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 55 feet
RB	36 du/acre - (Executive staff note this should be deleted) 48 du/acre Duplex, triplex, fourplex, townhouses, and apartments must be mixed use development	<u>In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline:</u> - 72 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing + TDR <u>In all other urban areas or rural towns:</u> - 72 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 72 du/acre with TDR - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing + TDR - 96 du/acre for mixed use using TDR <u>In Snoqualmie Pass (zone doesn't exist here):</u> - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>RB:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 35 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet o Max height if mixed use: 65 feet o Max height if using IH: 85 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback)
O	48 du/acre Duplex, triplex,	<u>In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline:</u> - 72 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing + TDR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>O:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base height: 35 feet o Max height for Vashon: 35 feet

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 2. Middle Housing Zoning, Density and Height Table

Zone	Housing Types and Base Density	Maximum Density	Height
	fourplex, townhouses, and apartments must be mixed use development	<p><u>In all other urban areas or rural towns:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 72 du/acre with inclusionary housing - 72 du/acre with TDR - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing + TDR - 96 du/acre for mixed use using TDR <p><u>In Snoqualmie Pass (zone doesn't exist here):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 96 du/acre with inclusionary housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Max height if mixed use: 65 feet o Max height if using IH: 85 feet o Max height if not using IH: up to 75 feet (1 ft height for 1 ft setback)

Table 3. Other Zoning Requirements

Other	Standards				
Recreational open space	<p>"21A.14.180 On-site recreation - space required.</p> <p>A. Residential developments, other than cottage housing developments, of more than four units in the UR and R-4 through R-48 zones, stand-alone townhouse developments in the NB zone on property designated commercial outside of center in the urban area of more than four units, and mixed-use developments of more than four units, shall provide recreation space for leisure, play and sport activities as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residential subdivision, townhouses and apartments developed at a density of eight units or less per acre: three hundred ninety square feet per unit; 2. Mobile home park: two hundred sixty square feet per unit; 3. Residential subdivisions developed at a density of greater than eight units per acre: one hundred seventy square feet per unit; and 4. Apartments and townhouses developed at a density of greater than eight units per acre and mixed use: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Studio and one bedroom: ninety square feet per unit; b. Two bedrooms: one hundred seventy square feet per unit; and c. Three or more bedrooms: one hundred seventy square feet per unit. <p>B. Recreation space shall be placed in a designated recreation space tract if part of a subdivision. The tract shall be dedicated to a homeowner's association or other workable organization acceptable to the director, to provide continued maintenance of the recreation space tract consistent with K.C.C. 21A.14.200."</p>				
Parking	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>LAND USE</th> <th>MINIMUM PARKING SPACES REQUIRED</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	LAND USE	MINIMUM PARKING SPACES REQUIRED		
LAND USE	MINIMUM PARKING SPACES REQUIRED				

Table 3. Other Zoning Requirements

Other	Standards	
	RESIDENTIAL (K.C.C. 21A.08.030.A.):	
	Single detached/Townhouse	2.0 per dwelling unit
	Duplex, triplex, fourplex	1.0 per dwelling unit
	Apartment:	
	Studio units	1.2 per dwelling unit
	One bedroom units	1.5 per dwelling unit
	Two bedroom units	1.7 per dwelling unit
	Three bedroom units or larger	2.0 per dwelling unit
	Mobile home park	2.0 per dwelling unit
	Senior ((citizen)) assisted housing	1 per 2 dwelling or sleeping units
	Community residential facilities	1 per ((two)) 2 bedrooms
	Dormitory, including religious	1 per ((two)) 2 bedrooms
	Hotel/Motel including organizational hotel/lodging	1 per bedroom
	Bed and breakfast guesthouse	1 per guest room, plus 2 per facility
	Cottage housing	1 per dwelling unit
Apartments and Townhouses build under Inclusionary Housing K.C.C. 21A.48	1 per dwelling unit	

Table 4. Inclusionary Housing

	Standards	Policy Staff Comments
Mandatory Areas	Mandatory inclusionary housing applies to areas with an unincorporated activity center land use designation. This includes the Skyway Business District and White Center.	In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline, areas outside of the unincorporated activity center is voluntary.

Table 4. Inclusionary Housing

	Standards			Policy Staff Comments	
Mandatory Requirements	Mandatory Affordability Requirements		TDR Allowance	<p>Inclusionary housing is required any time more than 1 unit is developed or substantially improved in the mandatory area. In the voluntary area, this threshold is up to 9 units.</p> <p>The occupancy type and AMI levels were recommended by DCHS and DLS in 2022, who stated "At the time of ordinance development, market rents in SWH and NH were affordable to households at 80 percent AMI. Therefore, the inclusionary housing options scale from 50% AMI rent levels to 70% AMI rent levels." The provisions do not include an option for Rental at 80% AMI.</p>	
	Occupancy Type and AMI	Minimum % of Units Required to be Affordable	Maximum Density (as % of base density)		Additional Maximum Density Allowed with purchase of TDRs
	Owner Occupied at 80% AMI	100%	200%		None
		30%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
		15%	125%		Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density
	Any combination of 80% AMI (Owner) and 60% AMI (Rental)	100%	200%		None
		25%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
		12%	125%		Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density
	Rental at 60% AMI	100%	200%		None
		20%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
		10%	125%		Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density
	Rental at 50% AMI	100%	200%		None
		15%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
7%		125%	Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density		
Voluntary Areas	<p>"2. The voluntary incentives in K.C.C. 21A.48.030 shall apply to:</p> <p>a. <u>areas in the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline community service area subarea geographies</u> that do not have an unincorporated activity center land use designation; and</p> <p>b. <u>except as provided for in subsection B.1. and B.2. of this section, sites that are served by public sewers and that are in the following zones in the urban area or rural towns:</u></p> <p>(1) <u>the R-4 through R-48 zones; and</u></p>			<p>The voluntary provisions apply outside of White Center and the Skyway Business District. Skyway-West Hill and North Highline do not need to be served by public sewer to use inclusionary housing.</p>	

