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Proposed Rezone:

ARL3

Rezone from Rural 5-Acre to Low Density Multiple Residential.
Applicant: City of Arlington       File: ARL3       12-109657-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

GPP FLUM Designation: Proposed: Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR)
                      Existing: Rural Residential (RR) with Rural Urban Transition Area (RUTA)

GPP Text Amendments: Proposed: N/A

UGA Expansion: Yes – Arlington UGA

Zoning: Proposed: Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR)
         Existing: R-5

Acres: 239

SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location: The proposal site is located on the west side of Interstate-5 (I-5), adjacent to and immediately west of the Arlington UGA and adjacent to and immediately north of the Marysville UGA. The proposal site is bounded on the north by 200th St. NE, on the west by 19th and 23rd Aves. NE, and on the south by 184 St. NE.

Existing Land Use: The proposal site includes several single family residences on rural parcels. A south bound I-5 rest area is located in the eastern portion of the proposal site.

Adjacent Land Use: West – rural single family residences; North – Arlington Christian School; East – residential and commercial uses in the city of Arlington (Arlington); South – multifamily housing in the city of Marysville (Marysville) and rural single family residences

Adjacent GPP FLUM Designation: West – RR and RUTA; North – RR and RUTA; East – Arlington; and South – RR and RUTA and Marysville

Site Characteristics: The proposal site has relatively flat topography with a mix of woods and pastures. A small stream flows from east to west and bisects the site.
Infrastructure: The proposal site is within Arlington’s water service system. Sanitary sewer service is not available as the proposal site is outside of a UGA. The residences within the proposal site are all on individual septic systems. Arlington has not demonstrated that there are adequate existing or planned utilities including sanitary sewer capacity to serve future urban development of the site.

The primary access from Arlington is to the east via 200th St. NE which crosses over I-5 from the city into the north portion of the proposal site, at which point it becomes a rural local access road. The primary access from the south is via 19th Ave. NE, a rural local access road which becomes a Marysville street further south where it intersects with 172nd St. NE (SR 531). County local access roads connecting the proposal site along the west side are 188th St. NE and 23rd Ave. NE. There are no county roads serving the proposal site that are designated as arterials.

The proposed UMDR plan designation would likely generate significantly more traffic than the existing RR plan designation. The existing county road infrastructure in the area surrounding the proposal site is inadequate for the proposed future land uses because of the lack of signalized intersections, designated arterials and road connectivity with urban areas east of I-5 to serve this proposed UGA expansion. A traffic and access/circulation study would be required for this proposal if it were placed on the final docket.

Critical Areas: The proposal site contains a stream and associated wetlands.

EVALUATION

PDS shall conduct an initial review and evaluation of proposed amendments and assess the extent of review that would be required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). PDS shall recommend to the county council that an amendment be further processed only if all of the following criteria are met, except as provided in SCC 30.74.040.

Initial Review and Evaluation Criteria (SCC 30.74.030(1)):

Criterion “a”: The proposed amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies (CPPs), the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), the Growth Management Act (GMA), and other applicable state and federal laws.
No. The proposal by the city of Arlington to expand the UGA to include 239 acres and re-designate from RR and RUTA to UMDR is inconsistent with the GMA, the MPPs, and the CPPs as described below.

GMA
The proposal is inconsistent with the following GMA requirements for locating urban growth (RCW 36.70A.110(3)):

(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350.

The proposal is located in a rural area that contains single family residences on parcels ranging from one-half acre to 15 acres. All residences use on-site septic systems and are accessed by rural local access roads. The proposal area is not characterized by urban growth. Arlington has not demonstrated that there are adequate existing or planned public facilities including sanitary sewer capacity and transportation improvements to serve future urban development of the site.

The proposal is inconsistent with the following GMA buildable lands review and evaluation requirement in RCW 36.70A.215(1)(b):

(1) Subject to the limitations in subsection (7) of this section, a county shall adopt, in consultation with its cities, countywide planning policies to establish a review and evaluation program. This program shall be in addition to the requirements of RCW 36.70A.110, 36.70A.130, and 36.70A.210. In developing and implementing the review and evaluation program required by this section, the county and its cities shall consider information from other appropriate jurisdictions and sources. The purpose of the review and evaluation program shall be to:

(a) Determine whether a county and its cities are achieving urban densities within urban growth areas by comparing growth and development assumptions, targets, and objectives contained in the countywide planning policies and the county and city comprehensive plans with actual growth and development that has occurred in the county and its cities; and

(b) Identify reasonable measures, other than adjusting urban growth areas, that will be taken to comply with the requirements of this chapter.

RCW 36.70A.215(1) requires a county, in consultation with its cities, to adopt countywide planning policies to establish a buildable lands review and evaluation program to assist in maintaining appropriately sized urban growth areas. The county has done so. RCW 36.70A.215(1)(b) directs cities and the counties to first consider measures that are reasonably likely to increase capacity without expanding UGAs to resolve inconsistencies between planned growth and development capacity to
accommodate the growth that was identified in the most recent buildable lands review and evaluation program.

Arlington has not submitted an updated list of reasonable measures that would first assess increasing residential land capacity within its existing UGA before proposing an expansion of the UGA boundaries.

Arlington’s proposed UGA expansion to increase residential capacity within its UGA is the result of the most recent draft buildable lands report (BLR). The Draft Snohomish County Tomorrow 2012 Buildable Lands Report determined that there will be a lack of sufficient residential capacity for the Arlington UGA by 2025 in relation to its 2025 UGA population target of 26,002. By 2025, the draft 2012 BLR projects that the Arlington UGA as a whole will have a 1,533 person shortfall in residential capacity. This residential shortfall is primarily due the city’s action in the time period between the 2007 BLR and the draft 2012 BLR, to reduce the buildable density originally assumed for the city’s transfer of development rights (TDR) receiving area known as the Brekus-Beach properties. This TDR receiving area is zoned Suburban Residential as it contains a significant amount of critical areas and road access is limited.

It should be noted that the county and its cities are in the process of developing new population and employment growth targets that extend to 2035 to replace the 2025 targets currently contained in the CPPs. The adoption of the new targets will help guide the GMA plan updates in 2015. That update process may resolve identified inconsistencies such as the Arlington UGA residential shortfall. It is possible that the updated growth targets, when compared to the draft 2012 BLR, will result in a significant reduction in the Arlington UGA population shortfall.

MPPs
The proposal is inconsistent with MPP DP-2:

Encourage efficient use of urban land by maximizing the development potential of existing urban lands, such as advancing development that achieves zoned density.

The proposal promotes higher density residential development outside of the existing Arlington UGA without first evaluating opportunities to maximize residential development potential within the existing UGA through an updated analysis of reasonable measures, as required by MPP DP-2.

CPPs
The proposal is inconsistent with CPPs GF-7 and DP-2:

GF-7 Maintain the review and evaluation program, which includes an annual data collection component, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.215 (“Buildable Lands Program”). Complete the evaluation component required by the Buildable Lands Program at least once every five years. This evaluation may be combined with the review and evaluation of County and city comprehensive land use plans and development regulations required by RCW 36.70A.130(1), and the review of Urban Growth Areas required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).

a. Use the procedures report in Appendix E for the Buildable Lands Program.
b. A list of reasonable measures that may be used to increase residential, commercial and industrial capacity in UGAs, without adjusting UGA boundaries, is contained in Appendix D. The County Council shall use the list of reasonable measures and guidelines for review contained in Appendix D to evaluate all UGA boundary expansions proposed pursuant to DP-2.

