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MOTION 87-015

APPROVING THE CATHCART-MALTBY-CLEARVIEW
AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, on May 5, 1986; June 9, 1986; June 23, 1986; and July 23, 1986, the Snohomish County Council held public hearings on the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Council carefully and thoroughly considered all oral and written testimony and recommendations of the public, Planning Commission, Department of Planning and Community Development and others; and

WHEREAS, the Council has determined that a comprehensive plan revision to the Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview area is in the interest of the public as there are sufficient changed conditions in that area since the Hillman Plan was adopted in 1964; and

WHEREAS, the Council determined that modifications of certain of the Planning Commission's recommendations were necessary to assure the quality of life in that area, maintain a desirable and high level of environmental protection, and promote, stimulate and sustain economic growth among the properties encompassed by the Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Council did initiate two changes that the Rural and Rural Reserve designations for the planning area north of Highway 522 should be redesignated to a density of one dwelling unit per acre and that the Agricultural designation for the valley side slopes outside of the flood plain above the Snoqualmie River between SR 522 and Crescent Lake Road should be redesignated at 2.3 acres per dwelling unit and through Resolution 86-080 did refer such changes to the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 23, 1986, to consider the Council's recommended changes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:

Section 1. The Snohomish County Council makes the following findings of fact.

1. The original land use plan, known as the Hillman Plan, was adopted in 1964, and many changes, such as population growth, commercial and industrial development, and improved transportation, have occurred since that time.
2. In considering the Planning Commission's recommendation, and in developing its own land use plan, the Council studied a number of factors and information:

a. Current land use,

b. Natural site conditions,

c. Existing environmental quality,

d. Population and growth projections,

e. Availability and future plans for utilities and services,

f. Opinions, desires, exhibits and other testimony of local citizens and community interests,

g. Natural resources,

h. Projected land use needs and opportunities, and

i. Transportation.

3. Local citizens were encouraged to participate and did participate in the planning process. Numerous meetings were held to gather public comment by the planning staff, the Planning Commission and the County Council. Notices of such meetings were placed in newspapers, and an extensive mailing list was assembled to further promote public participation.

4. A number of agencies and organizations were contacted and subsequently became involved in the process. These include:

a. The cities of Snohomish and Bothell,

b. Utility Districts,

c. School Districts,

d. Local interest groups and agencies,

e. State and Federal agencies, and

f. Snohomish County agencies and interest groups.
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5. The plan provides for a mixture of agricultural, rural, suburban residential, commercial and industrial uses.

6. The Rural designation for the planning area south of Highway 522 is supported by the following reasons:
   a. Proposed lot sizes are in keeping with existing lot sizes and the rural character of the planning area;
   b. The majority of roads are narrow, two lane rural roads;
   c. There is a larger extent of environmentally sensitive areas; and
   d. Rural lot sizes will encourage retention of existing upland agricultural uses by minimizing land use conflicts.

7. The plan provides adequate areas to meet the Neighborhood and Community Business needs of the expected population.

8. The plan uses existing industrial uses and zoning to consolidate an approximate 375-acre Maltby Industrial Area. This includes approximately 200 vacant acres which will meet the demand for industrial areas beyond the planning period. A clear boundary is established for the industrial area which will prevent the further placement of incompatible industrial uses in rural residential areas. The Council does not support any expansion of an Industrial designation north of 212th Street SE.

9. The plan's provisions for the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan Community recognizes the benefits of an integrated master plan community in meeting housing needs and the presence of adjacent suburban areas from which urban facilities can be logically extended yet provides policies to minimize primary and secondary impacts on adjacent rural areas.

10. Existing conditions in the planning area have been extensively analyzed and potential impacts of the proposed plan and alternative plans have been evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Draft Supplemental EIS. The Draft and Supplemental EIS were circulated in compliance with SEPA and SCEPO and changes in the text were included in the Final EIS.
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11. The Planning Commission recommended changes to Policies D6. (pg. 36), E6 (pg. 43) and E7 (pg. 44) of the CMC Draft Comprehensive Plan issued December 1984. These policies are amended to read:

D6. Commercial uses should be designed so that they promote the formation of shopping nodes rather than linear (strip) developments.

E6. Require 50-foot buffer strips, visual screens, and similar design features to make proposed industrial development more compatible with neighboring rural residential or agricultural uses.

E7. Maintain or establish 100-foot wide natural vegetation buffers on each side of streams and wetland areas located in a proposed industrial development.

The policy change recommendations are based on the following findings of fact:

a. The importance of promoting shopping nodes rather than strip commercial development should be emphasized by strengthening policy language.

b. A significant amount of public testimony was received on existing problems of compatibility between industrial uses and surrounding residential uses. Many persons testified on the need to promote compatibility and establish minimum buffer standards between the two uses.

c. The Department of Game submitted detailed testimony on the importance of maintaining 100-foot buffers along streams and wetlands.

d. Increased buffer widths will help to maintain the important runs of resident and anadromous fish in the planning area's streams.

12. The Planning Commission recommended approval of a portion of Alternative F as described in the Draft Supplemental EIS (pg. 24) issued April 1985 to apply the Residential Estates designation only to property associated with the Wellington Hills Golf Course (approximately 80 1/2 acres, Tax parcels

s;cmc/motion

APPROVING THE CATHCART-MALTBY-CLEARVIEW AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
Page 4
The Planning Commission recommended that this designation be implemented with the requirement that this area be developed as a Planned Residential Development in accordance with the Planned Residential Development section of the zoning code and with the requirement that the existing golf course (approximately 50 acres) be dedicated and maintained as a golf course or other permanent open space. This recommendation is based on the following findings of fact.

a. Public testimony indicated that the proposed condominium development is necessary to maintain the economic viability of the golf course.

b. It is the intent of the Planning Commission to encourage the retention of the golf course as a recreational and open space asset to the surrounding community.

c. This designation is consistent with similar designations the Planning Commission has recommended around special scenic or recreational attractions in other planning areas.

d. Increased surface water run-off can be mitigated through compliance with the county's drainage ordinance.

e. Any necessary sewer extension can be designed to minimize impacts to adjacent rural areas.

f. The Cross Valley Water Association has included public water service to the Wellington Hills Area within its ten-year capital improvement program.

g. While it is recognized that road improvements may be required, the Wellington Hills area has access to a better transportation network than other portions of the planning area. Necessary road improvements will be required by Title 26B.

13. The plan amendments recommended by the Planning Commission and described in the preceding paragraphs 11 and 12 necessitate changes to the plan text issued in December 1984. Required plan text changes are identified in Exhibit B.
14. The designation of Agricultural for the valley side slopes outside the flood plain above the Snoqualmie River between SR 522 and Crescent Lake Road recommended in the plan issued December, 1984, is changed to a Rural designation and is supported for the following reasons:

a. The side slope areas have not been recommended for an Agricultural designation in the Agricultural Preservation Plan; and

b. Transition area policies have been adopted which address impacts of development adjoining agricultural land.

15. The Rural and Rural Reserve designation for the planning area north of SR 522 recommended in the plan issued December, 1984, are changed to a Residential Estate designation with an associated density of 1 dwelling unit per acre. While the Council has determined in the past that 2.3 and 5 acre zones are the appropriate zones for Rural areas, allowing a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per acre is appropriate in this particular area due to the following unique circumstances:

a. This area is a transition area, with beginning signs of the transition from rural to suburban uses;

b. Testimony indicated there is a demand for smaller, more affordable lots,

c. Public water is generally available and better developed in this portion of the planning area; and

d. There is a more developed road system.

16. The plan amendments established by the Council and described in the preceding paragraphs 14 and 15 necessitate changes to the plan text issued in December, 1984. Required plan text changes are identified in Exhibit B.

Section-2. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, the Snohomish County Council makes the following conclusions.

1. The existing Hillman Area Comprehensive Plan is outdated and needs revision.
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2. The revised plan better deals with existing and future conditions in the area.

3. The revised plan will provide a more consistent and reliable guide for the hearing examiner and other county officials.