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 4. Inclusionary Housing

	Standards			Policy Staff Comments	
	<u>(2) the NB, CB, RB, and O zones when part of a mixed-use development”</u>			In the R-4 through R-48, NB, CB, RB, and O zones inside the urban area or rural town, they must be sewered.	
Voluntary Area Standards	Affordability Requirements			<p>In the NB, CB, RB, and O zones in all other areas of the county, properties can purchase the same amount of density shown here using TDRs only. In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline, properties must provide inclusionary housing consistent with the table to earn additional density.</p> <p>According to the Housing Appendix, 18 units of housing have been constructed under the IH regulations and 40 units are projected over the next 20 years. The Executive indicates that inclusionary housing program will produce some income-restricted units but is unlikely to produce a significant amount of affordable housing on its own.</p>	
	Occupancy Type and AMI	Minimum % of Units Required to be Affordable	Maximum Density (as % of base density)		TDR Allowance
	Developments with 9 or fewer units	0%	100%		Up to 150% base density
	Rental at 60% AMI	100%	200%		None
		20%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
		10%	125%		Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density
	Rental at 50% AMI	100%	200%		None
		15%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
		7%	125%		Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density
	Owner Occupied at 80% AMI	100%	200%		None
		30%	150%		Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density
		15%	125%		Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density
	Any combination of 80% AMI (Owner) and 60% AMI (Rental)	100%	200%		None
25%		150%	Additional 50%, up to 200% of base density		
12%		125%	Additional 50%, up to 175% of base density		
	C. In Vashon Rural Town:				

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 4. Inclusionary Housing

	Standards	Policy Staff Comments
	<p><u>1. Only developments that provide one hundred percent affordable housing are eligible; and</u></p> <p><u>2. Use of the TDR allowance is prohibited.</u></p>	
Calculation of affordable dwelling units	<p>"2. Affordable dwelling units in the development shall be calculated as follows:</p> <p>a. Studio dwelling units shall be counted as one-half of one affordable dwelling unit;</p> <p>b. One-bedroom and two-bedroom dwelling units shall be counted as one affordable dwelling unit;</p> <p>c. Three-bedroom dwelling units shall be counted as one and one-half affordable dwelling units; and</p> <p>d. Dwelling units with four or more bedrooms shall be counted as two affordable dwelling units.</p> <p>B. <u>Base density is as established in K.C.C. chapter 21A.12 or in in property-specific development conditions or special district overlays, where applicable. In cases of conflict, the base density in the property-specific development condition or special district overlay shall apply.</u></p> <p>C. <u>The total number of market-rate dwelling units and affordable dwelling units shall not exceed the total allowed density as established in this chapter and K.C.C. chapter 21A.12 or as established in property-specific development conditions or special district overlays, where applicable. In cases of conflict, the maximum density in the property-specific development condition or special district overlay shall apply."</u></p>	<p>This section describes how the number of affordable dwelling units are calculated. The system provides additional weight to units with more bedrooms. No issues identified.</p>
Inclusionary Housing Construction Standards	<p>"For developments subject to this chapter:</p> <p>A. The affordable dwelling units shall:</p> <p>1. Have a similar or larger unit size and bedroom composition as the market-rate dwelling units in the development;</p> <p>2. Be integrated throughout the development;</p> <p>3. Be constructed with materials and finishes of comparable quality to the market-rate dwelling units in the development;</p> <p>4. Meet accessibility standards at the same ratio as required by the development; and</p> <p>5. Have access equal to that of the market-rate dwelling units to on-site amenities including, but not limited to, parks, outdoor play areas, pools, exercise facilities and equipment, gathering spaces, bicycle repair facilities, shared work spaces, and similar on-site amenities."</p>	<p>These standards are intended to ensure that affordable units within a development are not isolated to certain areas or floors of a building. No issues identified.</p>

Table 4. Inclusionary Housing

	Standards	Policy Staff Comments
Inclusionary Housing Dimensional Standards	<p>“B. All the dimensional standards of K.C.C. chapter 21A.12 and any applicable property-specific development standards and special district overlays apply, except as specifically prescribed by this chapter. The following modifications shall only be utilized for developments that provide housing in conformance with K.C.C. 21A.48.020 or K.C.C. 21A.48.030:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The maximum height limits are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In the R-18, R-24, and R-48 zones, eighty feet; b. In the NB zone, sixty-five feet; c. In the CB zone, eighty feet; d. In the RB and O zones, eighty-five feet; ((and)) e. For properties subject to P-Suffix ((NH-PXX (the p-suffix established in Map Amendment 17 of Attachment D to Ordinance 19555))) <u>NH-P04</u>: the height limits set in the P-Suffix; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> f. <u>In the CB zone in Snoqualmie Pass Rural Town, sixty-five feet; and</u> g. <u>In Vashon Rural Town, thirty-five feet;</u> 2. In the R-18, R-24, and R-48 zones, any portion of a building that exceeds the base height for the zone ((set forth)) in K.C.C. chapter 21A.12 shall be set back an additional ten feet from the street property line and interior property line; 3. In the NB, CB, RB, and O zones, any portion of a building that exceeds the maximum height allowed for the zone by K.C.C. 21A.12.040.B.6. shall be set back an additional ten feet from the street property line and interior property line; 4. The percentages of residential uses in mixed use developments in K.C.C. 21A.14.110 do not apply. The percentages are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a maximum of seventy-five percent of the total built floor area when located in NB zones; and b. a maximum of eighty-five percent of the total built floor area when located in CB, RB, and O zones; 5. The building floor area ratios in K.C.C. 21A.14.130 do not apply. Developments subject to this chapter shall not have a floor area ratio maximum; and 6. The parking and circulation standards of K.C.C. chapter 21A.18 apply, except: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The minimum required parking spaces for apartments and townhouses shall be one space per dwelling unit; b. The minimum required parking spaces for nonresidential uses of the project shall be the minimum required in K.C.C. 21A.18.020, or the minimum required in any 	<p>This section identifies some additional development benefits for inclusionary housing developments.</p>

Table 4. Inclusionary Housing

	Standards	Policy Staff Comments
	<p>applicable property-specific development standard or special district overlay, whichever is less; and</p> <p>c. The director may authorize a reduction of up to fifty percent of the minimum required number of spaces for inclusionary housing projects without a required a parking study. The director shall consider proximity to transit, bedroom composition, availability of on-street parking, and proposed nonresidential uses when determining the size of the reduction.”</p>	