CPP GF-7 directs cities and the county to consider reasonable measures, other than expanding UGAs, to resolve any inconsistencies identified in the most recent BLR. The draft 2012 BLR identified an inconsistency, which is a lack of sufficient residential capacity for the Arlington UGA by 2025 to accommodate its projected 2025 UGA population target. The county council is required to use the list of reasonable measures to evaluate the city’s proposed UGA expansion. Arlington has not provided evidence that the UGA expansion proposal has been evaluated for consistency with either an existing or updated reasonable measures list.

According to CPP Appendix D, “Jurisdictions should review and update their reasonable measures programs and finding of sufficiency at least every five years in conjunction with the buildable lands review or their comprehensive plan update.” Arlington submitted a reasonable measures report to the county in 2005 and has not provided an updated reasonable measures report to the county since 2005.

**DP-2** An expansion of the boundary of an individual Urban Growth Area (UGA) that results in a net increase of residential, commercial or industrial land capacity shall not be permitted unless:

a. The expansion is supported by a land capacity analysis adopted by the County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110;

b. The expansion otherwise complies with the Growth Management Act;

c. Any UGA expansion should have the support of affected cities. Prior to issuing a decision on a UGA boundary change, the County shall consult with affected cities and give substantial weight to a city’s position on the matter. If the County Council approves an expansion or contraction of a UGA boundary that is not supported by an affected city, it shall include in its findings how the public interest is served by the UGA expansion or contraction despite the objection of an affected city; and

d. One of the following conditions is met:

1. The expansion is a result of the most recent buildable lands review and evaluation required by RCW 36.70A.215 and performed per policy GF-7 following the procedures in Appendix E.

Arlington’s UGA expansion proposal would result in a net increase of residential land capacity and is inconsistent with several applicable criteria and conditions in Policy DP-2.

**Criterion “a”:** The expansion is not supported by a land capacity analysis. PDS determined that the expansion area would support an additional population of 2,193 which exceeds the projected shortfall, based on the current 2025 growth forecast, of 1,533 in population. In addition, it is possible that the forthcoming 2035 population growth targets, when compared to the draft 2012 BLR, will result in a significant
reduction in the Arlington UGA population shortfall, making the additional projected population of 2,193 generated from this proposal even less necessary.

Criterion “b”: The expansion does not comply with GMA provisions in RCW 36.70A.110 which require that Arlington demonstrate that there are adequate existing or planned public facilities, including sanitary sewer capacity and transportation improvements, to serve future urban development of the site. Additionally, the city has not identified any reasonable measures to increase residential development capacity in order to comply with the requirements in RCW 36.70A.215(1)(b).

Criterion “c”: Marysville would be the city most affected by Arlington’s proposed UGA expansion. The Marysville UGA and city limits are adjacent to and south of Arlington’s UGA expansion proposal. Marysville would be directly impacted by traffic generated from the proposal site and may also be impacted by utilities and services necessary for development. Arlington and Marysville are currently negotiating an interlocal agreement to determine the extent of each city’s future planning area not currently in their UGA, including the ARL3 proposal.

Criterion d: Arlington states that the proposed UGA expansion is supported by Condition 1 of Criterion “d” because this expansion is the result of the most recent BLR review and evaluation. The Draft Snohomish County Tomorrow 2012 Buildable Lands Report determined that there would be a lack of sufficient residential capacity for the Arlington UGA by 2025 in relation to its 2025 UGA population target of 26,002. By 2025, the draft 2012 BLR projects that the Arlington UGA as a whole will have a 1,533 person shortfall in residential capacity.

However, as previously noted, the county and its cities are in the process of developing new population and employment growth targets that extend to 2035 to replace the 2025 targets currently contained in the CPPs. The adoption of the new targets will help guide the GMA plan updates in 2015 and may resolve identified inconsistencies such as the Arlington UGA residential shortfall. It is possible that the updated growth targets, when compared to the draft 2012 BLR, will result in a significant reduction in the Arlington UGA population shortfall. Any adjustment to the Arlington UGA will be part of a comprehensive analysis that will occur as part of the county’s 2015 comprehensive plan update pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(3).

Criterion “b”: Any proposed change in the designation of agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands is consistent with the designation criteria of the GMA and the comprehensive plan.
N/A. This criterion is not applicable. The proposal will not change any GMA resource lands designation.

Criterion “c”: If the proposed amendment has been reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed and support a plan or regulation change at this time.
N/A. This criterion is not applicable. The proposed amendment has not been previously reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal.
Criterion “d”: If the next docket cycle to be set is limited to minor amendments by SCC 30.74.015(2)(a), the proposal satisfies all of the following conditions:
N/A. This criterion is not applicable to the proposal since Docket XVII, the next docket cycle to be set, is scheduled for processing of both major and minor amendments according to SCC 30.74.015(2)(c).

Initial Review of Rezone Requests (SCC 30.74.040):

(1) The rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with a concurrent proposed amendment to the future land use map that meets the criteria of SCC 30.74.030.
No. Since the rezone request is for a zone that implements a concurrent proposed future land use map amendment that does not meet the criteria of SCC 30.74.030(1), the proposed rezone is not consistent with this criterion.

(2) Public facilities and services necessary for development of the site, as defined in applicable capital facilities plans, are available or programmed to be provided consistent with the comprehensive plan and development regulations as determined by applicable service providers.
No. Arlington has not demonstrated that public facilities and services, including sewer and water, are available or programmed to serve the proposal site. For example, analysis of feasible wastewater treatment options and analysis of adequate transportation access would be necessary to determine whether those facilities can be adequately provided.

(3) Site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.
Yes, site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.

Summary of Consistency with Review Criteria

| Consistent with Initial Docket Review Criteria: SCC 30.74.030(1) | Consistent with Rezone Criteria: SCC 30.74.040 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| "a" | "b" | "c" | "d" | "1" | "2" | "3" |
| N | N/A | N/A | N/A | N | N | Y |

Recommendation:

According to SCC 30.74.030 and 30.74.040, PDS is required to recommend to the county council that proposed docket amendments be further processed only if all of the initial review and evaluation criteria are met. The docket proposal by the city of Arlington does not meet all of the initial review and evaluation criteria; therefore, PDS recommends that the proposal not be further processed.
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Snohomish County
Docket XVII Initial Review and Evaluation of Docketing
Proposal to the GMA Comprehensive Plan
March 28, 2012

Applicant: City of Everett, Public Works/Utilities
File: 11-108424-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

GPP FLUM Designation:
Proposed: No Change
Existing: Riverway Commercial Farmland (RCF)

GPP Text Amendments:
Proposed: N/A

UGA Expansion:
Yes – SW UGA

Zoning:
Proposed: No Change
Existing: A-10

Acres: 21

SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location:
Smith Island, west of Union Slough, south of 12th St. NE, and east of the City of Everett Water Pollution Control Facility.

Vicinity:
Adjacent to the SW UGA and the City of Everett

Existing Land Use:
The proposal site is vacant and owned by the City of Everett and is used for wetland restoration and mitigation. The site is diked along its east boundary, adjacent to Union Slough, with a dike breach in the south portion of the site.

Adjacent Land Use:
North - pasture/future wetland restoration area; south and east – Union Slough; west – existing and proposed wetland restoration area

Adjacent GPP FLUM Designation:
North, east, south – Riverway Commercial Farmland; west – none (City of Everett)

Site Characteristics:
The north portion of the site is protected from floodwaters originating in Union Slough by a continuous dike. The south portion of the site contains a breached dike along Union Slough that allows the restoration of tidal influenced wetlands on the site.
Infrastructure: Existing dike along the site’s east boundary with Union Slough with a footbridge crossing a breach in the dike. Access to the site is from 12th St. NE.