4. All provisions of SEPA and SCEPO have been complied with.

5. The Revised Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview Area Comprehensive Plan as prepared and issued in December 1984 and amended by the Snohomish County Planning Commission and Snohomish County Council

- is in the public interest,
- satisfies the needs of the public as well as individual citizens,
- has reasonably considered the needs of the planning area as well as county-wide planning objectives,
- balances the needs of competing land uses,
- provides development guidelines for private citizens and government officials,
- has provided opportunities for citizen participation,
- has been widely communicated and advertised, and
- has been carefully assessed through state and local environmental procedures.

Section 3. Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Council hereby adopts the Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview Area Comprehensive Plan text and map attached hereto as Exhibit A, and amendments recommended by the Council, Planning Commission and Planning Division staff attached hereto as Exhibit B, and incorporates the same herein by this reference. The Council also adopts the amendments to the plan map, as recommended by the Council and the Planning Commission, as identified in Section 1 of this motion and shown in Exhibit C.
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Dated this 4th day of March, 1987.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL
Snohomish County, Washington

Chairman

Clerk of the Council
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INTRODUCTION

A. COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN SNOHOMISH COUNTY

Few of us would argue that we do not need land use planning. Most would agree that working for the highest degree of public health, safety and welfare is a worthwhile goal. The challenge comes when we must make land use decisions. Land use decisions affect many people and each has a slightly different perception about what action is "best", or "most efficient", or "least damaging". A proposal that is attractive to one person may be totally unacceptable to his neighbor.

Local government needs a vehicle for merging the opinions of all interest groups, including residents, landowners, developers, farmers, businessmen, industrialists, low-income elderly, sewer districts, school boards, sports enthusiasts, environmentalists, and a host of others. Furthermore, government needs a forum so that each point of view can be presented openly, rationally, and with a chance of being heard. The forum that is used and required by law is the "comprehensive land use planning process."

This is the Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview (CMC) Area Plan. The CMC Area Plan is one of thirteen area plans (Figure 1) which together constitute the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County. This plan is the land use guide for the CMC area and provides the policy basis for future land use decisions in that community. It describes, in a general way, the existing character of the area and how that influences future development, the rudimentary infrastructure for public services and utilities, the valuable natural resources, demand for residential, commercial, and industrial land, and procedures for avoiding environmental problems in the future.

The first comprehensive plan for the county was adopted in 1957. It was a map showing the distribution of land uses and recommended densities. It did not include a text or policy statement to describe, explain or guide development and change. Consequently, in 1964 the County was divided into twelve planning areas for which a comprehensive plan map and descriptive text were written and adopted. This mosaic of subarea plans comprised the county comprehensive plan. One of these twelve area plans was called the Hillman Plan.

The Hillman Plan was adopted in 1964 and described land uses for the area east of interstates I-5 and I-405, north of the King County line, and south and west of the Snohomish/Snoqualmie River flood plains. The Hillman Plan text and map are descriptive. The plan provides almost no policy guidance or recommendations of a type that can be used by a hearing examiner to make land use decisions. In addition, it was a saturation plan which attempted to anticipate land use needs twenty or more years into the future.
but resulted in short-term, haphazard land use development patterns.

Recognizing these shortcomings, the then Board of County Commissioners directed in June 1975, that the Hillman Plan be revised. Soon after the revision began, it became obvious that the area was too large and diverse to be manageable. As a result, the Hillman area was split into two new planning areas, North Creek area to the west and CMC area to the east. The North Creek Area Plan was completed first and serious work started on the CMC plan in the spring of 1979.
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B. Preparing This Plan

The first task in revising the CMC plan was the preparation and evaluation of background data and materials. These included population, housing and employment forecasts, recent development trends, and several physical environmental variables. Some of this information is not contained in the plan text even though it influenced the evolution of the document. The following maps are on file in the Planning Division and are available for public review:

- slopes
- topography
- soils
- surficial geology
- 1964 Hillman Plan
- existing land use
- current zoning
- ownership and parcel size
- air photographs
- hydrology
- fire, school and water districts
- 1990, 1995 and year 2000 population, housing and employment projections

The second ingredient in developing the plan was public opinion. Workshops were held in April 1979, in the CMC community to:
- publicize the revision of the plan;
- explain the purpose of comprehensive plans and their relationship to zoning, subdivision, and capital improvements, and to solicit opinions about local land use issues. It was clear from workshop comments and written submissions that participants perceive the area to be rural and want it to remain rural. It was equally clear, however, that there is substantial difference of opinion in terms of what it means to be rural and how one proceeds to maintain a rural character. Many citizens believe that rural means large lot size requirements with no provision for planned residential developments (PRDs) or master planned communities. Others believe that large lot size requirements are too restrictive, unfairly limit growth and that physical environmental variables would adequately limit development and preserve rural character.

In responding to these differences of opinion, the Planning Division prepared three alternative plan maps for discussion at a second series of community workshops. These meetings were held in November and December 1979. One map showed 2.3-, 5-, 10-, and 20-acre minimum lot sizes throughout the planning area but provided for small urban lot sizes in a master plan community. A second showed 2.3- and 5-acre lot sizes predominantly with scaled down master plan potential. A third map showed predominantly 2.3-acre lots with suburban sized lots surrounding existing commercial nodes.

At a third round of public workshops in the fall of 1980, a generalized plan map describing an attempt at compromise was
presented and discussed. Based on these workshops and the background work that preceded them, a draft plan and environmental impact statement (EIS) were issued for comment in July 1982. However, the final environmental impact statement, public hearings and adoption of a plan were delayed because of concurrent Planning Commission deliberations on a proposed countywide Growth Management Strategy (GMS).

The Planning Division resumed work on the comprehensive plan in mid-1984, as the growth management issue was not resolved. Data and assumptions of the 1982 plan were reviewed and an update of the plan completed. The updated plan maintained the objective of the 1982 plan to maintain the rural character of the planning area. A Rural designation was recommended for the area south of SR 522 and for areas north of SR 522 outside of the SR 9 corridor. This designation was based on the rural level of public facilities and services available in the area and the existing lot size pattern. The area has no sewer districts, generally has poor soils for septic system use, a rudimentary road system with a lack of north-south or east-west connectors, and rural police and fire protection.

A Rural Reserve designation was recommended for the SR 9 corridor. This designation required an overall rural density of 2.3 acres per dwelling unit (acres/du), but allowed flexibility in the size of individual lots created. Clustering of lots was allowed, with the remaining area required to be included in a large reserve tract. This designation recognized that this area was beginning to experience a transition from rural to semi-rural use, yet that public facilities were not projected to be capable of sustaining a major expansion of development activity. It attempted to recognize the testimony supporting the need for smaller lots, yet promote a development pattern that preserved future development options.

During public information meetings in early 1985, different groups of residents requested consideration of several different alternatives in addition to those already considered in the EIS. Alternatives were developed to consider a one acre residential density throughout the planning area and expansion of the Rural Reserve designation to the Rural designated areas.

In the public hearings on the proposed plan, there was much testimony on appropriate residential lot sizes in different portions of the planning area. Residents in favor of the rural residential densities argued that they lived in the area for its rural character and that the existing conditions in the area in terms of roads, drainage, sewage treatment, and police and fire protection would only support rural densities. Others argued that planning and zoning for the past 20 years had allowed lot sizes as small as one-half acre and this development trend had been established in portions of the planning area. While some areas did have development constraints, those areas which could support higher density should be allowed to develop in accordance with past planning and zoning.
After four public hearings, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Rural and Rural Reserve designations of the proposed CMC plan. Their recommendation was based on the rural level of facilities and services available in the area and the area's existing rural character.

The County Council also had four public hearings on the proposed CMC plan. Due to the past planning and zoning, resultant development trends, and landowner concerns; the recommended Rural and Rural Reserve designations were amended to a Residential Estate designation for the portion of the planning area north of SR 522.

Major differences of opinion still exist among residents, landowners, and citizens interested in the CMC planning area. The issues are discussed in the following paragraphs. Chapter II contains adopted policies and recommendations for future development, and the associated environmental impact statements (EIISs) discuss significant alternatives considered during the plan adoption process.
C. SPECIFIC PLAN ISSUES

SNOWISH CASCADE MASTER PLAN

One of the major issues to be resolved in this comprehensive plan concerns a master plan community called Snohomish Cascade (see Figure 1). A master plan is prepared to coordinate and direct the development of a specific area. It can ensure that growth occurs in an orderly and timely manner and in conformity with the comprehensive plan goals and policies and can provide for more efficient use of areas in high demand for development. A master plan depicts the type and approximate location of land uses, transportation corridors, public facilities, and open space areas. If a master plan and rezone contract is approved, the area is divided into sectors, for which a more detailed plan is prepared, refining the elements listed above and resolving particular development issues. Approval of a sector plan leads to submission of a preliminary plat and subsequent review.

