

Countywide Planning Policy	Type of Change	Policy Staff Comments
<p><b>DP-17</b> Allow expansion of the Urban Growth Area only if at least one of the following criteria is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A countywide analysis determines that the current Urban Growth Area is insufficient in size and additional land is needed to accommodate the housing and employment growth targets, including institutional and other non-residential uses, and there are no other reasonable measures, such as increasing density or rezoning existing urban land, that would avoid the need to expand the Urban Growth Area; or</li> <li>b) A proposed expansion of the Urban Growth Area is accompanied by dedication of permanent open space to the King County Open Space System, where the acreage of the proposed open space:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is at least four times the acreage of the land added to the Urban Growth Area;</li> <li>2) Is <del>((contiguous with))</del> adjacent to the original Urban Growth Area boundary adopted in the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan, with at least <del>((a portion))</del> half of the site to be placed in dedicated open space <del>((surrounding))</del> and shall fully buffer the proposed Urban Growth Area expansion from surrounding Rural Area and Natural Resource Lands; and</li> <li>3) Preserves high quality habitat, critical areas, or unique features that contribute to the band of permanent open space along the edge of the Urban Growth Area; or</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) The area is currently a King County park being transferred to a city to be maintained as a park in perpetuity <del>((or is park land that has been owned by a city since 1994 and is less than thirty acres in size))</del>.</li> </ul>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In subsection (sub) b.2, the change from "contiguous" to "adjacent" is a policy choice. The change to adjacent is consistent through the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), Comprehensive Plan, and King County Code (KCC).</li> </ul> <p><b>UGA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In sub b.2, the UGA boundary used for the 4:1 program would be changed from the current UGA to the original UGA as adopted in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 UGA does not include portions of the UGA for cities that were subject to Joint Planning Area Agreements: Issaquah, Renton, North Bend, Black Diamond, and Snoqualmie. This language also means that areas where the UGA boundary has contracted since 1994 could request a 4:1 based on that old line. The language could be clearer (either here, or in the KCCP policies), if this is not intended. The UGA boundary used for the 4:1 program is a policy choice.</li> <li>• There is no map of the 1994 UGA boundary in the Comprehensive Plan. Council could consider adding a new map with the 1994 boundary to reflect and clarify this policy change.</li> <li>• Policy staff comments also apply to CPP DP-18, KCCP U-185, U-187, and U-189, and Section 38 of the Proposed Ordinance.</li> </ul> <p><b>TDR/Offsite</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In sub b.2, adding "half of the site to be placed in dedicated open space" would allow for the use of TDR or off-site fee simple dedication to satisfy open space requirements for this program. This is a policy choice, and Council may wish to consider whether this change aligns with the goals and purpose of the 4:1 program to "add land to the regional open space system through the dedication of permanent open space."           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Off-site fee simple dedication would allow for the dedication of open space not adjacent to the UGA. Council may wish to consider requiring that off-site dedication occur adjacent to the UGA.</li> <li>○ Not every TDR sending site becomes a part of the open space system. The Council may wish to consider adding a requirement that transfers management of the property over to the County in addition to the transfer of the development right (the TDR sending site would have to be owned or managed by King County to be part of the open space system).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As part of a 4:1 review in the 2020 KCCP update, the Executive did not recommend allowing TDR to satisfy the open space requirement: "Based on this experience [with previous 4:1], and the fact that the conservation benefit occurs on land that remains in private ownership rather than land that gets added to County's open space system, it is not recommended that conservation be achieved through the Transfer of Development Rights program."</li> <li>• If the option for TDR remains, the Council may wish to consider monitoring, management plans, access provisions, and other tools to meet County expectations and requirements for this program.</li> <li>• Policy staff comments also apply to KCCP U-185, U-186, U-187, U-189, and Section 38 and 39 of the Proposed Ordinance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Space Layout</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In sub b.2, the language "where the acreage of the proposed open space ...include half of the site in dedicated open space" is unclear. Executive staff indicate that the requirement is that half of the site be in open space, not that half of the open space would be on-site. The Council may wish to consider separating the open space requirements from the UGA requirements in sub-b.2 for clarity.