

**Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS)
Docket XVIII Initial Review and Evaluation
Proposed Amendments to the GMA Comprehensive Plan (GMACP) and
Implementing Development Regulations
March 31, 2016**

Applicant: Kevin Van Hollebeke – SW1

File: 15-117164-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

GPP FLUM Designation: Proposed: Urban High Densit Residential (UHDR)
Existing: Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR)

UGA Expansion: No

Zoning: Proposed: Multiple Residential (MR)
Existing: R-9,600

Acres: .45

SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location: 20610 Richmond Rd., between Filbert Rd. and I-405

Vicinity: SW Urban Growth Area (SW UGA) – Bothell Municipal UGA (MUGA)

Existing Land Use: Single family residence

Adjacent Land Use: North and west – existing single family residential subdivisions on R-7,200 and R-9,600 square foot lots; south – existing single family residences on large parcels; east – single family detached unit development under construction

Adjacent GPP FLUM Designation: North and west – ULDR; south and east - UHDR

Adjacent Zoning Designation: West – R-9,600; north – R-7,200; south and east – MR

Infrastructure: Richmond Road is a local county street that serves the proposal site. Richmond Road connects with Filbert Road (SR 524) approximately 600 feet northeast of the proposal site. Filbert Road/SR 524 is under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Transportation and is classified as an urban minor arterial. Water and sewer service are provided by the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District. The subject site is within the service area of Fire District No. 01.

Critical Areas: None identified

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 or federal laws.

Yes. The proposed redesignation to UHDR and rezone to MR 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 proposal would allow for increased density in the SWUGA, which is already characterized by urban growth. The site is served by existing public water and sewer service to accommodate the proposed increased density.

MPPs

The proposal is consistent 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 would maximize the urban residential development potential of the site. The proposal would also encourage more compact and efficient urban development which reduces demand on public facilities and services.

CPPs

The proposal is consistent with CPP DP-11:

The County and cities should revise development regulations and incentives, as appropriate, to encourage higher residential densities and greater employment concentrations in Urban Growth Areas.

The proposed plan redesignation to UHDR and rezone to MR would encourage higher density residential development on this infill site.

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 redesignation to UHDR and rezone to MR 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 in SCC 30.74.030(d):

(i) **The time required to analyze environmental impacts of the proposed amendment is available within the time frame for processing minor amendments;**

Yes. There is time available to analyze environmental impacts of the proposal within the minor amendments docket schedule.

(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 time available for additional analysis within the minor amendments docket schedule to determine the need for additional capital improvements and revenues to maintain level of service if impacted by the proposal.

(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 are no additional required amendments anticipated to process these minor amendments. However, if additional amendments are necessary, there is adequate time to process them within the schedule for this minor amendments docket cycle.

(iv) **The proposed amendment does not alter the urban growth boundary;**

Yes. The proposal does not alter the SWUGA.

(v) **The proposed amendment does not make or require substantial changes to comprehensive plan policy language;**

Yes. The proposal does not necessitate any amendments to the GMACP policies.

(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. The proposal would result in a minimal increase in residential density of approximately 14 persons in the SW UGA.

Initial Review of Rezone Requests (SCC 30.74.040):

PDS shall recommend to the county council that a rezone be further processed only if all of the following criteria are met:

(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 meets 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, serve the proposal site and are provided by the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District.

(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 is not required concurrent with the rezone.

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"
Y	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y	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 Van Hollebeke SW1 proposal is consistent with all of the initial review and evaluation criteria; therefore, PDS recommends that the proposal be further processed as minor amendments.