On February 28, 1979, the then Board of County Commissioners approved a master plan for Snohomish Cascade and a contract rezone to Planned Residential Development (PRD) 9600. Even though the zoning was changed to PRD-9600, the adoption resolution states that dwelling unit count, density, and housing type decisions will be made during the revision of the CMC plan and as a part of that planning process.

There are those in the community who believe that a project at the scale of Snohomish Cascade is not compatible with the rural character of the CMC area. They cite potential impacts from the project, such as increased traffic, extension of sewer lines, drainage and water quality problems, as unacceptable and oppose the master plan concept except at very low density.

Others recognize the Snohomish Cascade site as proximate to, and a logical extension of, the existing urban area of the county. They argue that off-site impacts on the rural portions of the CMC area can be avoided and recommend that the community be developed at the density outlined in the master plan. To do otherwise would be an inefficient use of urban resources such as sewers, storm drainage systems, and transportation arterials and would represent a lost opportunity to provide much needed housing in a coordinated and well-planned manner.

There is another factor which affects the extent of development within Snohomish Cascade. In July 1984, the Snohomish County Solid Waste Division released a draft environmental impact statement which identified a 440-acre site in the eastern portion of the Snohomish Cascade holdings as the preferred site for a new regional sanitary landfill. Approximately one-third of the area included in the master community would be required for the landfill and supporting facilities. All of these issues are resolved in the Residential element of Chapter II and opposing views are analyzed in the CMC area draft EIS.
EAST-WEST ARTERIAL

In August 1979, the county's Department of Public Works issued a draft EIS dealing with improvements to, and the extension of, 132nd Street SE from Interstate 5 to SR 9. The county Department of Public Works had contended for years that the county is in serious need of an improved west to east connection across the North Creek Valley to State Route 9. Transportation planning consultants which were retained by the county tended to favor the 132nd Street SE corridor because it would make Snohomish, Monroe, and the Skykonish Valley more accessible to southwest Snohomish County and would help to serve the transportation needs of the Snohomish Cascade community.

Opponents to the extension of 132nd Street argue that it is premature to make this proposal because other arterial corridors have not been adequately considered. In addition, they maintain that there is no demonstrated traffic demand for this east-west link in the near future and that scarce highway construction funds could be better used elsewhere in the county. And finally, critics claim that the primary reason for the 132nd Street extension proposal is to provide a second entrance to the Snohomish Cascade community at the taxpayers' expense. They are concerned that an east-west arterial will increase development pressure in the CMC planning area and eventually destroy the valued rural character of the community. This issue is addressed in the Transportation element of Chapter II.

RURAL LAND USES

Based on the existing land use, parcel size, and ownership pattern, the CMC area is clearly rural in character. Large tracts, wood lots, pasture lands, and hobby farms predominate. Many have chosen to live on acreage in the area because it offers a rural lifestyle within reasonable commute distance of metropolitan areas and employment centers. The area has a rural level of public facilities and services. There are no sewer districts (except Snohomish Cascade), most roads are improved to narrow two lane rural standards, and the soils are generally poor for septic systems.

However, the use of a "saturation" comprehensive land use plan in this rural area since 1964 has had impacts on the development pattern in portions of the planning area.

A "saturation" plan is a type of land use plan which recommends land use and residential densities to reflect the eventual build-out of an area assuming the availability of a full range of necessary services and facilities. The 1964 Hillman Plan recommended a residential density of 1-4 dwelling units per acre over a large portion of the planning area. While a saturation plan may be used in an area where urbanization is encouraged, its use in a rural area can cause scattered, small lot development and conflicting suburban and rural land uses.
For example, in the area north of SR 522 along the SR 9 corridor, there has been a trend towards semi-rural and suburban density development primarily along county roads where public water supply is available.

While the CMC planning area is rural in character, with a rural level of public facilities and services, past planning and zoning has affected the development pattern and raised the development expectations of some landowners. This trend and property owner's concerns led to a change in the recommended Rural and Rural Reserve residential designations to a Residential Estate designation for a portion of the planning area.
D. **HOW TO USE THIS PLAN**

The CMC Area Comprehensive Plan consists of two major components. The first component is this document, the plan text and the land use map. The plan map graphically describes the recommended future land use for this planning area. The plan text discusses the various land use problems in this area and the reasons behind the major policy recommendations and map designations. The second component is the environmental impact statement (EIS) which is required by state and county laws. The EIS discusses the possible environmental impacts and describes how the proposed policies and provisions of the plan help to mitigate the impacts. The EIS also considers several alternative land use proposals which were considered for specific areas within the planning area but which were not adopted for reasons discussed at length in the plan, the EIS, or the plan adoption public hearings.

Additional background information and maps were used in developing this comprehensive plan. These materials were not included in either the plan or the EIS in order to minimize reproduction costs, but are available for public review at the Snohomish County Planning Division.

This comprehensive plan has been written to help private citizens and landowners, as well as public officials, make rational land use decisions. To use this plan, first locate the subject property on the comprehensive plan map and identify the type of land use which is recommended for your particular parcel. Each land use type, residential, commercial, industrial, etc., is discussed in Chapter II of this document. Read the relevant section carefully, noting the assumptions which led to the designation for your parcel, the problems associated with further land development in your area, and conditions which must be satisfied if you wish to develop your land through a rezone, subdivision, or other permit process. A property owner or potential land user should also review the transportation, public services, and environmental management sections for additional information, policies, and recommendations which may influence development in this planning area. Of particular importance are the "specific policies" which are identified in the plan text and which will govern all permit processing and review of development proposals in this planning area. The specific policies are in contrast to general policies which are statements of planning assumptions and were used to develop this comprehensive plan.
Chapter II

PLAN ELEMENTS
Chapter 2

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENTS

A. PLAN SUMMARY

The Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview (CMC) planning area is a rural portion of the county. The area south of SR 522 is characterized by large tracts of open space, forest lots, pasture lands, productive dairy farms, and predominantly dispersed residential units on large rural lots. These resources are of value to the county's economy and to the residents who are searching for a rural lifestyle. The goal of the comprehensive plan in this area is to maintain the rural character by allowing primarily large rural-size lots to be developed and to support agriculture and rural activities.

The area north of SR 522 is also a rural area with hobby farms, pasture land, open space, wood lots, and rural homesites.

However, the development pattern also shows the trend of semi-rural residential development in the SR 9 corridor which has occurred under the past Hillman Plan. Due to past planning and zoning, resultant development trends, and landowners support for small lot sizes, this plan recommends a Residential Estate designation for residential areas north of SR 522. Due to the development constraints of the area, it is expected that the overall character of this area will remain rural.

While there is not unanimous support among local residents and landowners for these objectives, they emerge as the most logical and reflect the realities that will be found in this planning area over the next ten years. The county has responded to these realities and to the lack of funds for infrastructure expansions by adopting Interim Growth Management policies. These policies encourage new developments of higher density in close proximity of, or within, existing urban areas and communities. In rural portions of the county, low density requirements are aimed at preserving agriculture, environmental amenities, and the rural character of the area. To that end, this plan also attempts to preserve opportunities for future urban development through its recommendations for the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan.
B. POPULATION GROWTH

GOAL:

Accommodate growth in the CMC planning area in a way that will preserve the rural and semi-rural character and protect the physical environment.

GENERAL POLICIES:

B1. Scale the land use allocations in this plan to a projected 1995 population of 15,500 residents.

B2. Provide for a range of land uses consistent with the rural and semi-rural character in this planning area.

B3. Accommodate growth in the area south of SR 522 in a manner that is compatible with a rudimentary system of public services and utilities, a fragile physical environment, and existing rural land uses.