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
<p>“(3) The accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed one thousand square feet of heated floor area and one thousand square feet of unheated floor area except:</p> <p>(a) when the accessory dwelling unit is wholly contained within a basement or attic, this limitation does not apply;</p> <p>(b) for detached accessory dwelling units, the floor area contained in a basement does not count toward the floor area maximum; or</p> <p>(c) on a site zoned RA if one transferable development right is purchased from the Rural Area or Natural Resource Lands under K.C.C. chapter 21A.37, the accessory dwelling unit is permitted a maximum heated floor area of one thousand five hundred square feet and one thousand five-hundred square feet of unheated floor area;”</p>	<p>“(1) The accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed one thousand square feet of heated floor area and one thousand square feet of unheated floor area except:</p> <p>(a) when the accessory dwelling unit is wholly contained within a basement or attic, this limitation does not apply; or</p> <p>(b) for detached accessory dwelling units, the floor area contained in a basement does not count toward the floor area maximum;”</p>	<p>(b) There is the possibility of having 2 ADUs in a single structure detached from the primary unit. This could mean there could be a building detached from the primary structure with an ADU at ground level with 1,000 sf of heated and 1,000 sf of unheated, and a second ADU in the basement with 2,000 sf of heated.</p> <p>(c) The proposal removes allowances to use TDRs to build bigger ADUs in the rural area, or to build them on smaller lots. Removal of these allowances is a policy choice.</p>
<p>“(4) Accessory dwelling units that are not wholly contained within an existing dwelling unit shall not exceed the base height</p>	<p><i>No equivalent standard</i></p>	<p>(4) Under the current code, ADUs cannot exceed the base height for the zone. The proposal would remove this, allowing</p>

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
established in 21A.12.030;"		<p>ADUs to potentially reach 75 feet (which is theoretically possible since 8 or more ADUs could be allowed per lot).</p> <p>If K.C.C. 21A.08.030 is silent on height, then just the standards in K.C.C. 21A.12.030 apply. Executive staff indicate that the standards in K.C.C. 21A.12.030 aligns with new RCW 36.70A.681(1)(g): "The... county may not establish roof height limits on an accessory dwelling unit of less than 24 feet..."</p>
	<p>"(2) Attached accessory dwelling units shall have at least one common wall with the primary dwelling unit and appear to be contained within one structure. Connection through a breezeway or covered pathway shall not constitute an attached accessory dwelling unit unless the breeze way or covered pathway is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) is less than ten feet in length; (b) shares a common wall with both the accessory dwelling unit and primary residence; (c) has a continuous roofline that appears to be one single building; (d) is completely enclosed; and (e) is heated space;" 	<p>(c) Requires attached ADUs using a covered pathway or breezeway to have "a continuous roofline that appears to be one single building." Executive staff indicate that the intent is that the rooflines appear to be connected when viewed from the air (plan view). They do not necessarily have to be the same height, but should share one or more unifying features, such as: ridges, valleys, eaves, or termination on a common wall with the ADU and primary residence. This could be clarified.</p>
"(6) No additional off-street parking spaces are required for accessory dwelling units;"	"(3) No additional off-street parking spaces are required for accessory dwelling units;"	No issues identified.
"(7) The primary dwelling unit or the accessory dwelling unit shall be occupied either by the owner of the primary dwelling	<i>No equivalent standard</i>	RCW 36.70A.681(1)(b) prohibits, in the urban area, restrictions on owner occupancy. There are no restrictions in

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
unit or by an immediate family member of the owner. Immediate family members are limited to spouses, siblings, parents, grandparents, children and grandchildren, either by blood, adoption or marriage, of the owner. The accessory dwelling unit shall be converted to another permitted use or shall be removed if neither dwelling unit is occupied by the owner or an immediate family member;"		the rural area.
"(8) An applicant seeking to build an accessory dwelling unit shall file a notice approved by the department of executive services, records and licensing services division, that identifies the dwelling unit as accessory. The notice shall run with the land. The applicant shall submit proof that the notice was filed before the department approves any permit for the construction of the accessory dwelling unit. The required contents and form of the notice shall be set forth in administrative rules;"	"(4) An applicant seeking to build an accessory dwelling unit shall file a notice approved by the department of executive services, records and licensing services division, that identifies the dwelling unit as accessory. The notice shall run with the land. The applicant shall submit proof that the notice was filed before the department approves any permit for the construction of the accessory dwelling unit. The required contents and form of the notice shall be established in administrative rules;"	No issues identified.
"(9) Accessory dwelling units are not allowed in the F zone;"	"(5) Accessory dwelling units are not allowed in the F zone;"	No issues identified.
	"(6) For lots in the UR, R-1 through R-48, and NB zones in the urban growth area and that meet the minimum lot area for construction in K.C.C. 21A.12.100:"	(6) Previously, ADUs were allowed with townhouses in the CB, RB, and O zone. This allowance appears to be removed (or at least, the code is silent on them). Previously, 1 attached ADU was allowed on any urban lot with a SFR or townhouse. This proposal would prohibit ADUs on urban lots less than 2,500 sf.
"(1) Only one accessory dwelling per primary single detached dwelling or townhouse	<u>"(a) Two accessory dwelling units are allowed per primary single detached</u>	The new state law only requires 2 ADUs per lot. This proposal goes beyond that