</li> <li>• In sub b.3, the open space for a proposal is required to "Preserves high quality habitat, critical areas, or unique features that contribute to the band of permanent open space along the edge of the Urban Growth Area." Executive proposed changes to the K.C.C. would require the open space contain Type 1 landscaping unless the Director determines that different landscaping would be more appropriate. The Code change is discussed below in the Proposed Ordinance section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Space Definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Open space" has a different definition in the CPPs, Comprehensive Plan, and the KCC. In the CPPs, open space is defined as "a range of green places, including natural and resource areas (such as forests), recreational areas (such as parks and trails), and other areas set aside from development (such as plazas)." There is no definition of "Open Space" in the Comprehensive Plan, only "Open Space System". "Open Space" is defined in the K.C.C. as "areas left predominately in a natural state to create urban separators and greenbelts, sustain native ecosystems, connect and increase protective buffers for environmentally sensitive areas, provide a visual contrast to continuous development, reinforce community identity and aesthetics, or provide links between important environmental or recreational resources."</li> <li>• Executive staff note that for the 4:1 program, the primary definition would be the one found in the K.C.C. They note that "Open Space" is used in the Comprehensive Plan, and most often used in a generic manner that is not synonymous with the term "Open Space System." It is also intended to be used in that manner when discussing the 4:1 Program. However, Council staff would note that there have been issues in implementation when taking this approach (where the language wasn't clear and more activities were thought by</li> </ul>

Countywide Planning Policy	Type of Change	Policy Staff Comments
		<p>the property manager to be allowed in the open space than actually is). Looking at the language in U-188, regarding the type of open space that is contemplated, Council may want to be clearer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council may wish to consider how the definition of “Open Space” aligns with the proposed landscaping requirements discussed above.</li> <li>• Policy staff comments also apply to KCCP U-186 and U-188.</li> <li>• The change in sub c. removes a condition specific to a previous park transfer (Soaring Eagle Park) that has already occurred.</li> </ul>
<p><b>DP-18</b> Add land to the Urban Growth Area only if expansion of the Urban Growth Area is warranted based on the criteria in DP-17(a) or DP-17(b), and it meets all of the following criteria:</p> <p>a) <u>For expansions based on DP-17(a) only:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is adjacent to the existing Urban Growth Area(<del>b) For expansions based on DP-17(a) only, is</del>);</li> <li>2. Is no larger than necessary to promote compact development that accommodates anticipated growth needs;</li> </ol> <p><del>(e)</del>b) Can be efficiently provided with urban services and does not require supportive facilities <u>or services to cross or be located in the Rural Area;</u></p> <p><del>(d)</del>c) Follows topographical features that form natural boundaries, such as rivers and ridge lines and does not extend beyond natural boundaries, such as watersheds, that impede the provision of urban services;</p> <p><del>(e)</del>d) Is not currently designated as <u>Natural Resource Land;</u></p> <p><del>(f)</del>e) Is sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support urban development without significant adverse environmental impacts, unless the area is designated as an Urban Separator by interlocal agreement between King County and the annexing city; <del>(and)</del></p> <p>f) <u>Is not expanding the Urban Growth Area from a location that was previously expanded through the Four-to-One program;</u></p> <p>g) Is subject to an agreement between King County and the city or town adjacent to the area that the area will be added to the city’s Potential Annexation Area. Upon ratification of the amendment, the Countywide Planning Policies will reflect both the Urban Growth Area change and Potential Annexation Area change; <u>and</u></p> <p>h) <u>For expansions of the Urban Growth Area based on the criteria in DP-17 (b) where the area is adjacent to an incorporated area, no development proposal or activity shall be allowed until the land added to the Urban Growth Area is annexed into a city or town.</u></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In sub f., the proposed change is intended to prohibit a cascading 4:1. If the 1994 UGA boundary is used, this provision may not be needed.</li> <li>• The changes to sub f. (prohibiting UGA expansions from a previous 4:1) would also impact proposals to expand the UGA under DP-17(a). DP-17(a) is the policy that guides UGA changes if the Urban Growth Capacity Report finds insufficient capacity in the UGA. The Council may wish to consider whether this requirement is appropriate for all UGA expansions.</li> <li>• In sub h., the change would not allow for development proposals and activities on the new urban land until the land is annexed. This change would not apply if the new urban land is next to a Potential Annexation Area (PAA). Allowing development adjacent to a PAA before annexation could create new pockets of urban unincorporated area. A city must add the new urban land to its PAA, but that does not guarantee annexation. It could be clearer what would happen if a proposal was adjacent to both an incorporated area and a PAA.</li> </ul>