DISCUSSION

Snohomish County has grown rapidly over the past several decades. While there have been periods of boom (1977-1979) and bust (1971-1973), the long-term trend has been one of a moderate to high rate of growth. Furthermore, state and regional projections suggest that the growth rate will continue at existing levels until at least the year 2000.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>172,199</td>
<td>265,236</td>
<td>354,847</td>
<td>400,767</td>
<td>449,936</td>
<td>510,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(34%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,715</td>
<td>7,752</td>
<td>12,034</td>
<td>15,479</td>
<td>19,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64%)</td>
<td>(55%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) Refers to percent change in population over the previous period.
The CMC area can expect a small additional increase in population if the U.S. Department of Navy sites a homeport for a 15-ship Carrier Battle Group in Everett as expected. The Puget Sound Council of Governments (PSCOG) has provided preliminary forecasts of impacts expected from location of the homeport, with most of expected growth occurring in the Everett, Lynnwood and Alderwood areas. The PSCOG forecasts show that the CMC area could expect an increase of 200 people by 1990 and 400 people by the year 2000.

For a variety of reasons, the county is finding it increasingly difficult to accommodate population growth and new development. Inflation, the 106% level lid, and increasing demands for service have resulted in severe financial problems for the county. In addition, increasing numbers of residents are attending public hearings to protest new development, citing the impacts on schools, highways, police and fire protection, the drainage system, and the character of their communities.

One response on the part of the county has been to attempt to channel new growth into appropriate locations. Urban and suburban development with its greater dependence on sophisticated public services and utilities is encouraged to locate in existing urban areas where the necessary infrastructure is planned or already available. Rural activities, on the other hand, are encouraged to locate in the outlying portions of the county where they are compatible with existing land uses and a fragile physical environment.

The area south of SR 522, with its rural level of services and facilities, is an area where rural activities, including rural residential uses, will be encouraged. While the plan designation for the area north of SR 522 allows semi-rural development, the area is expected to maintain a rural character overall due to development constraints, such as the existence of poor soils for septic system use and steep slopes. In addition, the allocation of commercial land uses will be scaled to meet the needs of the projected 1995 population of 15,500 residents. It is important to note, however, that actual growth and the rate at which it occurs is a function of national and regional economic conditions, housing preferences, and the availability of public services and facilities necessary to support growth. In general, the county does not anticipate any major capital improvement projects in the bulk of the CMC area by 1995, so that new development may in some cases be limited by the lack of infrastructure to support it.
C. RESIDENTIAL LAND USE

GOAL:

Distribute the expected residential growth in a pattern that will maintain the existing rural and semi-rural character of the CMC area and preserve environmental quality.

GENERAL POLICIES:

C1. Designate the area south of SR 522 for low density, large lot, rural residential use in keeping with the rudimentary road system, rural level of public facilities and services and existing lot sizes.

C2. Preserve future development options in that portion of the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan area which is not authorized for development during the life of this comprehensive plan.

C3. Provide a Residential Estate designation for residential areas north of SR 522 with a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per acre.

C4. Recognize the unique recreational nature of the Wellington Hills Golf Course by providing the opportunity for clustered residential development, while assuring that the golf course will remain in permanent open space.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:

C5. Where the opportunity is available, require that dwelling units and other structures be located on the least environmentally sensitive portion of the building lot.

C6. Require building setbacks and natural vegetation buffers as provided in Policy I3 and I4, page 67, along all streams, lakes, wetlands and wet soils to avoid adverse impacts on the hydrologic system.

C7. Encourage rural residential development which is sensitive to neighboring land uses and the rural character of the planning area.

C8. Approval of maximum density in plats and short plats within the Residential Estate designation should be dependent on the availability of adequate soils for on-site sewage disposal, adequate roads and drainage, the lack of constraining environmentally sensitive areas and, where wells are used, a demonstration of well supply reliability for the entirety of the subdivision.

C9. Wherever possible, subdivisions shall be designed to use a single access from a dedicated county road.
C10. Rezone the area designated Residential Estate in the Wellington Hills Area to a higher density zone than Rural Conservation only if the approximate 80-acre area is developed as a unit under the Planned Residential Development section of the zoning code and the existing golf course is dedicated and maintained as a golf course or other permanent open space.

Additional policies address specifically the Snohomish Cascade community and will be discussed later in this chapter.

DISCUSSION

As mentioned briefly in Chapter 1, there was considerable discussion of residential development issues at the public workshops and hearings conducted during the CMC comprehensive planning process. As Tables 2 and 3 demonstrate, the predominant land uses in the CMC area are rural uses. Over 80% of the planning area is shown in vacant, undeveloped residential, agriculture, or forest uses. A little over 2% of the total land area is being used for urban uses such as industrial, commercial, government, education, or utilities.

Table 2

LAND USE - 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Commercial</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govern/Ed/Util</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommitted Vacant</td>
<td>10,123</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Tax</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1985 Planning Inventory of Assessor's Information File
Table 3

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>No. of Dwelling Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 1 acre</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 acre to 2.3 acres</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 acres to 10 acres</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 10 acres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,289</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1985 Planning Inventory of Assessor's Information File

In 1985, about 66% of the residential dwellings in the CMC area were situated on building lots larger than 1 acre in size, and 34% of the lots were larger than 2.3 acres in size. This lot size distribution helps to explain the category "undeveloped residential" shown in Table 2. This category does not identify vacant building lots, but rather, the nonresidential portion of large residential parcels. Typically, a family living on a 5- or 10-acre parcel will use approximately 1 acre for the building site and associated garden and lawn areas, with the remaining land used for animal pasture, wood lot, or natural open space. The undeveloped residential category refers to this pasture or open space area.

Table 3 also shows approximately 33% of the developed lots in the planning area are parcels of 1 acre or smaller. This reflects the trend in the SR 9 corridor of semi-rural or suburban development occurring under the provisions of the 1964 Hillman "saturation" plan which allowed suburban development in this rural area of the county. A "saturation" plan provides a plan for the ultimate land use when an area eventually builds out, assuming that all necessary facilities and services are available. Planners have learned that use of a saturation plan in a rural area can cause short-term haphazard growth. Since the densities and extent of land planned for residential growth so greatly exceeds facility and service capacity and expected rural population growth, scattered small lot subdivisions and conflicting suburban and rural land uses can result.
RESIDENTIAL ESTATE

The area north of SR 522 is presently rural in character. It consists of a mixture of hobby farms, pasture, wood lots, residential homesites and open space. The area has no sewer districts (except Snohomish Cascade), the majority of roads are narrow two-lane roads of a rural cross-section, and other facilities and services are rural in nature.

However, the development pattern of the area shows the impact of development decisions being made in accordance with a "saturation" comprehensive land use plan in effect for the past 20 years. While the area is rural overall, there has been a trend of semi-rural and suburban density residential development primarily along county roads in areas where public water service has been available. The result has been the beginning of the transition of the SR 9 corridor area to semi-rural uses.

Appropriate residential density was discussed at length during the public hearings on this plan. Testimony supported the need for areas of smaller lot sizes than the minimum 2.3 acres/du proposed for the majority of the planning area. With the past trend of development and past zoning and planning in the area north of SR 522, land owners expected that they too would be able to develop at similar density. It was acknowledged that portions of this area would not support a residential estate density due to the existence of steep slopes, unsuitable soils for septic systems or wetlands, but it was argued that areas that did have suitable conditions should be allowed to develop at a higher density. The result should be maintenance of the rural character overall. In recognition of public testimony supporting smaller lot sizes and past planning, zoning, and development trends; the Snohomish County Council designated the area north of SR 522 Residential Estate with an associated residential density of a maximum of 1 dwelling unit per acre. This area was chosen for a semi-rural designation because:

- the area has a more traditional road network grid than other portions of the planning area,
- public water is generally available and better developed in this portion of the planning area, and
- this area is a transition area of the county, with beginning signs of the transition from rural uses.

While many portions of this area may support a Residential Estate density, it is recognized that portions have development constraints that will require a lower density.

Subdivisions and short plats should be reviewed to ensure physical conditions support the maximum density allowed by this plan. The presence of soils which will not support on-site sewage treatment at Residential Estate density, conditions that will not support the combined use of on-site septic systems and individual wells at
Residential Estate density, drainage problems, inadequate roads, or the presence of environmentally sensitive areas may require reducing the allowable density.