Critical Areas: The site is within the 100-year floodplain of the Snohomish River. The north portion of the site is designated density fringe. The south portion of the site is designated floodway fringe and contains intertidal wetlands.

Initial Review and Evaluation Criteria:

SCC 30.74.030 and 30.74.040 require PDS to conduct an initial review and evaluation of each docket proposal and any associated rezone request and determine whether a proposal is consistent with all of the following criteria in those two sections.

Criterion “a”: The proposed amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies (CPPs), the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), the GMA, and other applicable state and federal laws.

Yes. The proposal is consistent with the GMA, the MPPs and the CPPs.

GMA
The proposal is consistent with RCW 36.70A.060(4) which requires that designated agricultural land located within urban growth areas shall not be designated as agricultural land of long-term significance under RCW 36.70A.170 unless the city or county has enacted a program authorizing a transfer or purchase of development rights.

The City of Everett has adopted a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

The proposal was evaluated against the criteria in RCW 36.70A.110(8) which generally prohibits, with some exceptions, the expansion of a UGA into the 100-year floodplains of rivers with a mean annual flow of 1000 or more cubic feet per second and located west of the crest of the Cascade mountains. The proposal site is located within the 100-year floodplain of the Snohomish River, which has an annual flow that is greater than 1,000 cubic ft./sec.

According to RCW 36.70A.110(8), the EVR1 proposed UGA expansion is exempt from the prohibition of UGA expansions into a 100-year floodplain since 1) the land is owned by the City of Everett; 2) the city is planning under the GMA; and 3) the use of the land will be limited to wetland restoration with future passive recreation opportunities.

MPPs
The proposal is consistent with MPP DP-29 which addresses the need to “Protect and enhance significant open spaces, natural resources, and critical areas.” The EVR1
proposal would allow for continued protection and future enhancement of the open space, floodplain and wetlands functions on the site.

**CPPs**
The proposal is consistent with CPP DP-1(f) which states that designated agricultural resource lands can only be included in a UGA if “the city or county has enacted a program authorizing transfer or purchase of development rights.” The City of Everett has adopted a TDR program. The proposal would not change the county’s RCF comprehensive plan designation.

**Criterion “b”:** Any proposed change in the designation of agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands is consistent with the designation criteria of the GMA and the comprehensive plan.
N/A. The proposal will not change the current RCF comprehensive plan designation on the site. The proposal is consistent with the designation criteria of both the GMA and the county’s comprehensive plan.

The proposed retention of the RCF comprehensive plan designation within the proposed expansion area of the SWUGA is consistent with the GMA provision in RCW 36.70A.060(4) which requires that agricultural land located within urban growth areas shall not be designated as agricultural land of long-term significance under RCW 36.70A.170 unless the city or county has enacted a program authorizing a transfer or purchase of development rights. The proposal is consistent with GPP LU Policy 1.A.7, which allows designated agricultural lands within a UGA if the designated lands are maintained as natural resource lands and a TDR/PDR program has been enacted by the city or the county. The City of Everett has adopted a TDR program.

**Criterion “c”:** If the proposed amendment has been reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed and support a plan or regulation change at this time.
N/A. The planning commission and the county council have not previously reviewed this proposal.

**Criterion “d”:** If the next docket cycle to be set is limited to minor amendments by SCC 30.74.015(2)(a), the proposal satisfies all of the following conditions:
N/A. The next docket to be set (in 2013) is scheduled to consider further processing of both major and minor amendments. The county council is required under 30.74.050(2) to determine if this proposal should be further processed on a final docket as a minor amendment, a major amendment or not processed further. To assist the council, PDS evaluated the EVR1 proposal against the following minor amendment conditions. The EVR1 proposal did not satisfy condition (iv) as a minor amendment and, therefore, is only eligible to be processed as a major amendment in the next final docket cycle.

1. **The time required to analyze environmental impacts of the proposed amendment is available within the time frame for processing minor amendments.**
   Yes. There is sufficient time available to analyze any environmental impacts of the proposed amendment within the time frame for processing minor amendments.
(ii) The time required for additional analysis to determine the need for additional capital improvements and revenues to maintain level of service, when applicable to the proposal, is available within the time frame for processing minor amendments. Yes. There is sufficient time available to analyze the need for any additional capital improvements and revenues to maintain level of service, when applicable, within the time frame for processing minor amendments.

(iii) The time required for processing any required additional amendments not anticipated by the proponent is available within the time frame for processing minor amendments. Yes. There is sufficient time available to process any required additional amendments not anticipated by the proponent within the time frame for processing minor amendments.

(iv) The proposed amendment does not alter the urban growth area boundary. No. The proposal would alter and expand the SW UGA boundary.

(v) The proposed amendment does not make or require substantial changes to comprehensive plan policy language. Yes. The proposal does not make or require substantial changes to comprehensive plan policy language.

(vi) The proposed amendment does not change land capacity to an extent that would require compensating changes in other areas in order to maintain consistency with policies and growth allocations established at the county and regional level. Yes. The proposal does not change land capacity to an extent that would require compensating changes in other areas in order to maintain consistency with policies and growth allocations established at the county and regional level.

**Initial Rezone Review Criteria (SCC 30.74.040):**

(1) The rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with a concurrent proposed amendment to the future land use map that meets the criteria of SCC 30.74.030. N/A. There is no proposed rezone. The proposal would not change the current A-10 zoning on the subject property. The A-10 zone implements the Riverway Commercial Farmland (RCF) designation which will be retained on the subject property in the proposed UGA expansion. The proposed retention of the RCF designation meets the applicable criteria in SCC 30.74.030, particularly criterion “a” as discussed above.

The GMA and the county’s comprehensive plan require the conservation of agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance. According to SCC 30.21.025(3), the Resource zones category includes the A-10 zone as a zone that conserves and protects agricultural lands which have long-term commercial significance for these uses. Designated agricultural lands as implemented by the A-10 zone are allowed within a UGA provided that the county or affected city has enacted a program authorizing a transfer or purchase of development rights. The City of Everett has adopted a TDR program.

(2) Public facilities and services necessary for development of the site, as defined in applicable capital facilities plans, are available or programmed to be provided consistent with the comprehensive plan and development
regulations as determined by applicable service providers. N/A. There is no proposed rezone. The site is not served by public water or sanitary sewer. The City of Everett proposes to provide fire and police service to the property if the proposal is approved and the property subsequently annexed to the city.

(3) Site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC. N/A. There is no proposed rezone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;b&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;c&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;d&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;1&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**

PDS recommends to the County Council that the City of Everett (EVR1) docket proposal be further processed as part of Final Docket XVII since all applicable criteria in SCC 30.74.030 have been met.
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City of Granite Falls (GF2)

Proposed Rezone

Proposed Rezone:
GF2
Rezone
Rural 5-Acre to Residential-9,600 sq. ft.
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Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
Docket XVII Initial Review and Evaluation of Docketing
Proposal to the GMA Comprehensive Plan
March 29, 2013

Applicant: City of Granite Falls  File: GF2  12-109659-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

GPP FLUM Designation: Proposed: Public/Institutional Use (P/IU)
Existing: Rural Residential (RR) with Rural Urban Transition Area (RUTA)

UGA Expansion: Yes – Granite Falls UGA

Zoning: Proposed: R-9,600
Existing: R-5

Acres: 28.62

SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location: The properties are located east of Ray Gray Road and north of Paradise Lane.