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
unit; (2) Only allowed in the same building as the primary dwelling unit, except that detached accessory dwelling units are allowed when there is no more than one primary dwelling unit on the lot, and the following conditions are met: (a) the lot must be three thousand two hundred square feet or greater if located in the urban area or a rural town;"	<u>dwelling unit, duplex, triplex, fourplex, or townhouse unit in the following configurations:</u> <u>(i) one attached accessory dwelling unit and one detached accessory dwelling unit;</u> <u>(ii) two attached accessory dwelling units; or</u> <u>(iii) two detached accessory dwelling units, which may be either one or two detached structures;"</u>	by allowing 2 ADUs per primary unit, including for middle housing. A property with a fourplex could in theory have 8 ADUs in addition to the fourplex. This is a policy choice. Executive staff indicated to policy staff that they intended to allow 2 ADUs per lot.
<i>No equivalent standard</i>	<u>"(b) Accessory dwelling units may be converted from existing structures, including but limited to garages, even if the existing structure violates requirements for setbacks or maximum impervious surface percentage; and"</u>	(b) This language reflects the RCW requirements for ADUs, but the language could potentially be interpreted to require the County to allow conversion of illegally built structures to ADUs. As this likely was not the legislature's intent, this could be clarified to "even if the existing structure is legally nonconforming with respect to setbacks or maximum impervious surface percentage."
<i>No equivalent standard</i>	<u>"(c) No public street improvements are required for accessory dwelling units;"</u>	No issues identified.
<u>"(5) When the primary and accessory dwelling units are located in the same building, or in multiple buildings connected by a breezeway or other structure, only one entrance may front a street;"</u>	<i>No equivalent standard</i>	RCW 36.70A.681(1)(h) prohibits, in the urban area, restrictions on ADU entry door locations that are more restrictive than the primary unit. No issues identified.
<u>"(10) Accessory dwelling units should be designed to be compatible with the primary dwelling unit and the surrounding properties, including material, colors, and building forms; and"</u>	<i>No equivalent standard</i>	RCW 36.70A.681(1)(h) prohibits, in the urban area, ADU aesthetic requirements that are more restrictive than the primary unit. No issues identified.
<u>"(11) The applicant should consider</u>	<i>No equivalent standard</i>	RCW 36.70A.681(1)(h) prohibits, in the

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
a siting alternatives study that analyzes placement options of the accessory dwelling unit on the property to minimize impacts to privacy and views for surrounding property owners((-);”		urban area, design review that are more restrictive than the primary unit. No issues identified.
	<u>“(7) For lots in the rural area or on natural resource lands:”</u>	
<u>“(1) Only one accessory dwelling per primary single detached dwelling or townhouse unit;”</u>	<u>“(a) only one accessory dwelling unit per primary single detached dwelling unit;”</u>	(a) Under the current code, townhouses in the rural area are allowed to have ADUs. This allowance is removed in the proposal. Whether to remove this allowance is a policy choice.
<p><u>“(2) Only allowed in the same building as the primary dwelling unit, except that detached accessory dwelling units are allowed when there is no more than one primary dwelling unit on the lot, and the following conditions are met:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the lot must be three thousand two hundred square feet or greater if located in the urban area or a rural town; or</u></p> <p><u>(b) the lot must meet the minimum lot area for the applicable zone if located in the rural area but not in a rural town, except that if one transferable development right is purchased from the Rural Area or Natural Resource Lands under K.C.C. chapter 21A.37, a detached accessory dwelling unit is allowed on a RA-5 zoned lot that is two and one-half acres or greater;”</u></p>	<p><u>“(b) Only allowed in the same building as the primary dwelling unit, except that detached accessory dwelling units are allowed when there is no more than one primary dwelling unit on the lot, and the following conditions are met:</u></p> <p><u>(i) the lot must be three thousand two hundred square feet or greater if located in a rural town; or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) the lot must meet the minimum lot area for the applicable zone if located in the rural area but not in a rural town or on natural resource lands;”</u></p>	<p>(b) The proposal removes allowances to use TDRs to build bigger ADUs in the rural area, or to build them on smaller lots.</p> <p>When asked on the rationale for removing the TDR allowance, Executive staff indicated that:</p> <p>For rural substandard lots, the change is intended to comply with recent state guidance for rural ADUs based on recent case law. ADU's would still be allowed on substandard lots, but would be required to be attached.</p> <p>For size limitations, the current code allows RA-zoned properties to increase both the heated and unheated floor areas to up to 1,500 sq ft each if a TDR is purchased. This is proposed to be removed due to the same guidance/case</p>

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
		law mentioned above, which states that standards for rural ADUs should not be the same as for urban ADUs, i.e. that rural ADU regulations should include additional standards that further limit the size/scale/impact/etc. of the ADU than what is allowed for urban ADUs.
“(5) When the primary and accessory dwelling units are located in the same building, or in multiple buildings connected by a breezeway or other structure, only one entrance may front a street;”	“(c) When the primary and accessory dwelling unit are located in the same building, or in multiple buildings connected by a breezeway or covered pathway, only one entrance may front a street;”	(c) RCW 36.70A.680(2) does not prohibit the County from regulating ADU entry door locations in the rural area. No issues identified.
“(10) Accessory dwelling units should be designed to be compatible with the primary dwelling unit and the surrounding properties, including material, colors, and building forms; and”	“(d) Accessory dwelling units should be designed to be compatible with the primary dwelling unit and the surrounding properties, including material, colors, and building forms; ”	(d) RCW 36.70A.680(2) does not prohibit the County from regulating aesthetic requirements in the rural area. No issues identified.
“(11) The applicant should consider a siting alternatives study that analyzes placement options of the accessory dwelling unit on the property to minimize impacts to privacy and views for surrounding property owners.”	“(e) The applicant should consider a siting alternatives study that analyzes placement options of the accessory dwelling unit on the property to minimize impacts to privacy and views for surrounding property owners; and”	(e) RCW 36.70A.680(2) does not prohibit the County from encouraging ADU site analysis in the rural area. No issues identified.
<i>No equivalent standard</i>	“(f) Accessory dwelling units in structures detached from the primary dwelling unit shall be counted as a separate dwelling unit for the purpose of lot calculations in place at the time of a proposed subdivision. If an accessory dwelling unit in a detached building in the rural zone is subsequently converted to a primary unit on a separate lot, neither the original lot nor the new lot may have an	(f) This standard was deleted by the Council in 2020 and is proposed to be added back in by the Executive. As written, the code would treat properties differently based on whether an ADU existed on a property prior to subdivision. For example, if someone has a ten-acre property in the RA-5 zone, and they have a detached ADU, the ADU would become the primary unit on the