RURAL

Reflecting the existing character of this area, this comprehensive plan recommends a Rural designation for the majority of the area south of SR 522. The majority of the existing lot sizes are 5 acres or greater in size, with a significant portion of the area in tracts over 20 acres. The rural road system is rudimentary in nature with a lack of north-south and east-west connector roads. A higher percentage of Environmentally Sensitive areas are located in this area, including the headwaters of several creeks. Public testimony supported maintenance of the rural character and large rural sized lots in this area.

Under the provisions of the Hillman Plan, a few suburban scale developments occurred in the late 60's and early 70's, primarily around the area's lakes, but these developments are in sharp contrast to the surrounding land uses.

The plan supports a Rural designation with a density of 1 dwelling unit per 2.3 acres for this area and an implementing zone of Rural Conservation (RC). The RC zone requires a 2.3-acre minimum lot size which would allow some development yet maintain rural land use. Existing legally subdivided parcels which are smaller than 2.3 acres are still legal building lots. In addition, the RC zone allows a wide variety of land uses which are traditionally part of a rural lifestyle such as agriculture, greenhouses, livestock, forestry, and similar activities.

Residential Estate - Wellington Hills

During the plan adoption process, the Planning Commission and County Council recommended a Residential Estate designation for the Wellington Hills Golf Course property. This designation is intended to recognize the unique recreational character of the existing golf course and promote its retention as a valuable open space in the surrounding community. This designation provides the opportunity for clustered residential development, while assuring that the golf course remains in permanent open space.

The Residential Estate designation includes approximately 80 acres associated with the Wellington Hills Golf Course. This designation will be implemented through the following provisions. In the areawide rezones occurring after the adoption of the CMC plan, a Rural Conservation (RC) zone is recommended. Rezone to the higher density allowed under the Residential Estate designation will be considered under the following conditions:

- The approximate 80-acre property is developed as a unit in accordance with the Planned Residential Development section of the zoning code.
Residential units are clustered outside of the golf course area (approximately 50 acres) with the existing golf course dedicated a golf course or other permanent open space.

The covenants required in planned residential developments provide for continuous maintenance of the golf course or permanent open space.

The Residential Estate designation could allow a density of up to 2 du/acre averaged over the entire site. However, the actual density that can be achieved will depend on PRD code provisions and the slope, drainage, and other site specific development conditions of the property proposed to be developed.

While recognizing the unique amenity of the golf course, it is this plan's intent to minimize impacts to surrounding rural areas. If development according to the plan requires the extension of sanitary sewers, this plan provides that any extension be designed, located, and sized to minimize impacts outside of the Residential Estate designation. (See Public Facilities section.)

SNOWHOMISH CASCADE

Specific Policies for Development of Master Plan Community:

C11. Density, housing unit counts, and housing type in the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan for those geographical areas depicted by the light shading in Figure 3 (the eastern portion of Sector 4, the southern part of Sector 5, all of Sectors 6 and 7) shall be determined in a subsequently revised CMC Comprehensive Plan (e.g., small area amendment) which would ensue sometime after the 1995 planning period of this CMC Comprehensive Plan. No development will be permitted in this area until such a revision, except as provided in Policy C19.

C12. A maximum of 1,100 dwelling units may be approved for the Snohomish Cascade project lands within Sectors 5 and 8 through 1995, subject to the potential constraint of policy C13 and additional public facility and service needs identified during the sector review process.

C13. In addition to those factors cited in the Snohomish Cascade enabling Resolution 79-9, subparagraphs one through nine, the timing and placement of dwelling units in the northern portion of Sector 5 and all of Sector 8 shall be determined by the capacity of westerly-oriented access roads to accommodate projected traffic volumes without reliance upon a through connection from Snohomish Cascade to SR 9. This policy will apply unless a new alternatives study (as per Policies P6 and P7, pg 41) shows a regional need to construct an east-west connection to SR 9 through Snohomish Cascade.
C14. Development potential in Sectors 5 and 8 shall be calculated based on PRD 9600 zoning code standards. Unused development potential from Sectors 1, 2, 3, and 4 may be transferred to Sectors 5 and 8 but no more than 1,100 housing units may be constructed in the latter two sectors before 1995. Any development potential remaining in Sectors 5 and 8, either as a result of underutilization of development potential in Sectors 1 through 4 or because of the 1,100 unit development lid, may be used after 1995. It should not be assumed that unutilized development potential in Sectors 1-5 and 8 can be transferred to the eastern areas of Snohomish Cascade not authorized for development in this plan, as allowable densities will not be established until a plan revision occurs after 1995.

C15. The community park identified in Sector 5 will be dedicated to the county or home owners association for park purposes as a condition of development approval for the first sector developed within the CMC planning area. This policy will apply if dedication has not previously been required as a condition of approval for Sectors 1, 2, 3 or 4. Subsequent sectors may utilize the park land to meet their PRD open space requirement to the extent that this park exceeds the open space requirement for the first sector approved within the CMC planning area.

C16. Resolution 79-9 shall remain in full force for development of the master plan community. Land areas not authorized for development as part of the master plan community during the planning period shall not be either further subdivided or developed, except as provided by Policy C19. Future planning for this land will be conducted in accordance with master planning techniques utilized in Sectors 1 through 4, with the density and timing of future development determined through a CMC plan amendment which will occur after 1995. The specific timing for initiating this amendment shall be determined by the county.

C17. The exclusion identified within the Snohomish Cascade sector plan map shall be eligible for Residential Estate densities during the planning period of this CMC Comprehensive Plan. In subsequent comprehensive plan updates, ultimate development densities and the timing of development for these exclusions would be determined concurrent with the post-1995 plan amendment process which has been enumerated in Policy C16 for the undeveloped portions of Snohomish Cascade. In the plan update, the exclusions will be required to utilize the master planning technique as a prerequisite to densities other than Residential Estate and demonstrate an overall development plan which is consistent and compatible with that authorized for Snohomish Cascade.

The following policies will only apply if a regional landfill is approved for development within the boundaries of the Snohomish Cascade holdings:
C18. Approval of a revised master plan for the remaining areas of Sectors 5 and 8 outside of the landfill site will be required before any development can be authorized within the CMC planning area. The Department of Planning and Community Development may require a master plan revision prior to the start of development in the CMC area if it is necessary in order to adequately review circulation, open space or utility placement of Sectors 1 through 4 as they are submitted for approval.

C19. If a revised master plan excludes any land originally covered by Resolution 79-9, the CMC plan will designate this land Residential Estate. These areas will be eligible for development at Residential Estate densities during this planning period.

C20. Policies C11-C14 and C16-C17 will continue to apply to development of the remaining areas of the master plan community outside of the landfill site.

C21. The land within the boundaries of the landfill site will be designated Public Facilities, with a recommended implementing zone of RC.

Discussion

Snohomish Cascade is an approved master planned residential development, consisting of approximately 4,400 dwelling units (see Figure 3). The anticipated development period is from twenty to thirty years ("Snohomish Cascade and Silver Firs Final EIS," June 28, 1978, page 17). On February 28, 1979, the Board of County Commissioners approved the rezoning of the master plan site to Planned Residential Development 9600. The Resolution 79-9, a copy of which is included in Appendix I, essentially divided the master plan into two phases. The master plan for the first phase, Sectors 1, 2, 3 and part of 4, located in the North Creek planning area, was approved as submitted. The second phase, Sectors 5, 6, 7 and 8, is located in the CMC planning area. Final approval of dwelling unit count, density, and housing type in these sectors was withheld until the adoption of the CMC plan. The resolution further provided that when each sector is proposed, a public hearing would be held by the county. The purpose of these hearings would be "to establish the approved dwelling unit count, density, type." The Resolution concluded that while PRD- 9600 zoning had been extended, "consideration of Sectors 5 through 8 shall be based in part on the then current comprehensive plan, utility and public service availability, developer performance, current growth policies and environmental assessment... and compatibility." In the context of Resolution 79-9, the issues which the CMC plan must consider relate specifically to dwelling unit count, density, and timing of development in Sectors 5 to 8.