Existing Land Use: The site is undeveloped and contains three parcels. The city owns the two southerly parcels (3 and 20 acres) and the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church owns the north parcel (6.38 acres). The city proposes to expand its existing park, located to the west, to include the city owned portion of the proposal site. The church owned property in the proposal site will be developed as either a church or a retreat facility with trails that would connect to the adjacent future city park.

Adjacent Land Use: West – rural residential development in unincorporated county and city owned parkland within the city limits; North – open space common area tracts associated with a residential development within the city limits; East – Granite Falls sewage treatment plant and privately owned vacant land, all within the city limits; and South – vacant city owned land and a single family residential plat, all within the city limits.

Site Characteristics: The site is vacant with wooded areas in the middle and west portions of the site. The site is slightly hilly in the north portion and there is a moderate slope southward towards the Pilchuck River which is several hundred feet south of the property.
Infrastructure: The site can be served by PUD water and Granite Falls' sanitary sewer.

Critical Areas: A portion of the floodway fringe of the Pilchuck River's 100-year floodplain covers the south one-third of the site. The site also contains several wetland areas.

EVALUATION

PDS shall conduct an initial review and evaluation of proposed amendments and assess the extent of review that would be required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). PDS shall recommend to the county council that an amendment be further processed only if all of the following criteria are met, except as provided in SCC 30.74.040.

Initial Review and Evaluation Criteria (SCC 30.74.030(1)):

Criterion “a”: The proposed amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies (CPPs), the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), the Growth Management Act (GMA), and other applicable state and federal laws.
Yes. The proposal by the city of Granite Falls to expand the UGA to include 29.38 acres and re-designate to Public/Institutional Use is consistent with the GMA, the MPPs, and the CPPs.

GMA

The proposal was analyzed for consistency with the following UGA requirements in RCW 36.70A.110:

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

The proposed UGA expansion is consistent with the requirement in RCW 36.70A.110(2) that a city must include sufficient area to accommodate a broad range of needs and uses to accompany the projected urban growth including government and institutional uses. The proposed UGA expansion and re-designation to Public/Institutional Uses would include city-owned land for future public park purposes and church-owned land for future community uses.

(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve
such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that
will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and
services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are
provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions
of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated
new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350.

Existing public facilities and services, including fire and law enforcement protection,
and sewer and water services, within the UGA can be extended to serve the proposed
UGA expansion, consistent with the requirements in RCW 36.70A.110(3).

MPPs
The proposal is consistent with the following MPP:

DP-39: Identify and create opportunities to develop parks, civic places and public
spaces, especially in or adjacent to centers.

The proposal is consistent with MPP DP-39 which addresses the need to develop
parks and open space in order to create more livable communities.

CPPs
The proposed Granite Falls UGA expansion and re-designation from RR to P/IU to
include city-owned park land and a parcel owned by the Christian and Missionary
Alliance Church is consistent with CPP DP-2 which establishes conditions for
expansion of a UGA boundary.

DP-2 An expansion of the boundary of an individual Urban Growth Area (UGA) that
results in a net increase of residential, commercial or industrial land capacity
shall not be permitted unless:

a. The expansion is supported by a land capacity analysis adopted by the
County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110;
b. The expansion otherwise complies with the Growth Management Act;
c. Any UGA expansion should have the support of affected cities. Prior to
issuing a decision on a UGA boundary change, the County shall consult with
affected cities and give substantial weight to a city’s position on the matter.
If the County Council approves an expansion or contraction of a UGA
boundary that is not supported by an affected city, it shall include in its
findings how the public interest is served by the UGA expansion or
contraction despite the objection of an affected city; and

d. One of the following conditions is met:

6. Schools (including public, private, and parochial), churches, institutions
and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within
the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired
growth plans should be located in an urban growth area. In the event that it
is demonstrated that no site within the UGA can reasonably or logically
accommodate the proposed facilities, urban growth area expansions may
take place to allow the development of these facilities provided that the
expansion area is adjacent to an existing UGA.
The most relevant CPP for purposes of evaluating this proposal is DP-2. Although the purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for UGA expansion proposals that would result in a net increase of residential, commercial, or industrial capacity, one of the conditions that can be met for expansion applies to uses such as churches and community facilities, in this case parks, which do not increase residential, commercial or industrial capacity.

The P/IU future land use map designation in the GPP is applied to lands used or planned for public or institutional purposes. Lands designated P/IU are not intended to accommodate population or employment capacity within UGAs and, therefore, no land capacity analysis is required.

The proposed UGA expansion is consistent with requirements of the GMA as described in this report. The proposal is sponsored by Granite Falls, which is the city affected by the UGA expansion application.

The proposal is consistent with Condition No. 6 of CPP DP-2(d) for expansion of an individual UGA since the Granite Falls UGA expansion would include city-owned parkland and church-owned property that 1) primarily serves residents within the UGA; 2) is a logical location given the proximity to adjacent city parkland, city services, urban population densities; and 3) is located adjacent to the existing UGA boundary.

Criterion “b”: Any proposed change in the designation of agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands is consistent with the designation criteria of the GMA and the comprehensive plan.
N/A. This criterion is not applicable. The proposal will not change any GMA resource lands designation.

Criterion “c”: If the proposed amendment has been reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed and support a plan or regulation change at this time.
Yes. The area of the proposed plan map amendment was previously reviewed by the planning commission and county council as part of the 10-Year Update of the county comprehensive plan in 2005. Circumstances have significantly changed and support the proposal at this time. The proposed UGA expansion area was previously located within the Granite Falls UGA prior to 2005. At that time, the entire 28.62 acre proposal area was under private ownership. At the request of the city, the county council removed the proposal area from the Granite Falls UGA as part of Amended Ordinance No. 05-074 in conjunction with adoption of the 10-Year Update. Subsequently, the city purchased 23 acres of the proposal area in 2011 for park purposes in order to add this property and the church parcel to the UGA.

Criterion “d”: If the next docket cycle to be set is limited to minor amendments by SCC 30.74.015(2)(a), the proposal satisfies all of the following conditions:
N/A. This criterion is not applicable to the proposal since Docket XVII, the next docket cycle to be set, is scheduled for processing of both major and minor amendments according to SCC 30.74.015(2)(c).
Initial Review of Rezone Requests (SCC 30.74.040):

(1) The rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with a concurrent proposed amendment to the future land use map that meets the criteria of SCC 30.74.030.
Yes. Since the rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with the concurrent proposed future land use map amendment that meet the criteria of SCC 30.74.030, the proposed rezone is consistent with this criterion.

(2) Public facilities and services necessary for development of the site, as defined in applicable capital facilities plans, are available or programmed to be provided consistent with the comprehensive plan and development regulations as determined by applicable service providers.
Yes. Public facilities and services including sewer and water are available to the site and would be provided by the city of Granite Falls.

(3) Site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.
Yes. A site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.