<p><b>DP-19</b> Allow redesignation of Urban land currently within the Urban Growth Area to Rural land outside of the Urban Growth Area if the land is not needed to accommodate projected urban growth, is not served by public sewers, is <del>(contiguous with)</del> <u>adjacent</u> to the Rural Area, and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is not characterized by urban development;</li> <li>b) Is currently developed with a low-density lot pattern that cannot be realistically redeveloped at an urban density; or</li> <li>c) Is characterized by environmentally sensitive areas making it inappropriate for higher density development.</li> </ol>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The change from “contiguous with” to “adjacent” is a policy choice. Adjacent means near or close, while contiguous means touching or connecting. The change to adjacent is consistent through the CPPs, Comprehensive Plan, and the K.C.C.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Comprehensive Plan Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistency with other related plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>RP-106 <del>((Except for Four-to-One proposals,))</del> King County shall not amend the Urban Growth Area prior to the Growth Management Planning Council taking action on the proposed amendment to the Urban Growth Area.</p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>To align with existing mandates in the Countywide Planning Policies, current practice, and Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations</p>	<p>No change; reflects existing practice and requirements</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policy DP-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: Programmatic</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: No</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: Ongoing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RP-106 was amended in 2020; "amend" replaced "expand." This policy was part of the striking amendment that removed all proposed changes to the Four-to-One Program and maintained existing policy and code language. So, the 4:1 reference was removed, and the other revision moved forward. The amendment would align the RP-106 with CPP DP-16 which requires that King County bring all UGA changes to the GMPC for recommendation before Council action, but it is a policy choice. With the current language, the Council could approve a 4:1 before GMPC making a recommendation to expand the UGA.</li> </ul>
<p>RP-107 King County shall not forward to the Growth Management Planning Council for its recommendation any proposed amendment to the Urban Growth Area unless the proposal was:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included in the scoping motion for a King County Comprehensive Plan update;</li> <li><del>((An))</del> Subject to area zoning study <del>((of the proposal))</del> that was included in the public review draft of a proposed King County Comprehensive Plan update; or</li> <li>Subjected to the hearing examiner process for site specific map amendments as <del>((contemplated))</del> established by the King County Code.</li> </ol>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Edits for clarity</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<p>U-104 Rural zoned properties that are immediately adjacent to a city and are planned or designated for park purposes by that city may be redesignated to urban when the city has committed to designate the property in perpetuity in <del>((a form satisfactory to))</del> an interlocal agreement or conservation easement adopted by the King County Council for park purposes and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is <del>((no more))</del> less than 30 acres in size and was acquired by the city prior to 1994; or</li> <li><del>((The property is no more than 30 acres in size and receives county support through a park or recreation facility transfer agreement between King County and a city; or</del></li> <li><del>e.))</del> The property is <del>((or was formerly))</del> a King County park and is being <del>((or has been))</del> transferred to a city.</li> </ol>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>To align with existing mandates in the Countywide Planning Policies.</p> <p>Updates form of implementing vehicle to for clarity, to reflect the legal options to enforce this</p>	<p>No change; reflects existing practice and requirements</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policy DP-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In sub a., the rationale for the change is alignment with CPP DP-17. A change is proposed for DP-17 that is not reflected in the proposed updates for this policy. Executive staff have indicated that U-104 should be updated accordingly.</li> </ul>