Another factor will affect the extent of development of those portions of Snohomish Cascade located in the CMC area. In July 1984, the Snohomish County Solid Waste Division released a draft
environmental impact statement which identified a 440-acre site in the eastern portions of the Snohomish Cascade holdings as the preferred site for a new regional sanitary landfill. The site was recommended after a one-year site selection process which evaluated 71 potential landfill sites. The need for a new regional landfill was identified in the 1981 Solid Waste Management Plan which determined that existing landfill capacity would be reached by approximately 1989. The County Council accepted the designation of the preferred site in 1985 and the county has now taken ownership of the parcel through the condemnation process. A conditional use permit will be required before the county can establish a sanitary landfill at this location. It is expected that application for the permit will occur in 1987.

Snohomish Cascade will be developed under the master plan concept. A master planned community possesses several positive features. A master planned community promotes developmental predictability to a greater degree than would be possible if conventional subdivisional techniques were used. Unified ownership, comprehensive site planning, and advanced procurement of sites for road and utilities permit the sponsors of a planned development to forecast the timing and location of development, thus avoiding an otherwise piecemeal and illogical approach to subdivision of real property. Predictability has advantages. Adjacent property owners are assured when development will occur and in what form. Investment in private property is protected when owners understand and have knowledge of the conditions that will affect their neighborhoods. Local governments, including special purpose districts, are better able to anticipate when their services and/or facilities will be required. They can take steps for future accommodation in a cost-effective manner, with the resultant facility often providing increased benefit over the existing service network.

However, a development the size of Snohomish Cascade is not completely without disadvantages. There is potential for significant impacts on that portion of the planning area immediately outside the project's boundaries. These impacts could originate from three sources: utility extension, the construction of a regional or secondary arterial access to SR 9, and from a disproportionate demand on public services as a result of the magnitude or rate of development of the planned community. The latter are primarily fiscal impacts which could be particularly severe if the financial burdens of public service facility expansion have to be shared by households not residing within the project. Cost-sharing mitigative measures are incorporated as part of the rezone contract for Snohomish Cascade, and this issue will be addressed as part of the SEPA process. Policies are discussed elsewhere to prevent utility extensions from stimulating growth outside the project. In the transportation element, various transportation policies are recommended in order to reduce the impacts of the circulation system.
The problem is how to structure Snohomish Cascade in order to allow the project to progress on a reasonable schedule, and still prevent primary and secondary impacts from affecting non-project land. This goal is generally achievable through a refinement of the rate, timing, and location of development within the Snohomish Cascade community. It is recommended that this refinement to the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan accomplish two major objectives: a reorientation of the internal transportation system westward, and the incorporation of a threshold or absolute limit on the number of dwellings that will be approved during the planning period. These objectives are discussed below.

The first step in the refinement of the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan beyond Sectors 1, 2, and 3 is a delimitation of the location and amount of development to be authorized in the Snohomish Cascade development by the CMC plan. A major objective of the CMC plan is to define the appropriate development level within Snohomish Cascade which is compatible with rural and semi-rural environs to the south and east of the proposed community. In order to minimize direct and indirect externalities of the Snohomish Cascade proposal, it is recommended that certain areas within Sectors 4 and 5 be held for future development until after the 1995 time frame. Additionally, it is further proposed that Sectors 6 and 7 not be considered for development until after 1995. The objective of this recommendation is to provide a physical separation between two distinct residential environments and to deter or postpone utility and road extension based on local demand which would add premature development pressure to the easterly portion of the CMC planning area. The areas within the master plan where development should not be considered until sometime after the 1995 time frame are depicted on Figure 3 and include all of Sectors 6 and 7 and portions of Sectors 4 and 5. Figure 3 does not portray exact boundaries.

Actual boundaries will be dependent upon future site analysis, road alignments and topography, as well as other design considerations. However, the ultimate boundaries which are established during the sector plan review process must fulfill the general intent of this recommendation and approximate the areas depicted by Figure 3.

A second major element of the master plan refinement concerns Sector 8 and a majority of Sector 5. This area will be allowed to develop during the life of this comprehensive plan and prior to 1995. The calculation of housing count in this area will be based on Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone criteria, using RR 9600 as the underlying zone. The PRD zone criteria will determine the number of allowed housing units by applying the density allowed in the underlying zone (9600 in this case) to the net developable area. The net developable area is found by subtracting unbuildable areas from the original total acreage. For the purposes of density calculations, the county considers steep slopes, road rights-of-way, powerline easements, peat soils, waterways and floodways unbuildable. If the developers so choose, they may transfer unused development potential (housing units)
from the western half of the master plan area into the pre-1995 development sectors in the eastern half of the master plan. There are two stipulations concerning development in Sectors 5 and 8 prior to 1995. The first is that the total housing units constructed in this area before 1995 cannot exceed 1,100 dwelling units. This figure approximates the number of housing units the sponsors of Snohomish Cascade believe can be absorbed by the local housing market by 1995 and which could conceivably be constructed without requiring through access to SR 9. As this comprehensive plan recommends, the decision of a through connection should be dependent upon a justification of regional demand for such a facility and not because of localized demand created by the Snohomish Cascade community (this regional demand is not projected to occur until after 1990). Furthermore, while 1,100 units could be authorized before 1995, this figure is a maximum which may be adjusted by market conditions, PRD zoning criteria, utility and other public service constraints as well as traffic circulation considerations. These specific impact issues will be reviewed through the sector level EIS which is prepared for each sector submitted for approval.

A second stipulation for Sectors 5 and 8 is that the community park identified in Sector 5 in the original master plan will be dedicated to the county or homeowners association for park uses as a condition of development of the first of either Sectors 5 or 8 if it has not previously been dedicated as a part of Sectors 1, 2, 3 or 4. This community park land will serve as the public open space that is required by the PRD section of the zoning code. If the community park lands result in more open space than that which is required by code, open space credit may be transferred to subsequent sectors submitted for development, including post-1995 sectors, for use in those eventual PRD development calculations.

The refinement of the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan should also accomplish the reorientation of the internal road networks. This orientation would be to the west, with primary access to 132nd, 144th, 51st, 180th, and Mill Creek (Penney Creek) Road. Reorientation of the road network is necessary if the externalities of the Snohomish Cascade project area are to be minimized. Reorientation will also avoid the creation of situations which would encourage the construction of either a secondary access or primary regional arterial facility to SR 9, based on local demand, before 1995. However, redesign of the portions of the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan in the CMC area should reflect the potential future need for arterial right-of-way east to SR 9 and should reserve right-of-way options for future acquisition or dedication if the need is demonstrated.

The above discussion assumes that no landfill will be developed within the Snohomish Cascade holdings and all approved lands will develop as part of the master plan community. However, should required permits be granted to establish a regional landfill on the 440-acre site within the boundaries of Snohomish Cascade, approximately 1/3 of the total original acreage included in the master plan community would be required for the landfill,
supporting facilities, and required buffers. Over half of the proposed landfill site is located in areas not authorized for development during this planning period.

Development of a regional landfill site within the Snohomish Cascade holdings will result in the need to revise the original master plan. Approval of the revised master plan will be required before any development can be authorized in Sectors 5 or 8 in the CMC planning area. However, approval of a revised master plan may be required before this time if it is necessary to adequately review circulation, open space, or utility aspects of Sectors 1-4 as they are submitted for approval.

The revised master plan must follow policies C11-C14 and C16-C17 which are aimed at preventing primary and secondary impacts from affecting adjoining rural and semi-rural areas during this planning period. These policies authorize development in portions of Snohomish Cascade holdings during this planning period and require reorientation of the road system to the west. A full discussion of the reasoning for these policies is contained in previous paragraphs. Policy C15, which requires dedication of the community park in Sector 5, would no longer be applicable as most of the park is within the boundaries of the landfill site. However, the revised master plan for the remaining areas outside of the landfill must make provisions to meet the PRD zoning ordinance requirements for open space and park land.

The preferred landfill site as shown in the draft landfill EIS incorporates all of Sector 6, portions of Sector 7, and the majority of Sector 5 of the master plan within its boundaries. In addition to the areas actually included within the boundaries of the site, there could be impacts preventing development of other portions of the master plan community. For example, the boundaries of the landfill site as identified in the DEIS isolates Sector 7 from the other areas of Snohomish Cascade. In addition, a problem may exist in providing economically feasible access across Thomas Creek to the remaining portions of Sector 5. These facts point to the possibility that a revised master plan for the remaining areas of Snohomish Cascade outside of the landfill site may exclude areas originally approved for PRD-9600 zoning.