Summary of Consistency with Review Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consistent with Initial Docket Review Criteria: SCC 30.74.030(1)</th>
<th>Consistent with Rezone Criteria: SCC 30.74.040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;b&quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;c&quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;d&quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;1&quot;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;2&quot;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;3&quot;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:

According to SCC 30.74.030 and 30.74.040, PDS is required to recommend to the county council that proposed docket amendments be further processed only if all of the initial review and evaluation criteria are met. The city of Granite Falls (GF2) docket proposal does meet all of the initial review and evaluation criteria; therefore, PDS recommends that the proposal be further processed.
Proposed Future Land Use Map Comprehensive Plan Amendment
(Revised 5/20/2013)

City of Sultan (SLN2)

Future Land Use Plan Designations:
- Commercial Forest
- Commercial Forest-Forest Trans. Area
- Riverway Commercial Farmland
- Local Commercial Farmland
- Low Density Rural Res. (1 DU/20 Ac.)
- Rural Res. - 10 Res. Trans. (1 DU/10 Ac.)
- Rural Residential-5 (1 DU/5 Acres)
- Rural Residential-5 (1 DU/5 Acres Basic)
- Urban Low Density Residential
- Urban Medium Density Residential
- Public/Institutional

Proposed FLU Map Amendment:
- UGA Removal
- UGA Addition 1
- UGA Addition 2

Produced by Snohomish County Department of Planning and Development Services, Cartography/GIS

Map: W:\plng\carto\docket\Docket_XVII\Preliminary\2013\CityofSultan_SLN2_FLU_rev5-2013.mxd Date: 5/20/2013
Proposed Rezones (Revised 5/20/2013)

Proposed Rezone:

SLN2
- Proposed UGA Additions 1 and 2
  - Rezone Rural 5-Acre to Residential-7,200 sq. ft.
- Proposed UGA Removal
  - Proposed UGA Removal
  - Rezone Residential-7,200 sq. ft. and Residential-9,600 sq. ft. to Rural 5-Acre

Zoning:
- Forestry
- Agriculture 10-Acre
- Rural Conservation
- Rural 5-Acre
- Residential-9,600 sq. ft.
- Residential-7,200 sq. ft.
- Townhouse
- Rural Use

Proposed UGA Boundary
City of Sultan
Assessor Parcels
100-year Floodplain
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Applicant: City of Sultan  
File: SLN2  
12-109658-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

GPP FLUM Designations and Urban Growth Area (UGA) adjustments:

Proposed removal: Remove 380 acres from the Sultan UGA and redesignate from Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR) to Rural Residential (RR)

Proposed addition 1: Add 138 acres to the Sultan UGA and redesignate from RR and Rural Urban Transition Area (RUTA) to ULDR

Proposed addition 2: Add 76 acres to the Sultan UGA and redesignate from RR and RUTA to ULDR

Zoning:

Proposed removal: Rezone 380 acres from R-7,200 & R-9,600 to R-5

Proposed addition 1: Rezone 138 acres from R-5 to R-7,200

Proposed addition 2: Rezone 76 acres from R-5 to R-7,200

Acres:

UGA removal area total: 380 acres

UGA addition area 1: 138 acres
UGA addition area 2: 76 acres
Total: 214 acres
SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location:  
UGA removal - NW portion of the Sultan UGA in the area of Trout Farm Road and east of the Sultan River.

UGA addition 1 - North of the Sultan UGA, SW and SE corners of the intersection of Sultan Basin Road and 124th St SE.

UGA addition 2 - East of the Sultan UGA, east of 339th Ave SE (Rice Road) and north of 140th St. SE.

Existing Land Use:  
UGA removal - Large and small parcel rural residential.
UGA addition 1 - Large parcel rural residential
UGA addition 2 - Large parcel rural residential

Adjacent Land Use:  
UGA removal - North/northeast - commercial forest lands; west – rural residential; south/southeast – city of Sultan and single family development.

UGA addition 1 - North/northeast – rural residential; southeast, south, west and northwest – primarily vacant parcels within the UGA with one single family residential subdivision west of the site within the city limits.

UGA addition 2 - North – commercial forest lands; east – large lot rural residential; south and west – single family residential within the UGA.

Site Characteristics:  
UGA removal - Mix of forested and open areas along the Sultan River with very steep slopes along the eastern edge of the site.

UGA addition 1 - Mix of forested and open areas; moderate grade with steep slopes along western portion of site.

UGA addition 2 - Relatively flat grade with moderate slopes along the north boundary; primarily open pasture land; Wagleys Creek flows north to south through the site.
Infrastructure:

The UGA removal site is accessed by 307th Ave. SE and Trout Farm Road and is within the city’s public water service area. No sanitary sewer service is available to the removal site. Residences in the removal site rely on-site sewage disposal systems.

The Sultan Basin Road, a minor arterial is the primary access road to UGA Addition 1. No significant impacts were identified to county roads as a result of this addition. However, there may be local impacts to city streets and SR2.

339th Ave. SE (Rice Road), a collector arterial, is the primary access road to UGA Addition 2. No significant impacts were identified to county roads as a result of this addition. However, there may be local impacts to city streets and SR2.

The two UGA addition sites currently rely on individual wells and on-site sewage disposal systems. The city states that public water and sanitary sewers can reasonably be extended to serve these two sites.

Critical Areas:

UGA removal – Sultan River 100-year floodplain is located along the west portion of the site; steep slopes along the east portion of the site; lake and stream in the north portion of the site.

UGA addition 1 - Steep slopes along west portion of site

UGA addition 2 – Wagleys Creek flows north to south through the site

EVALUATION

PDS shall conduct an initial review and evaluation of proposed amendments and assess the extent of review that would be required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). PDS shall recommend to the county council that an amendment be further processed only if all of the following criteria are met, except as provided in SCC 30.74.040.

Initial Review and Evaluation Criteria (SCC 30.74.030(1)):

Criterion “a”: The proposed amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies (CPPs), the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), the Growth Management Act (GMA), and other applicable state and federal laws.
Yes. The proposed adjustment of the UGA boundaries by the city of Sultan is consistent with the GMA, the MPPs, and the CPPs.

**GMA**
The proposal is consistent with the UGA requirements in RCW 36.70A.110(3):

> (3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas . . .

The primary purpose of Sultan's proposed adjustments to the UGA boundaries is to include only those areas where infrastructure, particularly roads, sewer and water, can be adequately provided. According to Sultan, the isolated nature of the proposed UGA removal area would require costly road and utility improvements in order to provide urban levels of service. The city states that the areas proposed for addition to the UGA can more cost effectively be served by public sewer and water.

**MPPs**
The proposal is consistent with following Vision 2040 MPP:

> *DP-1 Provide a regional framework for the designation and adjustment of the urban growth area to ensure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.*

The proposed adjustment to the Sultan UGA is consistent with the MPP DP-1 which allows for adjustments to UGAs in order to plan for more efficient land uses and infrastructure to better accommodate population and employment growth within a UGA.

**CPPs**
The proposal is consistent with CPP DP-3:

> Following consultation with the affected city or cities, the County may adjust urban growth areas – defined in this policy as concurrent actions to expand an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in one location while contracting the same UGA in another location – without resulting in net increase of population or employment land capacity. Such action may be permitted when consistent with adopted policies and the following conditions:

  a. The area being removed from the UGA is not already characterized by urban development, and without active permits that would change it to being urban in character; and

  b. The land use designation(s) assigned in the area removed from the UGA shall be among the existing rural or resource designations in the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County.

Sultan’s proposed UGA adjustments will not result in a net increase of population land capacity. For the proposed UGA removal area, there would be a population reduction
The two proposed addition areas would add a total population of 655. This adjustment would result in no net increase in population land capacity. The residential densities used in the land capacity analysis were derived from Snohomish County Tomorrow's draft 2012 Buildable Lands Report.