<p>U-185 Through the Four-to-One Program, King County shall actively pursue dedication of open space along the original Urban Growth Area <del>((line))</del> boundary adopted in the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan. Through this program, one acre of Rural Area zoned land may be added to the Urban Growth Area in exchange for a dedication to King County of four acres of permanent open space. <del>((Land added to the Urban Growth Area for drainage facilities that are designed as mitigation to have a natural</del></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Moves detailed technical language to the K.C.C., substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations</p>	<p>No change; standards would still be required in the code</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: Proposed integration into K.C.C. Chapter 21A.18</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County does not actively pursue dedication through the 4:1 program. The Council may wish to consider changing the first sentence to reflect that.</li> <li>To streamline the 4:1 policies, this policy could be combined with U-189, and some policy language could be moved to lead-in text.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Comprehensive Plan Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistency with other related plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<del>looking visual appearance in support of its development, does not require dedication of permanent open space.))</del>						<p><b>TDR/Offsite</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed changes to the 4:1 program would allow TDRs to satisfy open space requirements. This is a policy choice.</li> </ul>
<p>U-186 King County shall evaluate Four-to-One proposals for both quality of open space and feasibility of urban development and <u>annexation</u>. The highest-quality proposals shall be recommended for adoption as amendments to the Urban Growth Area. Lands preserved as open space shall <u>retain their Rural Area designations ((and should)); generally be configured in such a way as to connect with open space on adjacent properties; include half of the site in dedicated open space; and fully buffer the new urban area from surrounding Rural Area lands and Natural Resource Lands.</u></p>	Substantive change	<p>Alignment with other Countywide Planning Policies and Comprehensive Plan policies that support the annexation of urban unincorporated lands, and adds clarity for placement of on-site open space requirement, consistent with existing intent; substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations:</p>	<p>Supports proposals that are feasible for annexation.</p> <p>Helps ensure surrounding rural area and natural resource lands will be protected from growth pressure and urban impacts</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> Regulatory</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> Proposed integration into K.C.C. Chapter 21A.18</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li><u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed changes add annexation potential as an evaluation criterion. This is a policy choice. The CPPs do not include the feasibility of annexation as a criterion.</li> </ul> <p><b>TDR and Open Space Layout</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed changes add new requirements for the lands preserved as open space. This includes language allowing TDR and offsite dedication to satisfy open space requirements. This is a policy choice.</li> <li>The language "lands preserved as open space shall... include half of the site in dedicated open space" is unclear. Executive staff indicate that the requirement is that half of the site be in open space, not that half of the open space would be on-site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Space Definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Open space" has a different definition in the CPPs, Comprehensive Plan, and the K.C.C.</li> <li>The Council may wish to consider how the definition of "open space" aligns with the proposed landscaping requirements. The Council may wish to add a definition of "open space" to the Comprehensive Plan. This definition would impact the other 240ish times it is used in the Plan. The Council could also consider adding clarifying language to the lead-in text.</li> <li>The Council may wish to restructure the policy and clarify the requirements for the lands preserved as open space.</li> </ul>
<p>U-187 King County shall use the following criteria for evaluating open space in Four-to-One proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of fish and wildlife habitat areas;</li> <li>Connections to regional open space systems;</li> <li>Protection of wetlands, stream corridors, ground water and water bodies;</li> </ol>	Substantive change	<p>Reflects edits in U-118, substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations</p>	<p>No change; standards would still be required in the code</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> Regulatory</li> <li><u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> Proposed integration into K.C.C. Chapter 21A.18</li> <li><u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In sub e., there is a reference to the current UGA. Executive staff indicate that this was not intentional. This is a policy choice, whether to require the open space to be along the current</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Comprehensive Plan Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistency with other related plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>d. Unique natural, biological, cultural, historical, or archeological features;                      e. Size of proposed open space dedication and connection to other open space dedications along the Urban Growth Area (<del>(line)</del>) <u>boundary</u>; and                      f. The land proposed as open space shall remain undeveloped, except for those uses allowed in (<del>(U-188)</del>) <u>in King County Code 20.18.180.</u></p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<p>UGA boundary, or the 1994 boundary.</p> <p><b>TDR/Offsite</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing TDR and offsite dedication would impact the evaluation criterion in sub e. Executive staff indicates that, in some cases, allowing open space through conservation easements or off-site dedication could lead to protecting open space that is potentially of higher quality than requiring all the open space to be on-site. This is a policy choice.</li> </ul>