Any excluded areas are to be designated Residential Estate. As the excluded area would no longer be part of an integrated master plan community, PRD-9600 zoning would no longer be appropriate.

If a regional landfill is approved for development, this plan recommends a plan designation of Public Facilities and implementing zone of RC.
D. COMMERCIAL LAND USE

GOAL:

Scale the amount of commercial land to the projected demand in order to provide the planning area's residents with economical commercial services in a convenient, safe, and attractive manner.

GENERAL POLICIES:

D1. Designate land for neighborhood and community business uses at existing commercial centers as defined by existing land use and zoning.

D2. Prevent the proliferation of strip commercial areas along roads and highways, particularly SR 9 and SR 522.

D3. Allow small, low intensity neighborhood business uses throughout the planning area if they are compatible with adjacent land uses and comply with the locational standards described in this plan element.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:

D4. The location and design of all commercial sites should provide safe and convenient access for all customers, employees, and suppliers.

D5. All commercial sites should be located and designed to minimize the negative effects (traffic, noise, lights, and related impacts) of these uses on adjacent land users.

D6. Commercial uses should be designed so that they promote the formation of shopping nodes rather than linear (strip) developments.

D7. Multi-family dwellings are not appropriate uses in Neighborhood and Community Business designations within the CMC area for the planning period of this comprehensive plan.

DISCUSSION

One of the more important objectives of a comprehensive plan is to provide adequate space for appropriate commercial land uses. In 1980, there were approximately 37 acres of land supporting commercial enterprises in the CMC planning area. For the most part, these businesses supplied the daily convenience goods and services needs of the planning area's 7,750 residents. This is equal to a ratio of approximately 4.8 acres/1,000 population in the planning area and is less than the unincorporated countywide commercial land to population ratio of 7.6 acres/1,000 population.

A simple method of estimating the demand for commercial land by the year 1995 is to apply the above ratios to the area's projected
population growth of 7,730 additional residents. This calculation yields an estimate which suggests that from 37 to 59 acres of additional commercial land will be required by 1995 to meet local demand. It is the goal of this plan to ensure that adequate space is available at appropriate locations to satisfy these demand estimates.

COMMERCIAL NODES

As a saturation plan, the 1964 Hillman Plan designated a total of more than 250 acres of land for Community Business (CB) uses at one major node along SR 9 at 176th Street SE, and at five smaller nodes distributed throughout the planning area. In addition, the Hillman Plan designated 160 acres of land for Neighborhood Business (NB) use at seven locations, and 200 acres for General Commercial (GC) uses along SR 522 north of 212th Street SE.

These allocations are clearly excessive in scale and considerably premature. As a result, most of the designated land has not developed or even been rezoned for commercial use due to the lack of a local market. However, in the western portion of the planning area along SR 9 in the vicinity of 176th Street SE (Clearview), there have been a number of rezones to CB approved over the years. A few of the parcels have been developed, but in other cases, development plans have never materialized. The result is that the Clearview business area is a haphazard collection of retail activities spread out along SR 9. It is the intent of the CMC area plan to encourage commercial infill in the Clearview business node and thereby create a concentrated and identifiable commercial center. It is equally the intent of this plan to discourage further strip commercial development along SR 9 with its associated traffic and visual impacts.

Figure 4 describes the Clearview Community Business Center (CBC). The Clearview CBC encompasses 85 acres of land which is currently zoned CB or GC or eligible for zoning to CB. There is more than sufficient space available in the Clearview CBC, other commercial zones, and within the Snohomish Cascade Master Plan community to meet the expected 1995 demand for commercial land. Consequently, this plan recommends that no CB rezones be approved for land outside of the Clearview CBC as defined in Figure 4 unless it would help to intensify commercial activity proposed for the CBC or would support infill. Although it is the stated intent of this plan to encourage an identifiable commercial center at Clearview, intensive commercial development is not likely in this area by 1995 due to the lack of a public sewer system and the local market necessary to support such development. For those parcels outside the designated Clearview CBC with existing commercial zoning, this plan would allow continuation of existing zoning and uses.

Throughout the CMC planning area there are several other smaller commercial nodes of the Neighborhood Business (NB) scale. This plan recognizes these existing Neighborhood Business nodes and supports reasonable and logical infill or intensification of these centers as appropriate, given the constraints of the local market.
and lack of sewers. One such node is at the intersection of SR 9 and 164th Street SE. The northeast and southwest quadrants of this intersection are currently zoned NB with commercial uses occupying the latter quadrant. The existing zoning at this node represents 8.2 acres of Neighborhood Business zoning. Limited expansion of NB uses consistent with the plan map may be considered at this node if it is carefully designed, can demonstrate a market demand, is compatible with existing uses, and maintains or improves traffic flows through the intersection and along SR 9.

A second Neighborhood Business node is located at the intersection of 164th Street SE and 99th Avenue SE. The existing zoning at this intersection is CB, covers several acres and multiple parcels, but supports only one commercial use, a general store. The CMC area plan recommends that the commercial zoning at this node not be permitted to expand. The intersection is complex and would probably not support additional commercial uses without major redesign and improvements to the intersection, which are highly unlikely due to funding limitations. In addition, there are steep slopes to the east of the intersection which may effectively preclude additional neighborhood business development.

A third Neighborhood Business node is shown for the Maltby area at 212th Street SE, west of SR 522. There is an existing general store between SR 522 and the railroad tracks. In addition, there is a GC zoned parcel containing a commercial use at the corner of Elm Street and 212th Street SE. These two commercial parcels form the nucleus for the Maltby commercial center. This plan supports limited expansion of NB uses and zoning at this node. However, the area is poorly drained, the node is effectively bisected by the railroad tracks, and the approach to SR 522 from 212th Street SE is difficult. For this reason, commercial expansion potential is limited but could be considered if it would logically contribute to a convenience shopping complex, maintain or improve the flow of traffic through the area, and avoid drainage and hydrologic problems. There is an existing CB zoned parcel at the intersection of 91st Avenue SE and 206th Street SE which contains a nonconforming commercial use. This parcel should not be considered part of the Maltby commercial center for purpose of reviewing future NB rezone applications in this area. Rezones should only be granted in the Maltby area if they are logical and reasonable expansions of the existing commercial activities.

The fourth Neighborhood Business node reflects an existing store and NB zoned parcel along Echo Lake Road at 218th Place SE. Because there are 5 acres of NB zoned land at this site of which less than 1 acre is in NB use, and given the limited market in the local area, the county does not anticipate a need for additional NB zoning at this location before 1995.

A fifth site designated NB is at the intersection of SR 9 and 212th Street SE. This designation reflects the eastern half of an NB designation shown at this intersection in the North Creek Comprehensive Plan. The designation recognizes several existing
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commercial uses and Community Business (CB) zoning. The county
does not anticipate a demand for additional NB zoning or uses at
this node before 1995.

The county is not trying to encourage large scale or intensive
commercial complexes in this planning area. On the contrary, the
NB sites designated on the plan map and discussed in the previous
paragraphs should be limited to three or four businesses serving
the local neighborhood. The types of activities permitted on
these sites should be consistent with the NB code provisions,
except that multiple family dwellings are not appropriate for this
rural area.

However, as the population of this planning area increases, there
may be additional locations where the demand for convenience goods
is large enough to support another store with NB zoning. If the
proposed activity is a suitable low intensity neighborhood
business use and the site meets the following criteria, it may be
considered for a rezone to NB.

NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS CRITERIA

1. Access to an arterial as described in this plan.
2. Site is no larger than approximately 3 acres in size.
3. A minimum of 600 dwelling units within a 3 mile radius of the
   proposed site.
4. No other site zoned or used for commercial activities is
   located within 2 1/2 miles of the proposed site.
5. The site can be sufficiently screened from adjoining
   residential uses and the rezone request is supported by the
   local residential community.