Table 5. Accessory Dwelling Units and Living Quarters

Existing Standards	Executive Proposed Standards	Policy Staff Comments
	additional detached accessory dwelling unit constructed unless the lot is at least twice the minimum lot area required by the zone in K.C.C. 21A.12.030 or 21A.12.040."	second property when they subdivide, and neither property can ever have an ADU again. On the other hand, if someone has the same property without an ADU, and subdivides and builds a new home on the second property, both properties can then build ADUs.
"b. Accessory living quarters: (1) are limited to one per lot;"	"b. Accessory living quarters: (1) are limited to one per primary single detached dwelling unit;"	(b)(1) The County currently allows one accessory living quarters per lot, regardless of the type of primary unit. The proposal would change this to one per primary single detached dwelling unit only. This would both 1) would prohibit townhouses, apartments, middle housing, and other residential uses from having ALQs and 2) allow more than 1 ALQ per lot if there were more than one primary detached unit (which is allowed with a CUP) (the Executive states this was not the intent). Whether to make each of these changes or retain the existing language is a policy choice.
(2) are allowed only on lots of three thousand two hundred square feet or greater when located in the urban area or a rural town;	(2) are allowed only on lots of three thousand two hundred square feet or greater when located in the urban area or a rural town;	No issues identified.
"(3) shall not exceed the base height as established in K.C.C. 21A.12.030;"	"(3) shall not exceed the base height as established in K.C.C. 21A.12.030;"	No issues identified.
"(4) shall not exceed one thousand square feet of heated floor area and one thousand square feet of unheated floor area; and"	"(4) shall not exceed one thousand square feet of heated floor area and one thousand square feet of unheated floor area; and"	No issues identified.
"(5) are not allowed in the F zone."	"(5) are not allowed in the F zone."	No issues identified.

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 6. Vashon Rural Town

Topic	Alternative Housing Demo Project	Vashon Special District Overlay SO-270	Inclusionary Housing
Location	<p>The alternative housing demonstration project applies to two parcels zoned R-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3123039138 - 3123039108 <p>The demonstration project expires on July 19, 2024.</p> 	<p>The development is located on an eligible parcel as shown in the map below.</p> 	<p>R-4 through R-48, NB, CB, RB, and O in the rural town when served by sewer.</p> 
Affordability Requirement	<p>No affordability requirement.</p>	<p>At least 50 percent of the units must be affordable at or below 60% AMI.</p> <p>Remainder of the units must be affordable to 80% AMI maximum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100% of units must be owner occupied at 80% AMI; - 100% of units must be either owner occupied at 80% AMI or rental at 60% AMI; - 100% of units must be rental at 60% AMI; or

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 6. Vashon Rural Town

Topic	Alternative Housing Demo Project	Vashon Special District Overlay SO-270	Inclusionary Housing
Maximum Density	No more than 5 buildings with each building containing 8 dwelling and sleeping units. Units are limited to 350-385 sf each.	R-1: 4 du/acre or 400% R-4: 8 du/acre or 200% R-8: 18 du/acre or 225% R-12: 18 du/acre or 150% CB: 18 du/acre or 37.5%	- 100% of units must be rental at 50% AMI Under a 100% affordable development (which is required in the Vashon Rural Town under the Executive's proposal) the following maximum densities apply: R-1: not allowed. R-4: 8 du/acre or 200% R-8: 16 du/acre or 200% R-12: 24 du/acre or 200% CB: 96 du/acre or 200% If the Council chooses to not require 100% affordable housing, the maximum density would range from 125 to 150% depending on the number of units provided and the AMI.
Height	No height limit specified. Projects would be subject to the Executive-proposed height limit of 35 feet in the Vashon Rural Town. Waivers may be requested.	No height limit specified. Projects would be subject to the Executive-proposed height limit of 35 feet in the Vashon Rural Town.	Maximum 35 feet
Affordability Duration	No affordability requirement.	Rental affordable housing units: 30 years Ownership affordable housing units: 50 years from the date of final certificate of occupancy.	Renter-occupied dwelling units: for the life of the development project Owner-occupied dwelling units: 50 years from the date of initial occupancy
Utility Connections	No connection requirement.	All new units must connect to public water and public sewer.	Must be connected to public sewer to be eligible.
On-site recreation requirements	Communal space, such as kitchen facilities, recreational space, and lounges, must be	1. Subdivision, townhouses and apartments with 8 du/acre or less: 195 sf/unit	1. Subdivision, townhouses and apartments with 8 du/acre or less: 390 sf/unit 2. Mobile home park: 260 sf/unit

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 6. Vashon Rural Town

Topic	Alternative Housing Demo Project	Vashon Special District Overlay SO-270	Inclusionary Housing
	provided at a rate of 12% of the total floor area of units.	2. Mobile home park: 130 sf/unit 3. Subdivisions greater than 8 du/acre: 85 sf/unit 4. Apartments and townhouses with more than 8 du/acre and mixed use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Studio and one bedroom: 45 sf/unit b. 2 bedrooms: 85 sf/unit c. 3 or more bedrooms: 85 sf/unit 	3. Subdivisions greater than 8 du/acre: 170 sf/unit 4. Apartments and townhouses with more than 8 du/acre and mixed use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Studio and one bedroom: 90 sf/unit b. 2 bedrooms: 170 sf/unit c. 3 or more bedrooms: 170 sf/unit
Parking	No parking limit specified. Projects would be subject to the parking standards in K.C.C. 21A.18. Waivers may be requested.	1 off-street parking space per unit. The director may require additional parking, up to the maximum standards for attached dwelling units, which may be provided in common parking areas. Off-street parking may be reduced below one per unit, with the approval of the director, with submission of a site-specific parking study that demonstrates that parking demand is met.	1 off-street parking space per unit. The minimum required parking spaces for nonresidential uses shall be the minimum required in K.C.C. 21A.18.020, or the minimum required in any applicable property-specific development standard or special district overlay, whichever is less. The director may authorize a reduction of up to 50% for inclusionary housing projects without a required a parking study. The director shall consider proximity to transit, bedroom composition, availability of on-street parking, and proposed nonresidential uses when determining the size of the reduction.
Covenant	Not required.	Required.	Required.
Water reduction requirements	No requirement.	2. To reduce the impacts of a new development on potable water supplies, the development shall incorporate at least three of the following water conservation	No requirement for IH.

Note: Executive rationale is provided in the main Proposed Ordinance review matrix.