<p>U-188 King County shall preserve the open space acquired through the Four-to-One Program primarily as natural areas, passive recreation sites, or resource lands for farming or forestry. King County may allow (<del>(the following)</del>) additional uses only if located on a small portion of the open space, provided that these uses are found to be compatible with the site's natural open space values and functions, such as those listed in (<del>(the preceding policy:</del></p> <p>a. <del>Trails;</del>                      b. <del>Compensatory mitigation of wetland losses on the urban designated portion of the project, consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan and the Critical Area Ordinance; and</del>                      c. <del>Active recreation uses not to exceed five percent of the total open space area. Support services and facilities for the active recreation uses may locate within the active recreation area only, and shall not exceed five percent of the active recreation area. An active recreation area shall not be used to satisfy the active recreation requirements for the urban designated portion of the project as required by)</del> King County Code (<del>(Title 21A)</del>) <u>King County Code 20.18.180.</u></p>	Substantive change	Removes detailed technical language that is already in the K.C.C., substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations	No change; standards would still be required in the code	Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Planned implementation of proposal:</u> Regulatory</li> <li>• <u>Description of proposed regulations:</u> Proposed integration into K.C.C. Chapter 21A.18</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated resource need:</u> n/a</li> <li>• <u>Anticipated timeline:</u> n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Comprehensive Plan Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistency with other related plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>U-189 Land added to the Urban Growth Area under the Four-to-One Program shall:</p> <p>a. <del>Not expand the Urban Growth Area from a location that was previously expanded through the Four-to-One Program;</del></p> <p>b. <del>Be limited to residential development and have a minimum density of ((four)) eight dwellings per acre ((and));</del></p> <p>c. <del>((shall be)) Be ((physically contiguous)) adjacent to the original Urban Growth Area boundary adopted in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, unless there are limitations due to the presence of critical areas((-and));</del></p> <p>d. <del>((shall be)) Be able to be served by sewers and other efficient urban services and facilities(;) provided that such sewer and other urban services and facilities shall be provided directly from the urban area and ((shall)) not cross the open space or Rural Area or Natural Resource Lands((-));</del></p> <p>e. <del>((Drainage facilities to s))Support the urban development ((shall be)) with drainage facilities that are located within the urban portion of the development((-);</del></p> <p>f. <del>((In some cases, lands must m))Meet affordable housing requirements under this program((-); and</del></p> <p>g. <del>((The total area)) Not result in more than a total of 4,000 acres being added to the Urban Growth Area as a result of this ((policy shall not exceed 4,000 acres)) program.</del></p>	<p>Substantive change</p>	<p>Improved clarity and consistency amongst the provisions in the Countywide Planning Policies, Comprehensive Plan, and K.C.C.. Aligns Four-to-One provisions with other policy goals. Avoids cascading UGA changes, reiterates long-standing limitation for residential development, increases minimum densities, clarifies tenure of Urban Growth Area boundary for eligibility purposes, substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations.</p>	<p>Protects from urban sprawl</p> <p>Supports increased urban densities that are responsive to housing needs</p> <p>Creates consistency between program provisions, for a more effective and implementable program</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: Proposed integration into K.C.C. Chapter 21A.18</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy reads like code, and these requirements are already in, or are proposed to be added to, the K.C.C. This policy could be deleted. Alternatively, the Council may wish to make the language between policy U-189 and KCC 20.18.180 more consistent and clearer. As drafted, there are some requirements in the KCCP that are not in K.C.C. and vice versa.</li> <li>In sub a., the proposed change is intended to prohibit a cascading 4:1. If the 1994 UGA boundary is used, then this provision may not be needed.</li> <li>In sub b., the minimum density is proposed to increase from 4 to 8 dwelling units per acre. This is a policy choice.