The city's proposal is consistent with conditions “a” and “b” for adjusting UGAs under CPP DP-3. The proposed removal area is characterized by single family rural residences that are served by individual on-site sewage disposal systems. There are no active permits for urban development as the area is not served by urban infrastructure, including sanitary sewers. The RR land use designation assigned to the area proposed for removal from the UGA is an existing rural land use designation in the GPP.

**Criterion “b”:** Any proposed change in the designation of agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands is consistent with the designation criteria of the GMA and the comprehensive plan.
N/A. This criterion is not applicable. The proposal will not change any GMA resource lands designation.

**Criterion “c”:** If the proposed amendment has been reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed and support a plan or regulation change at this time.
N/A. The proposed amendment has not been previously reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal.

**Criterion “d”:** If the next docket cycle to be set is limited to minor amendments by SCC 30.74.015(2)(a), the proposal satisfies all of the following conditions:
N/A. This criterion is not applicable to the proposal since Docket XVII, the next docket cycle to be set, is scheduled for processing of both major and minor amendments according to SCC 30.74.015(2)(c).

**Initial Review of Rezone Requests (SCC 30.74.040):**

(1) The rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with a concurrent proposed amendment to the future land use map that meets the criteria of SCC 30.74.030.
Yes. Since the rezone requests are for implementing zones consistent with the concurrent proposed future land use map amendments that meet the criteria of SCC 30.74.030(1), the proposed rezones are consistent with this criterion.

(2) Public facilities and services necessary for development of the site, as defined in applicable capital facilities plans, are available or programmed to be provided consistent with the comprehensive plan and development regulations as determined by applicable service providers.
Yes. According to Sultan, public facilities and services, including sewer and water, will be programmed to serve the proposed UGA additions and would be provided by the city.
(3) Site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.
Yes. A site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.

Summary of Consistency with Review Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistent with Initial Docket Review Criteria: SCC 30.74.030(1)</th>
<th>Consistent with Rezone Criteria: SCC 30.74.040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;b&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:

According to SCC 30.74.030 and 30.74.040, PDS is required to recommend to the county council that proposed docket amendments be further processed only if all of the initial review and evaluation criteria are met. The city of Sultan docket proposal **does** meet all of the applicable initial review and evaluation criteria, therefore, PDS recommends that the proposal be further processed.
Proposed FLU Map Amendments:

**STAN5**

- **Proposed UGA Additions 1 and 2**:
  - Redesignate Rural Residential-5 (1 DU/5 Acres) to Urban Low Density Residential

- **Proposed UGA Removal 1a**:
  - Redesignate Urban Low Density Residential to Local Commercial Farmland

- **Proposed UGA Removal 1b**:
  - Redesignate Urban Low Density Residential-5 (1 DU/5 Acres)

- **Proposed UGA Removal 2**:
  - Redesignate Urban Industrial to Riverway Commercial Farmland

---
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Proposed Rezones

STAN5

Proposed UGA Additions 1 and 2:
- Rezone Rural 5-Acre to Residential 9,600 sq. ft.

Proposed UGA Removal 1a:
- Rezone Residential 7,200 sq. ft. to Agriculture 10-Acre

Proposed UGA Removal 1b:
- Rezone Residential 7,200 sq. ft. to Rural 5-Acre

Proposed UGA Removal 2:
- Rezone Rural Conservation to Agriculture 10-Acre

Zoning:
- Agriculture 10-Acre
- Rural Conservation
- Rural 5-Acre
- Residential 6,600 sq. ft.
- Residential 7,200 sq. ft.
- Residential 12,500 sq. ft.
- Low Density Multiple Residential
- Multiple Residential
- Neighborhood Business
- Rural Business
- Industrial Park
- Light Industrial
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Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
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Applicant:  City of Stanwood  
File: STAN5  
12-109674-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

GPP FLUM designations and Urban Growth Area (UGA) adjustments:  

- Proposed removal 1a: **Remove** 95 acres from the Stanwood UGA and redesignate from Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR) to Local Commercial Farmland (LCF)
- Proposed removal 1b: **Remove** 21 acres from the Stanwood UGA and redesignate from ULDR to Rural Residential-5 (RR-5)
- Proposed removal 2: **Remove** 26 acres from the Stanwood UGA and redesignate from Urban Industrial (UI) to Riverway Commercial Farmland (RCF)
- Proposed addition 1: **Add** 63 acres to the Stanwood UGA and redesignate from RR-5 and Rural Urban Transition Area (RUTA) to ULDR
- Proposed addition 2: **Add** 70 acres to the Stanwood UGA and redesignate from RR-5 and RUTA to ULDR

Zoning:  

- Proposed removal 1a: **Rezone** 95 acres from R-7,200 to ((R-5)) A-10
- Proposed removal 1b: **Rezone** 21 acres from R-7,200 to R-5
- Proposed removal 2: **Rezone** 26 acres from Rural Conservation (RC) to A-10
- Proposed addition 1: **Rezone** 63 acres from R-5 to R-9,600
- Proposed addition 2: **Rezone** 70 acres from R-5 to R-9,600
Acres: UGA Removal 1a – 95 acres
UGA Removal 1b – 21 acres
UGA Removal 2 – 26 acres
Total: - 142 acres

UGA Addition 1 - 63 acres
UGA Addition 2 – 70 acres
Total: - 133 acres

SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location: UGA removal 1a/1b - North of 288th St. NW (Larson Rd.),
south of 300th St. NW, west of 88th
Ave. NW (Skrinde Rd.), and east of
Pioneer Hwy

UGA removal 2 - North of the Stillaguamish River, south of
SR 532, and west of Stanwood city limits

UGA addition 1 - North of 281st St. (Jensen Rd), and east
of 68th Ave NW (Cedarhome Rd.)

UGA addition 2 - North of Pioneer Hwy., south of SR 532,
west of 64th Ave NW (Woodland Rd.),
and east of Stanwood city limits

Existing Land Use: UGA removal 1a/1b - Rural residences
UGA removal 2 - Agricultural operation
UGA addition 1 - Rural residences
UGA addition 2 - Rural residences and Stanwood –
Camano Fairgrounds

Adjacent Land Use: UGA removal 1a/1b – Large lot rural residences to the
north, west and east; small lot rural
residences to the south

UGA removal 2 – Agricultural lands to the north, west and
south; mini-storage in the city to the east
UGA addition 1 - Rural residences to the north and east; urban residential development to the west and south within the city

UGA addition 2 - Rural residences to the east and south; school and large lot single family residential to the west within the city; vacant land and single family residence to the north

Site Characteristics:

EGA removal 1a/1b - Mix of woodlands and fields
EGA removal 2 - Historically cultivated fields within floodplain

EGA addition 1 - Primarily fields with wooded swale along east border
EGA addition 2 - Mix of woodlands and fields; Church Creek and tributary located in north portion of site

Infrastructure:

The residences within both the UGA removal areas and the UGA addition areas are served by on-site sewage disposal systems. According to the city, it would be difficult and costly to serve UGA removal areas 1a/1b and 2 with city sewer and water. The UGA addition areas 1 and 2 can more easily and cost effectively be served with city sewer and water. Both public sewer and water services are available adjacent to UGA addition area 1. Public water is currently provided to UGA addition area 2 and public sewer can be provided along Pioneer Highway.

The proposed UGA removals and re-designations to lower intensity agricultural resource and rural residential designations would likely generate significantly less traffic than the existing plan urban plan designations for these sites.