Table 6. Vashon Rural Town

Topic	Alternative Housing Demo Project	Vashon Special District Overlay SO-270	Inclusionary Housing
		measures, and that only one of the outdoor measures from subsection C.3.a. through h. of this section may be counted toward the minimum requirement: <i>[list not included in this table]</i>	
Meetings	No public meeting requirement.	"Conduct the meeting in a location accessible to the public at least thirty days before the anticipated date of application. The purpose of the meeting is to provide neighboring property owners and residents with information regarding the proposed development and to answer questions regarding the proposed development."	No public meeting requirement.

EMERGENCY AND SUPPORTED HOUSING

The matrices below outline policy options related to emergency and supported housing uses in Proposed Ordinance 2023-0440 and the proposed Comprehensive Plan.

The Growth Management Act requires the County to plan to accommodate housing needs of residents at every income level. The Countywide Planning Policies establish the allocations of housing need for each jurisdiction. The table below was included as lead-in text to emergency and supported housing policies in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan and shows the identified housing need for urban unincorporated King County by income level.

Relevant to the proposed zoning regulations and Comprehensive Plan policies, the identified need for emergency housing and shelter is 1,034 beds/units by and 608 additional permanent supportive housing units by 2044.

Table 1. Projected Housing Needs by Income Level in Unincorporated King County

Income Level	% Median Income	Net New Units Needed, 2019-2044
Extremely low	0-30% Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	608
	0-30% Other (non-PSH)	1,157
Very low	>30-50%	571
Low	>50-80%	292
Moderate	>80-100%	366
	>100-120%	415
Above Moderate	>120%	2,003
All Income Levels		5,412
Temporary Housing Needs		Net New Beds Needed, 2019-2044
Emergency Housing/Shelter		1,034

Table 2. Emergency Shelter and Supported Housing Definitions and Zoning Requirements

This table identifies each emergency and supported housing type and the proposed zoning requirements.

Definition	Zoning	Additional Requirements	Policy Staff Comments
<p>Emergency Housing: emergency housing is defined as “permanent facilities providing temporary indoor accommodations for individuals or families who are homeless or at imminent risk of becoming homeless that is intended to address the basic health, food, clothing, and personal hygiene needs of individuals or families. Emergency housing includes: emergency supportive housing; emergency shelters; interim housing; microshelter villages; recuperative housing; and safe parking.”</p>	<p>Landscaping. As proposed, all emergency housing uses would be considered “group residences.” They would be required to meet the standards for "Attached /Group residences," which includes 10 ft of Type III landscaping along street frontages, 5-10 ft of Type II on interior lot lines, and 20 sf of landscaping per parking stall.</p> <p>Shorelines. Emergency housing would be allowed in the high intensity and residential shorelines. This is a policy choice.</p>	<p>All emergency housing applications are required to include a description of the staffing and operating characteristics, occupancy policies, a plan for managing the exterior appearance, contact information, an outreach plan for surrounding owners and residents, and a site plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definitions for various emergency housing uses switch the terms "persons" and "individuals" interchangeably. • This definition could use the term "household" instead of "family," as the term "family" has a specific definition in Section 85 that may not be appropriate here, especially as the other definitions use "households". • "Recuperative Housing" is more of a medical use and is not the same type of emergency housing as the others listed 1) could be removed from the Emergency Housing definition list and be a standalone use, or 2) the definition of Emergency Housing could be broadened encompass this use. • Safe Parking is not an “indoor facility” and would not meet the definition of emergency housing, despite being listed as an example. • Emergency housing would be subject to school concurrency standards in K.C.C. 21A.28. • Executive staff note that emergency housing should be added to the list of exemptions from school concurrency.
<p>Emergency shelter. A permanent facility that operates more than one hundred and eighty days in a calendar year and provides a temporary shelter for individuals or families who are currently homeless. Emergency shelters may include day and warming centers that</p>	<p>R-1: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-4 through R-8: Conditional use; must be in the urban area; on the same site as a religious facility, public agency, or other specific social services uses; and consistent with the additional</p>	<p>24/7 shelters shall be staffed 24 hours per day with beds and rooms assigned to specific residents for the duration of their stay. Overnight and rotating shelters shall provide on-site supervision while operating. A lease agreement for residents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As proposed, this use is required to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) in the R-4 through R-8 zones. Could change the Executive’s proposal from a Conditional Use to a Permitted Use and modify DC20 related to CUP requirements. Alternatively, consider whether associated uses, such as social services, associated with this proposed use should require a CUP. • This definition is consistent with the KCRHA's definition. The definition largely aligns with state law, except the requirement that emergency shelters operate more than 180 days in a calendar year.

Definition	Zoning	Additional Requirements	Policy Staff Comments
<p>do not provide overnight accommodations.</p> <p>Additional definitions: Rotating shelter. An emergency shelter where the hosting organizations host shelter operations for a brief time, rotating the shelter operations between its participating host locations.</p>	<p>requirements in the next column.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, and O: Permitted use when in the urban growth area and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed.</p>	<p>is allowed, but not required.</p> <p>Minimum parking spaces required for all emergency shelter units: 1 per 2 employees, plus 1 per 20 units/beds.</p> <p>Exempt from onsite recreation, landscaping, bicycling, and electric vehicle parking requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This definition uses the term "temporary," which potentially conflicts with how other temporary uses are characterized and regulated in the zoning code. • There is another temporary shelter use that includes temporary shelters like severe weather shelters, not addressed as emergency housing. However, the definition is much broader and overlaps with emergency housing. The Council may wish to address this. • Emergency shelter would not be allowed in NB zones, though the uses do not appear incongruent with that zoning. Executive staff indicate that there is sufficient capacity, without the NB zone being included, for emergency housing uses. This is a policy choice.
<p>Emergency supportive housing. Housing where persons experiencing chronic homelessness or persons at risk of chronic homelessness can reside temporarily while seeking permanent housing, and that offers housing-oriented services, case management, and other necessary services and supports to assist households in stabilizing.</p>	<p>R-1 through R-8: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, and O: Permitted use when in the urban growth area and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed.</p>	<p>Facilities shall be staffed and operational 24 hours per day; specific rooms and units shall be assigned to specific residents for the duration of their stay; on site services are limited to residents; all vehicles on site shall be licensed and operational; and a lease agreement for residents is allowed but not required.</p> <p>Exempt from onsite recreation, landscaping, bicycling, and electric vehicle parking requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This definition is consistent with the Health through Housing Implementation Plan definition. • Council could define the term "stabilizing", as it is not defined. • Emergency supportive housing would not be allowed in NB zones, though the uses do not appear incongruent with that zoning. Executive staff indicate that there is sufficient capacity, without the NB zone being included, for emergency housing uses. This is a policy choice.
<p>Recuperative housing. Housing that is designed for persons experiencing homelessness who are not acutely sick enough to warrant a hospital stay but have needs beyond what can typically be</p>	<p>R-1: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-4 through R-8: Conditional use; must be in the urban area; on the same site as a religious facility, public agency, or other specific</p>	<p>Recuperative housing is subject to the following criteria: prospective residents shall be referred by off site providers; facilities shall be staffed and in operation 24 hours a day; rooms shall be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the KCRHA's definition. • As proposed, this use is required to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) in the R-4 through R-8 zones. Council could change this from a Conditional Use to a Permitted Use, with a change to DC20 that would require a site with an existing CUP to obtain a new CUP or modify the existing CUP.