</li> </ul> <p><b>UGA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In sub c., the UGA boundary used for the 4:1 program would be changed from the current UGA to the original UGA as adopted in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 UGA does not include portions of the UGA for cities that were subject to Joint Planning Area Agreements: Issaquah, Renton, North Bend, Black Diamond, and Snoqualmie. The UGA boundary used for the 4:1 program is a policy choice.</li> <li>In sub f., there are proposed changes that would add 30% affordability requirements to projects with 10 or more dwelling units. This is discussed in more detail in the proposed ordinance matrix below. This is a policy choice.</li> <li>Sub g. could be a separate policy as it's a program goal that could be highlighted separately from the detail of the rest of this policy.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Comprehensive Plan Policy	Type of Change	Executive's Rationale	Executive's Anticipated outcome	Consistency with other related plans	Executive's Planned Implementation	Policy Staff Comments
<p>U-190 <del>((King County shall amend))</del> Amendments to the Urban Growth Area to add Rural Area lands to the Urban Growth Area <del>((consistent with Policy U-185))</del> through the Four-to-One Program may be made during the annual, midpoint, or 10-year Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Open space dedication shall occur at final formal plat recording. If the applicant decides not to pursue urban development or fails to record the final plat prior to expiration of preliminary plat approval, the urban properties shall be restored to a Rural Area land use designation and associated zoning during the next annual <del>((review of))</del> update to the King County Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>Four-to-One changes were already allowed in midpoints and 10-year updates under policies I-204 and I-204a. Other edits for clarity and streamlining. Substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a timeline for the expiration of preliminary plans; the Council may wish to add a similar timeframe when an applicant does not decide to pursue the 4:1 project.</li> <li>The Executive is also proposing to add a requirement for a tri-party agreement between the property owner, city, and King County to establish development conditions for the 4:1 proposal. This is not reflected in the Comprehensive Plan policies. This is a policy choice, and the Council may wish to add supporting language to the Comprehensive Plan.</li> </ul>
<p>U-190a For Four-to-One proposals adjacent to an incorporated area, development proposals and/or activities shall not be allowed until the land added to the Urban Growth Area is annexed into a city.</p>	<p>New policy</p>	<p>Requires Four-to-One projects to be annexed into cities before they can develop, substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations</p>	<p>Creates development consistent with the cities that the new urban area will be annexed to; incentivizes annexation to occur in a timely manner</p>	<p>Countywide Planning Policies DP-17, DP-18, DP-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: Regulatory</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: Proposed integration into K.C.C. Chapter 21A.18</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change would require annexation prior to any site development or permitting for proposals adjacent to cities. This is a policy choice. CPP DP-18 requires a city to add the new urban land to its PAA, but that does not guarantee or require annexation.</li> <li>This provision would not apply if the new urban land is next to a Potential Annexation Area (PAA). Allowing development adjacent to a PAA before annexation could create new pockets of urban unincorporated. It could be clearer what would happen if a proposal was adjacent to both an incorporated area and a PAA.</li> </ul>
<p>F-224 As part of pre-annexation or annexation agreements, King County shall work with the cities to create a financing partnership for areas of the Urban Growth Area that the cities will annex. This includes determining county/regional and city/municipal facilities and services and then committing to a shared financing strategy to build or provide these infrastructure improvements or services.</p>	<p>Clarification of existing policy intent</p>	<p>To reflect existing intent and current practice</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned implementation of proposal: n/a</li> <li>Description of proposed regulations: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated resource need: n/a</li> <li>Anticipated timeline: n/a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This change in Chapter 9 of the Comprehensive Plan would also apply to 4:1 triparty agreements. Council may wish to consider adding a 4:1 exception.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

<u>Ordinance Section</u>	<u>King County Code Section</u>	<u>Current Code</u>	<u>Proposed Change</u>	<u>Executive's Intent/Rationale</u>	<u>Policy Staff Comments</u>
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: - 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"> <li>No issues identified related to the 4:1 program.</li> </ul>