The proposed UGA additions have adequate connectivity with the system of arterial roadways serving the Stanwood area. Both of the proposed UGA additions would impact the intersection of SR 532 and 64th Ave. NW, which is not signalized. The existing road infrastructure, particularly the identified intersection, may not be adequate to serve the future development within these sites. The proposed UGA additions would likely generate significantly more traffic than the existing RR designations. A traffic study would be required for the proposed UGA additions.
The proposed UGA removals and re-designations to lower intensity agricultural resource and rural residential designations would likely generate significantly less traffic than the existing plan urban plan designations for these sites.

**Critical Areas:**

- **UGA removal 1a/1b - Stream located in northern portion of 1a site**
- **UGA removal 2 - Entire site is within the density fringe of the Stillaguamish River floodplain**
- **UGA addition 1 - Forested wetland along east border of site**
- **UGA addition 2 - Church creek and tributary within the north portion of site**

**EVALUATION**

PDS shall conduct an initial review and evaluation of proposed amendments and assess the extent of review that would be required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). PDS shall recommend to the county council that an amendment be further processed only if all of the following criteria are met, except as provided in SCC 30.74.040.

**Initial Review and Evaluation Criteria (SCC 30.74.030(1)):**

**Criterion “a”: The proposed amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies (CPPs), the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), the Growth Management Act (GMA), and other applicable state and federal laws.**

Yes. The proposed adjustment of the UGA boundaries by the city of Stanwood is consistent with the GMA, the MPPs, and the CPPs.

**GMA**

The proposal is consistent with the UGA requirements in RCW 36.70A.110(3):

> (3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350.

Stanwood is proposing the adjustments to its UGA boundaries in order to provide cost effective infrastructure service, particularly sewer and water, within its UGA. The city cannot provide adequate sewer and water utility service to the two proposed UGA removal areas. The three removal areas are difficult to serve due to access and topographic constraints. The parcels proposed for addition to the UGA, either have
existing adjacent water and sewer service (Addition 1), or public water service is already provided and sewer lines can be easily extended (Addition 2).

**MPPs**

The proposal is consistent with MPP DP-1:

> Provide a regional framework for the designation and adjustment of the urban growth area to ensure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.

The proposed adjustment to the Stanwood UGA is consistent with the *Regional Growth Strategy* in *Vision 2040* which allows for minor adjustments to UGAs in order to plan for more efficient land uses and infrastructure to better accommodate population and employment growth within a UGA.

**CPPs**

The proposal is consistent with CPP DP-3:

> Following consultation with the affected city or cities, the County may adjust urban growth areas – defined in this policy as concurrent actions to expand an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in one location while contracting the same UGA in another location – without resulting in net increase of population or employment land capacity. Such action may be permitted when consistent with adopted policies and the following conditions:

  a. The area being removed from the UGA is not already characterized by urban development, and without active permits that would change it to being urban in character; and

  b. The land use designation(s) assigned in the area removed from the UGA shall be among the existing rural or resource designations in the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County.

Stanwood’s proposed UGA adjustments will not result in a net increase of population land capacity. For proposed UGA removal areas 1a and 1b, there would be a population reduction of 589. The two proposed addition areas would add a total population of 551. This adjustment would result in a net decrease in population land capacity. The residential densities used in the land capacity analysis were derived from Snohomish County Tomorrow’s draft 2012 Buildable Lands Report.

The city does not propose to add employment capacity to the UGA to accommodate the 248 estimated jobs that were calculated for the UI designated land that is proposed for removal from the UGA (Removal 2).

The city’s proposal is consistent with conditions “a” and “b” for adjusting UGAs under CPP DP-3. The three proposed removal areas are not characterized by urban development, do not have active permits for urban development, and are not served by urban infrastructure, including sanitary sewers. The RR-5, RCF, and LCF land use designations assigned to the areas proposed for removal from the UGA are existing rural and resource designations in the GPP.
PDS reviewed the land capacity information provided by the city for the proposed UGA adjustments using county parcel, critical areas, public use, and market reduction factors, and future land use designations (for the UGA removal areas) and city assumed densities (for the UGA expansion areas), and have determined that the city’s proposed capacity neutral land use concept is accurate. The residential densities used in the city’s land capacity analysis were derived from Snohomish County Tomorrow’s draft 2012 Buildable Lands Report.

Criterion “b”: Any proposed change in the designation of agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands is consistent with the designation criteria of the GMA and the comprehensive plan.
Yes. The proposal includes the expansion of designated agricultural lands and is consistent with the agricultural designation criteria of the GMA and the county comprehensive plan. As a result of the proposed UGA removals, 95 acres (UGA Removal 1a) would be re-designated to LCF and rezoned to (R-5) A-10 and 26 acres (UGA Removal 2) would be re-designated to RCF and rezoned to A-10. 

((The rezoning of Removal 1a to R-5 is consistent with the R-5 zoning of surrounding LCF parcels. There are, in fact, no LCF designated lands in the county that are zoned A-10 as the General Policy Plan (GPP) does not list any implementing zones for LCF. However, GPP LU Policy 7.B.1 provides the minimum lot area requirements for LCF:))

The minimum GMA guidelines, developed by Commerce, are found at WAC 365-190-050(3) and provide specific rules that must be considered before amending an agricultural resource lands designation.

(3) Lands should be considered for designation as agricultural resource lands based on three factors:
   (a) The land is not already characterized by urban growth . . .
   (b) The land is used or capable of being used for agricultural production . . .
   (i) Lands that are currently used for agricultural production and lands that are capable of such use must be evaluated for designation. The intent of a landowner to use land for agriculture or to cease such use is not the controlling factor in determining if land is used or capable of being used for agricultural production . . .
   (ii) In determining whether lands are used or capable of being used for agricultural production, counties and cities shall use the land-capability classification system of the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service as defined in relevant Field Office Technical Guides. These eight classes are incorporated by the United States Department of Agriculture into map units described in published soil surveys, and are based on the growing capacity, productivity and soil composition of the land.
   (c) The land has long-term commercial significance for agriculture. In determining this factor, counties and cities should consider the following nonexclusive criteria, as applicable:
(i) The classification of prime and unique farmland soils as mapped by the Natural Resources Conservation Service;
(ii) The availability of public facilities, including roads used in transporting agricultural products;
(iii) Tax status, including whether lands are enrolled under the current use tax assessment . . . and whether there is the ability to purchase or transfer land development rights;
(iv) The availability of public services;
(v) Relationship or proximity to urban growth areas;
(vi) Predominant parcel size;
(vii) Land use settlement patterns and their compatibility with agricultural practices;
(viii) Intensity of nearby land uses;
(ix) History of land development permits issued nearby;
(x) Land values under alternative uses; and
(xi) Proximity to markets.

(i) Prime farmland soils: The two sites (Removal 1a and Removal 2) proposed for re-designation to agricultural resource lands contain prime farmland soils as identified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Removal 1a contains Pastik silt loams and Removal 2 contains Puget silty clay loams.

(ii) Availability of public facilities: The two sites are served by a network of rural roads that access the nearby city of Stanwood. Removal 1a is adjacent to Pioneer Highway NW which is a major collector and Removal 2 is adjacent to SR 532 which is a principal arterial. This road network can support the transporting of agricultural products from the sites to urban markets consistent with the intent of this criterion. It is also the intent of this criterion to identify whether certain public facilities are readily available to support a more intensive land use on the site. Sanitary sewer services are considered urban facilities and are generally not available outside of a UGA. The removal of these two sites from the Stanwood UGA will preclude future availability of sanitary sewer service by the city.