Definition	Zoning	Additional Requirements	Policy Staff Comments
addressed in a traditional housing environment.	<p>social services uses; and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, and O: Permitted use when in the urban growth area and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed.</p>	<p>assigned to specific residents for the duration of their stay; on site services shall be limited to residents; all vehicles shall be licensed and operational; and lease agreements for residents are allowed but not required.</p> <p>Exempt from onsite recreation, landscaping, bicycling, and electric vehicle parking requirements.</p>	
<p>Safe Parking. A site designated for unsheltered people to reside in a recreational vehicle or vehicle and that provides access to onsite services and utilities.</p>	<p>R-1: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-4 through R-8: Conditional use; must be in the urban area; on the same site as a religious facility, public agency, or other specific social services uses; and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, and O: Permitted use when in the urban growth area and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed.</p>	<p>When safe parking is located on a site with another primary use, the director may reduce the number of on-site parking spaces required through a parking study.</p> <p>Safe parking sites that allow vehicles without restrooms must require restroom and potable water access. If recreational vehicles are hosted at the safe parking site, provision must be made for potable water and disposal of grey and black water.</p> <p>Safe parking sites are subject to the following criteria: a 6 foot clearance around each recreational vehicle; all</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The KCRHA vehicle residency workgroup refers to "safe lots" when onsite services are required, and "safe parking zones" when they are not. • As proposed, this use is required to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) in the R-4 through R-8 zones. Council may wish to change this use from a Conditional Use to a Permitted Use, with a change to DC20 that would require a site with an existing CUP to obtain a new CUP or modify the existing CUP. • This definition uses the term "unsheltered people", whereas other definitions use "persons experiencing homelessness." • Council could define the term "unsheltered", as it is not defined elsewhere in the code. A possible definition utilized by HUD in the Point in Time Count is "Unsheltered: individuals and families sleeping in a place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation." • Safe parking would not be allowed in NB zones, though the uses do not appear incongruent with that zoning. Executive staff indicate that there is sufficient capacity, without the NB zone being included, for emergency housing uses. This is a policy choice.

Definition	Zoning	Additional Requirements	Policy Staff Comments
		vehicles shall be licensed, operational, and parked in the designated area; all personal property shall be stored in the vehicle; all propane tanks shall be securely fastened to a recreational vehicle; tents, leaking vehicles; fires; and sounds audible outside the vehicles are prohibited; the organization shall enforce compliance of state and local regulations.	
<p>Interim housing. A facility that provides temporary shelter for people who are unsheltered or waiting to move into permanent housing.</p>	<p>R-1 through R-8: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, and O: Permitted use when in the urban growth area and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed.</p>	<p>Facilities shall be staffed and operational 24 hours per day; specific rooms and units shall be assigned to specific residents for the duration of their stay; on site services are limited to residents; all vehicles on site shall be licensed and operational; and a lease agreement for residents is allowed but not required.</p> <p>Exempt from onsite recreation, landscaping, bicycling, and electric vehicle parking requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a housing type that is typically provided by the County. Executive staff note that it is not necessary to include in the Zoning Code.
<p>Microshelter village. Emergency housing located on a lot, or lots, containing multiple microshelters and that provide: cooking facilities or meals;</p>	<p>R-1: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-4 through R-8: Conditional use; must be in the urban area; on the same site as a</p>	<p>On site services shall be limited to residents; staff supervision provided on site at all times unless demonstrably not warranted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As proposed, this use is required to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) in the R-4 through R-8 zones. Council could change this use from a Conditional Use to a Permitted Use, with a change to DC20 that would require a site with an existing CUP to obtain a new CUP or modify the existing CUP.