Section 30 20.18.040	Clarification	Establishes procedures for consideration of site-specific land use map or Shoreline Master Program map amendments, including for: - 8-year Comprehensive Plan updates; and - Four-to-One proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes 8-year updates to 10-year</li> <li>Removes allowance for consideration of Four-to-One proposals through the site-specific land use map amendment process</li> </ul>	<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>The proposed Four-to-One program 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues identified.</li> </ul>
Section 38 20.18.170	Substantive	Establishes the process for amending the Urban Growth Area through the Four-to-One program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes the program purpose, consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and Comprehensive Plan</li> <li>Removes requirement to amend the Comprehensive Plan to update the total amount of land added through the Four-to-One proposal.</li> <li>Requires that Four-to-One proposals be initiated through the Docket Process (K.C.C. 20.18.140) or through a Comprehensive Plan update scope of work.</li> <li>Clarifies that site suitability, but not development conditions, be established through the preliminary plat process.</li> <li>Requires a tri-party agreement as part of each Four-to-One proposal. Establishes procedures for Tri-party agreements.</li> <li>Defines the types of open space that are eligible.</li> <li>Expands the notification process to include state agencies and Indian tribes. Clarifies some of the special purpose districts should be notified.</li> <li>Defines Four-to-One proposal conditions related to annexation. Requires annexation of a Four-to-One proposals adjacent to a city before the site can be developed.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed Four-to-One program changes are substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations. Changes seek to create more clarity and consistency amongst the provisions in the Countywide Planning Policies, Comprehensive Plan, and the King County Code. Aligns Four-to-One provisions with other policy goals related to annexation, program goals, and Comprehensive Plan update processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At sub A., this adds language from U-185 about the purpose of the 4:1 program. The addition also adds a new reference to the 1994 UGA line to the K.C.C.</li> <li>At E., this states that development conditions for a 4:1 proposal would be established through a triparty agreement between the County, property owner, and city affiliated for future annexation. The requirement for a triparty agreement is a policy choice.</li> <li>At E., the Council may wish to specify what types of conditions are to be included in the triparty agreement such as limiting development to residential uses and requiring minimum densities consistent with R-8 zoning, or anything else that is in the Code that should be carried over after the property is annexed (as the City would permit development and not King County). Executive staff note that the agreement could also include timing, sequencing, and other procedural issues related to the 4:1 proposal.</li> <li>At E.2, this would require the triparty agreement be approved at the time of Council adoption of the land use map amendment. This would require concurrent work on the triparty agreement and the 4:1. This timing could limit the ability of the Council to have input on the development conditions. The</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Ordinance Section	King County Code Section	Current Code	Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
					<p>Council may wish to consider adding a timeframe for action on the triparty agreement, that is after action on the 4:1 proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E.2, uses "land use map amendment.", while B.2 uses "land use amendment to the Comprehensive Plan." The references could be consistent. This could clarify that it is at the time of Council adoption.</li> </ul> <p><b>TDR/Offsite</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At F., this effectuates allowing off-site fee simple dedication and TDRs to satisfy 4:1 open space requirements. This is a policy choice, and the Council may wish to consider whether this change aligns with the goals and purpose of the 4:1 program to "add land to the regional open space system through the dedication of permanent open space."</li> <li>At H.1., this new language would require a written agreement that the city would add the area to its PAA. This would be enforced through the triparty agreement. The CPPs had an existing requirement for an agreement that the city will add the new urban area to its PAA. Upon ratification of the amendment, the CPPs would reflect the UGA and PAA change. Requiring this as part of the triparty agreement could cause a 4:1 to fail if the city does not add it to its PAA.</li> <li>At H.2., this new language would require annexation prior to development for proposals adjacent to a city. This is a policy choice. CPP DP-18 requires a city to add the new urban land to its PAA, but that does not guarantee annexation.</li> <li>This provision would not apply if the new urban land is next to a Potential Annexation Area (PAA). Allowing development adjacent to a PAA before annexation could create new pockets of urban unincorporated. It could be clearer what would happen if a proposal was adjacent to both an incorporated area and a PAA.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Ordinance Section	King County Code Section	Current Code	Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