(iii) Tax status: The majority of parcels within the Removal 1a site are enrolled in the county’s current use tax assessment program as Open Space General. Only one of the parcels within Removal 1a site is enrolled as Open Space Agriculture. The majority of the parcels in the Removal 2 site are enrolled as Open Space Agriculture. Although enrollment in this tax program is a criterion that demonstrates a commitment to farming, participation in the program is voluntary.

(iv) Availability of public services: Public services that are available to both sites include fire protection and emergency aid provided by the North County Regional Fire Authority and law enforcement provided by the Snohomish County Sheriff. The availability of these public services to the proposal sites is not limited by the proposed agricultural resource designation. No greater intensity of development would occur as a result of the availability of these public services to the site.

(v) Proximity to UGAs: The proposal sites are adjacent to the Stanwood UGA.

(vi) Predominant parcel size: Six out of ten parcels within Removal 1a are nine acres or larger in size. The average parcel size is 9.49 acres. Removal 2
contains four parcels and 26 total acres. Two of the four parcels within Removal 2 are recorded as part of two larger parcels of over 30 acres each that extend north of the site and which are in active agricultural use. The predominant parcel size would not significantly impair the long term commercial viability of the two UGA removal areas for agricultural use.

(vii) Land use settlement patterns: There is no evidence that the existing land use settlement patterns within the proposed sites would be incompatible with long term commercial viability for agricultural use. Only three of ten parcels in Removal 1a contain a single family residence. Only one of four parcels in Removal 2 contains a single family residence.

(viii) Intensity of nearby land uses: The majority of the land surrounding the two sites is designated farmland on the GPP Future Land Use (FLU) map and subsequently has a lower intensity of land use and is compatible with the proposed agricultural resource designations. Removal 1a is adjacent to Removal 1b, which would be redesignated from ULDR to RR-5. The RR-5 designation would result in greater compatibility with the proposed LCF designation than the current ULDR designation. Both sites only narrowly adjoin the Stanwood UGA.

(ix) History of land development permits issued nearby: There is no significant history of land development permits being issued in the unincorporated area surrounding the two sites. In the last eighteen years, only two parcels near the Removal 1a site were issued building permits (single family dwellings). One building permit was issued for a farm stand in 2011 near Removal 2 site

(x) Land values under alternative uses: The proposed redesignations of the two sites to agricultural land use could result in lower land values than under the current ULDR and UI land use designations. However, both sites have development constraints which have likely kept current development potential to a minimum. Removal 1a cannot be cost effectively served by city sanitary sewer. Removal 2 is located in the 100 year floodplain of the Stillaguamish River which limits urban development potential.

(xi) Proximity to markets: The proposal sites are adjacent to the Stanwood UGA and have good road access to transport agricultural products to this market for purchase by distributors or for direct sale at farmers markets. This proximity to markets favors the proposed agricultural designations.

The county comprehensive plan farmland designation criteria are located in GPP LU Policy 7.A.3:

7.A.3 The county shall designate farmland as required by the GMA, and consider the guidance provided for designating agricultural lands of long term commercial significance adopted by the State. In addition, farmland designations and expansions of such designations on contiguous lands should be made considering all of the following criteria:

(a) The land is prime farmland as defined by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (SCS) or consists of other Class III soils in the SCS’s capability classification;

(b) The land is shown to be devoted to agriculture by:
   1. the adopted future land use map;
   2. a current zoning classification of Agriculture-10 acre; and
3. was identified in the 1982 agriculture land inventory, the 1990 aerial photo interpretation, or the 1991 field identification of land devoted to agriculture;

(c) The land is located outside a UGA;
(d) The land is located outside a sewer service boundary; and
(e) The land consists of a parcel of 10 acres or greater in areas designated as Upland Commercial Farmland or Local Commercial Farmland.

The two proposal sites (Removal 1a and Removal 2) meet the criteria in GPP LU Policy 7.A.3 for redesignation to LCF and RCF. The proposal sites meet the criteria for designation as agricultural land of long-term commercial significance as follows:

(a) Prime farmland soils: The two sites proposed for re-designation to agricultural resource lands contain prime farmland soils as identified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Removal 1a contains Pastik silt loams and Removal 2 contains Puget silty clay loams.

(b) Devoted to agriculture: The two sites are devoted to agriculture based on identification in the 1982 agriculture land inventory, the 1990 aerial photo interpretation and the 1991 field identification of land devoted to agriculture. The aerial photos identified areas in active farm operations and those that were idle but included fields, pastures, fences and other factors which indicated past farming activities.

(c) Located outside a UGA: The sites are proposed to be removed from the Stanwood UGA.

(d) Located outside a sewer service area: The sites are proposed to be removed from the Stanwood sewer service area.

(e) Designated Local or Upland Commercial Farmland: The Removal 1a site, which is a proposed redesignation to LCF, contains three parcels that are 10 acres or larger in area. This criterion does not apply to the Removal 2 site which is proposed for re-designation to RCF.

Criterion “c”: If the proposed amendment has been reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed and support a plan or regulation change at this time.

Yes. The proposed amendments include a proposal that has previously been reviewed by the planning commission and the county council. However, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed to support the current inclusion of the previous proposal.

A proposal by Tom and Karie Tarte to expand the Stanwood UGA to include their 9.7 acre parcel as ULDR was submitted in 2007. An initial evaluation was completed by PDS and it was determined that the Tarte proposal was not consistent with all of the initial docket review criteria. The proposal was inconsistent with the CPP for expansion of an individual UGA since the percent of additional population capacity used in the UGA since the start of the planning period in 2005 had not equaled or exceeded 50%. In 2008, the county council, by Amended Motion No. 08-238, did not place the Tarte proposal on the final docket for further processing.
Since that action, the CPPs were revised in 2011 and now include CPP DP-3 which allows the county to consider adjustments of UGAs without resulting in a net increase of population or employment land capacity. The Tarte's 9.7 acre parcel is included in Addition 1 as part of the Stanwood application to adjust its UGA according to the requirements in CPP DP-3.

Criterion “d”: If the next docket cycle to be set is limited to minor amendments by SCC 30.74.015(2)(a), the proposal satisfies all of the following conditions: N/A. This criterion is not applicable to the proposal since Docket XVII, the next docket cycle to be set, is scheduled for processing of both major and minor amendments according to SCC 30.74.015(2)(c).

Initial Review of Rezone Requests (SCC 30.74.040):

(1) The rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with a concurrent proposed amendment to the future land use map that meets the criteria of SCC 30.74.030.
   Yes. Since the rezone requests are for implementing zones consistent with the concurrent proposed future land use map amendments that meet the criteria of SCC 30.74.030, the proposed rezones are consistent with this criterion.

(2) Public facilities and services necessary for development of the site, as defined in applicable capital facilities plans, are available or programmed to be provided consistent with the comprehensive plan and development regulations as determined by applicable service providers.
   Yes. Public facilities and services, including sewer and water, are available to proposed UGA Additions 2 and 3 and would be provided by the city of Stanwood.

(3) Site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.
   Yes. A site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.

Summary of Consistency with Review Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistent with Initial Docket Review Criteria: SCC 30.74.030(1)</th>
<th>Consistent with Rezone Criteria: SCC 30.74.040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;b&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation:

According to SCC 30.74.030 and 30.74.040, PDS is required to recommend to the county council that proposed docket amendments be further processed only if all of the initial review and evaluation criteria are met. The city of Stanwood docket proposal does meet all of the initial review and evaluation criteria; therefore, PDS recommends that the proposal be further processed.