Definition	Zoning	Additional Requirements	Policy Staff Comments
<p>hygiene facilities, including restrooms and showers; and a shared gathering space.</p> <p>Additional relevant definitions: Microshelter. A <i>small structure</i> designed to be used for overnight shelter.</p>	<p>religious facility, public agency, or other specific social services uses; and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, and O: Permitted use when in the urban growth area and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed</p>	<p>for the hosted population; the operating organization shall provide sanitation and basic safety measures; all on site vehicles shall be licensed and operational; a lease agreement for residents is allowed but not required.</p> <p>Must provide either: 1) be setback 10 feet from the street, provide Type II landscaping, or 3) a site obscuring fence.</p> <p>Exempt from onsite recreation, bicycling, and electric vehicle parking requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Executive’s proposal does not provide parameters on what size a “<i>small structure</i>” is, which leaves this open to interpretation. • Council could further define the term “microshelter” to <i>set shelter size</i> so it can't be construed as overly broad. Executive staff provided the following recommendation: “Microshelter: a structure generally smaller than 200 square feet that is used for emergency habitation. Common nomenclature often refers to microshelters as tiny houses.” “Habitation” should be changed to “housing,” as microshelters are included in the list of emergency housing types.
<p>Permanent supportive housing. Subsidized, leased housing with no limit on length of stay that prioritizes people who need comprehensive support services to retain tenancy and utilizes admissions practices designed to use lower barriers to entry than would be typical for other subsidized or unsubsidized rental housing, especially related to rental history, criminal history, and personal behaviors. Permanent supportive housing is paired with on-site or off-site voluntary</p>	<p>R-1: Not allowed.</p> <p>R-4 through R-8: Conditional use; must be in the urban area; on the same site as a religious facility public agency or other specific units; and consistent with the additional requirements in the next column.</p> <p>R-12 through R-48, CB, RB, O: permitted in the urban growth area and exempt from on-site recreation</p>	<p>In the R-4 through R-8 zones, permanent supportive housing units are permitted if the density does not exceed 18 units per acre of net buildable area.</p> <p>Minimum parking spaces required: 1 per 2 employees, plus 1 per 20 dwelling units.</p> <p>Exempt from onsite recreation, landscaping, bicycling, and electric vehicle parking requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As proposed, this use is required to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) in the R-4 through R-8 zones. Council could change this use from a Conditional Use to a Permitted Use, with a change to DC20 that would require a site with an existing CUP to obtain a new CUP or modify the existing CUP. • In the R-4 through R-8 zones, this use is a conditional use and additional development conditions apply, while it is a permitted use outright in denser zones. It is a policy call whether to impose those additional conditions in the R-4 through R-8 zoning. • The final sentence of the definition is a regulation and could be removed. • Executive staff request that DC5, related to a maximum of 18 du/acre net buildable area, apply to permanent supportive housing in the R-4 through R-8 zones. • Executive staff request that permanent supportive housing be added to the list of school impact fee exemptions in K.C.C. 21A.43.080.

Definition	Zoning	Additional Requirements	Policy Staff Comments
<p>services designed to support a person living with a complex and disabling behavioral health or physical health condition who was experiencing homelessness before moving into housing to retain their housing and be a successful tenant in a housing arrangement, improve the resident's health status, and connect the resident of the housing with community-based health care, treatment, or employment services.</p> <p>Permanent supportive housing is subject to all of the rights and responsibilities defined in Chapter 59.18 RCW.</p>	<p>requirements.</p> <p>NB: Not allowed.</p>		

Table 3. Proposed Comprehensive Plan Policies Related

This table identifies proposed Comprehensive Plan Policies related to emergency and supported housing.

Comprehensive Plan Policy	Additional Information
<p>H-170 King County shall work with jurisdictions and housing providers locally and across the state to urge state and federal governments to expand funding for direct assistance services, such as ((flexible)) rental assistance <u>and eviction prevention resources</u>, diversion assistance, and emergency <u>housing</u> services. In addition ((to rental assistance)), King County should ((support)) <u>encourage</u> programs that help prevent homelessness and ((that)) improve prevention and emergency services referral networks((,-including an efficient coordinated intake system for families and individuals experiencing homelessness)).</p>	<p>It is a policy decision to remove the focus of creating an efficient coordinated intake system for families and individuals experiencing homelessness.</p>
<p>H-307 <u>People-centered design elements that includes principles of patient-centered, recovery-oriented, and trauma-informed care should be considered and incorporated in County-owned or funded regional health and human services facilities, behavioral health facilities, emergency housing, transitional and permanent supportive housing, and affordable housing.</u></p>	<p>No issues identified.</p>

Table 4. Misc. Sections in Proposed Ordinance 2023-0440

This table identifies ordinance sections related to emergency and supported housing not directly related to zoning of those uses.

	Additional Information
<p>Section 197: Establishes a chapter related to emergency housing uses in K.C.C. 21A.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Section 198: Establishes the purpose of this chapter.</p> <p>The purpose of this chapter is to provide standards for emergency housing options and to address the potential impacts to neighborhoods.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Section 199: Establishes permit application requirements.</p> <p>All emergency housing applications are required to include a description of the staffing and operating characteristics, occupancy policies, a plan for managing the exterior appearance, contact information, an outreach plan for surrounding owners and residents, and a site plan.</p>	<p>This section appears to be consistent with the approach the County takes when establishing emergency housing units. However, the information required in this section is typically required by DCHS in contracting, so it appears to be a shift in scope from DCHS in contracting to DLS in permitting.</p> <p>Executive staff request removing safe parking from the definition of emergency housing, as it is not a temporary indoor accommodation.</p> <p>This section includes a statement on conflict with other chapters, but no specific</p>

	Additional Information
	conflicts are cited. An identification of potential conflicts could be cited.
<p>At imminent risk of becoming homeless: a household who will lose their primary nighttime residence as follows:</p> <p>A. The residence will be lost within fourteen days of the date of application for homeless assistance;</p> <p>B. No subsequent residence has been identified; and</p> <p>C. The household lacks the resources or support networks needed to obtain other permanent housing, such as family, friends, or faith-based or other social networks.</p>	<p>This is consistent with the HUD definition of the term.</p> <p>"a household who" may be changed to "a household that"</p>
<p>At risk of chronic homelessness: a household that:</p> <p>A. Includes an adult with a developmental, physical, or behavioral health disability;</p> <p>B. Is currently experiencing homelessness for at least ten months in the previous three years, or has experienced homelessness for a cumulative total of twelve months within the previous five years; and</p> <p>C. Includes an adult that has been incarcerated within the previous five years in a jail or prison, that has been detained or involuntarily committed under Chapter 71.05 RCW, or identifies as a member of a population that is demographically overrepresented among persons experiencing homelessness in King County.</p>	<p>This is consistent with the definition in K.C.C. Chapter 24.30 (Health through Housing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt this definition by reference instead of including the definition in K.C.C. 21A. • Add substance use disorders in the definition, consistent with the National Alliance to End Homelessness and other agencies. <p>It could be clarified that only one adult has to meet all three criteria, as subsection B. as currently written would require the entire household to have experienced homelessness.</p>
<p>Experiencing chronic homelessness: a household that includes an adult with a disability, that is currently experiencing homelessness for at least twelve consecutive months or has experienced multiple episodes homelessness for a cumulative twelve months within the previous three years.</p>	<p>This is consistent with K.C.C. 24.30 (Health through Housing).</p> <p>Adopt this definition by reference instead of including the definition in K.C.C. 21A.</p>