Section 39 20.18.180	Substantive	Establishes the criteria for amending the Urban Growth Area through the Four-to-One program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prohibits Four-to-One proposals on all natural resource lands.</li> <li>- Prohibits new Four-to-One proposal in a location that was previously expanded through the Four-to-One program.</li> <li>- Clarifies that at least half of the site must be placed in permanent open space.</li> <li>- Updates affordable housing requirements.</li> </ul>	The proposed Four-to-One changes are substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations. The changes seek to create more clarity and consistency amongst the provisions in the Countywide Planning Policies, Comprehensive Plan, and the King County Code. Clarifies Four-to-One criteria to strengthen the program results related to affordable housing, protection of natural resource lands, avoiding cascading Urban Growth Area expansions, and ensuring local open space benefits.	<p><b>TDR/Offsite</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At A.1., there are no changes proposed to this section about "permanent dedication to the King County open space system."</li> <li>• At A.3., it reads that the <i>director</i> can have an urban area of a 4-to-1 proposal not be on the 1994 UGA line, subject to criteria. Executive staff indicate this was not the intention, and given recent discussions around the UGA boundary, the provision should be removed.</li> <li>• At A.3c., the proposed change is intended to prohibit a cascading 4:1. If the 1994 UGA boundary is used, then this provision may not be needed.</li> <li>• At A.9.c., there is a new requirement for Type 1 landscaping in the open space. Type 1 landscaping is a "full screen" usually required between residential and commercial properties. Executive staff indicate that no site-specific analysis was completed for this provision, but it was vetted by Executive staff before being included in the GMPC recommendation, and there is some flexibility because the Director can determine that different landscaping would be more appropriate. CPP DP-17b3 requires that the open space for a proposal "Preserves high quality habitat, critical areas, or unique features that contribute to the band of permanent open space along the edge of the Urban Growth Area." The Council may wish to consider whether the Type 1 buffer requirement aligns with the goals of the 4:1 program.</li> <li>• At B., this adds affordable housing requirements for developments with over 10 units. The affordability requirements are discussed in Section 40.</li> <li>• At D.3., there is an existing 5% cap on the amount of open space that can be used for active recreation. Executive staff indicates this is intended to apply to all open space including that which might be off-site. This is a policy choice.</li> </ul>
Section 40 20.18.XXX	Substantive	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adds a new section to K.C.C. Chapter 20.18 requiring Four-to-One proposals with 10 or more dwelling units to have 30% of the units be affordable.</li> <li>- Establishes affordability levels and tenure for homeownership and rental units</li> <li>- Requires implementation consistent with inclusionary housing procedures in K.C.C. Chapter 21A.48</li> </ul>	The proposed Four-to-One changes are substantively consistent with Growth Management Planning Council Four-to-One program review recommendations. Current affordability requirements for Four-to-One proposals only apply to sites that are 200 acres or more in size. This was rarely triggered in the almost 20-years of the program's span. The proposed changes would require affordable housing in almost all Four-to-One proposals, consistent with current housing goals and needs and in alignment with similar provision in the current inclusionary housing program in K.C.C. 21A.48.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At A., the percentage of affordable units required is 30% of the total number of dwelling units that need to be affordable at 80% AMI for ownership or 60% AMI for rental. There is no density bonus proposed as with the other areas with mandatory inclusionary housing. Density bonuses help to offset the cost of affordable units. The Council may wish to consider adding a density bonus to increase density in the UGA.</li> </ul>

Four-to-One Program Update  
3/8/24

Ordinance Section	King County Code Section	Current Code	Proposed Change	Executive's Intent/Rationale	Policy Staff Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County's existing inclusionary housing regulations only require 25% of units to be affordable when they are for rent at 60% AMI. The proposed regulations would require 30%. The affordability requirements for the 4:1 program are a policy choice for Council.</li> <li>• At A.4a., this would have the proportion of affordable rental/ownership be identical to market rate proportion. This may not be possible depending if there are an odd number of units. The Council may wish to add some flexibility to the language while maintaining the intent. The Council may wish to remove this provision and let the developer determine how the affordable units are distributed based on occupancy.</li> <li>• In D., relying on the existing inclusionary housing regulations would allow for alternative compliance either by payment or off-site construction of units in the same CSA. This is a policy choice to allow alternative compliance for 4:1 projects.</li> <li>• This section could be simplified and better integrated with the inclusionary housing regulations.</li> </ul>