There are a few sites in the planning area which have been zoned
for commercial use over a decade but have never developed. The
largest site is a 53-acre piece zoned Freeway Service (FS) at the
intersection of SR 522 and 115th Avenue SE (Echo Lake Road). A
second site is at the intersection of Paradise Lake Road and SR
522. The latter site is zoned FS and is approximately 6 acres in
size. Because of the potential for adverse traffic impacts on SR
522, the demonstrated lack of retail market, and the potential
limitation these parcels represent for others seeking rezones to
NB at potentially more suitable sites, this plan recommends that
the FS zoned parcels be considered for rezone to RC during the
areawide rezones to implement this plan.
E. INDUSTRIAL LAND USE

GOAL:
Provide opportunities for industrial growth at a scale and of a type which is consistent with the planning area’s rural character.

GENERAL POLICIES:

E1. Use existing zoning and land use to define a Maltby Industrial Area (MIA).

E2. Permit low intensity, land extensive industrial uses which do not generate high commuter traffic volumes to infill within the identified Maltby Industrial Area.

E3. Recognize more intensive industrial uses that would help to create an impetus for unplanned growth and secondary impacts on surrounding areas as premature in the MIA and incompatible with the rural and semi-rural character of the CMC planning area.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:

E4. Prohibit LI and IP rezone actions on parcels which are located outside of the designated Maltby Industrial Area.

E5. To the extent possible, use contract rezone provisions to encourage warehouse and low intensity manufacturing uses in the Maltby Industrial Area.

E6. Require 50-foot buffer strips, visual screens, and similar design features to make proposed industrial development more compatible with neighboring residential or agricultural uses.

E7. Maintain or establish 100-foot wide natural vegetation buffers on each side of streams and wetland areas located in a proposed industrial development.

DISCUSSION
In a perfect world, a comprehensive plan designed to maintain the rural and semi-rural character of an area would not recommend urban uses such as a large area planned for industrial uses. However, the existing industrial complex in the CMC area presents an unusual situation. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the 1964 Hillman Plan was a saturation plan and designated approximately 75 acres in the Maltby area for industrial uses. From the perspective of ultimate development, industrial uses may be appropriate in the Maltby area. The area has good rail access and is reasonably close to metropolitan markets for truck traffic via SR 522, SR 9, I-405, and I-5.
It is clear, however, that the recommendation for a major industrial center in the CMC area is premature. There is no sewer system in the Maltby area to support intensive industrial development. Soils in the area are wet and poorly drained to the point that even low intensity industrial use on septic tanks is often not feasible. Moreover, the other public services and facilities to support industrial development, particularly public water and the transportation system, are presently adequate for low density residential uses but not for industrial activities. Substantial public capital investment would have to be made to bring these facilities up to standard and such investment is not probable in this area during the planning period.

Intensive industrial development is also inappropriate in the CMC area because of the untimely secondary impacts that development would likely have on the rest of the planning area. Normally, industrial growth and the associated employment stimulates other kinds of local growth and development, including residential and commercial. Existing county policy does not encourage such urban uses in the CMC area at this time. County policy does recognize the need for business and industrial centers which create jobs and stimulate growth but has identified these primary growth centers in other areas of the county such as North Creek, Faine Field, and North Marysville area.

Despite these limitations, there have been a number of rezones to Light Industrial (LI) and General Commercial (GC) in the Maltby area south of 212th and along Broadway near 206th Street SE. These rezones were seemingly consistent with the 1964 Hillman Plan which was relatively silent on implementation policies. As a result, there are now approximately 300 acres of industrially zoned land in the Maltby area of which approximately half is undeveloped (178 acres). At public meetings and hearings, many residents and landowners advocated expansion of the industrial designation in the Maltby area to permit additional rezones to LI.

**MALTBY INDUSTRIAL AREA (MIA)**

Based on the rural and semi-rural character of the planning area, the lack of necessary services and facilities, the county's commitment to industrial uses in urban areas, environmental site limitations, pressure for industrial development in Maltby, and the existing pattern of land uses and zoning in Maltby; this plan makes the following recommendation. Low intensity industrial uses should be allowed to infill on vacant parcels within the designated MIA.

Higher intensity uses which may generate high traffic volumes or help to create secondary impacts in the planning area such as demand for supporting commercial and residential uses should not be permitted in the Maltby Industrial Area. The off-site impacts and capital investment associated with more intensive uses are not consistent with the rural and semi-rural character of the planning area. Moreover, the county will not consider rezones to
industrial categories outside of the area shown for such uses on the plan map.

Figure 5 is a large scale map showing the area eligible for industrial zoning and land uses. County policy for implementing the industrial element of this plan will be to maintain the existing zoning on all parcels which currently have industrial zoning or are occupied by industrial uses. All parcels zoned for Rural Use (RU) or some other residential zone and which are vacant or occupied by a nonindustrial land use will be zoned Rural Conservation (RC) as a holding zone. At such time as a potential user would like to proceed with industrial development plans, the county will consider an owner-initiated rezone to Light Industrial (LI), or Industrial Park (IP). It is the county's clear intent to try and limit the type of land uses in this area of the county to low intensity, noncommercial, manufacturing and warehousing uses. To the extent possible, the county will consider using contract rezone provisions to encourage the preferred warehouse and manufacturing uses.

All parcels within the industrially designated MIA which contain industrial uses, but lack compatible zoning, will be eligible for rezoning to LI or IP zones as appropriate.

The MIA as defined in this plan contains 317 acres, of which 134 acres are currently being used for industrial uses and are zoned or eligible for industrial zoning, and 183 acres are vacant and zoned or eligible for industrial zoning. These vacant lands should be more than adequate to meet the planning period demand for industrial uses in the CMC area.
F. TRANSPORTATION

GOAL:
Provide and maintain a safe and efficient transportation system which recognizes the needs of existing and future residents and the planning area's rural and semi-rural character.

GENERAL POLICIES:

F1. Stress safety and road surface improvements before increasing the traffic capacity of existing roads, and design roads to meet rural and semi-rural residential travel demands.

F2. Discourage road improvement projects which would help stimulate growth or have other adverse impacts in this rural and semi-rural planning area.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:

F3. Restrict direct access from private property onto designated principal and minor arterials wherever possible to maintain and improve the integrity of traffic flows on these arterials.

F4. Provide for the safe and efficient movement of pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle traffic with emphasis on schools, parks and scenic areas.

F5. During the 1985-1995 planning period of this plan, the decision to build a new east-west arterial should be based entirely on regional travel demand as opposed to local traffic flows.

F6. The decision to build a new east-west arterial connecting I-5 and SR 9 should be made only after a thorough evaluation of alternative corridors, including 132nd Street, 164th Street, 180th Street, and 212th Street SE. The environmental and land use impacts of different alternatives should be given substantial weight in the choice of a corridor and in specific route location within a corridor.

F7. If a secondary access arterial is needed for the Snohomish Cascade urban area prior to 1995, it should have a westward orientation. This policy shall apply unless the results of a new alternatives study (Policy F6) show a regional need to construct an east-west connection to SR 9 through Snohomish Cascade.

F8. As sector plans in Snohomish Cascade are submitted for approval, encourage a road network design which results in an internally looped road system.
DISCUSSION

A circulation plan which is correlated with the land use plan is a required element in all comprehensive plans. This circulation element should show the location and alignment of all major roads. The information contained in the following pages is a summary of a portion of the 1990 Snohomish Subregional Transportation Study and Snohomish County Interim Arterial Plan, including traffic projections and potential highway problems, and satisfies the circulation plan requirement. In addition, this transportation element discusses several important highway system issues including: 1) a regional highway system link between SR 9 and SR 527, and 2) secondary access to the Snohomish Cascade/Silver Firs Master Planned Community.

1990 ARTERIAL PLAN

Snohomish County uses four classifications in rural areas to identify major links in the arterial system. The four levels are freeways, principal or minor arterials, major collectors, and minor collectors. These classifications refer to design standards and specifications adopted by the Urban Arterial Board and the Snohomish County Department of Public Works. The adopted design standards and the map in Figure 6, which shows location and classification of all arterial roads, are the most significant features of the transportation element of the comprehensive plan and identify the 1990 arterial system for the CMC planning area.

There are two designated principal arterials in the CMC planning area, SR 9 and SR 522. Principal arterials are intended to provide for movement between and across large subparts of the county and serve predominantly through trips with minimal direct access to abutting private property. To maintain the carrying capacity of principal arterials, regulations are necessary to control parking, turning movements, and to limit direct access from individual properties to the arterial. Principal arterials normally require 100 feet of right-of-way (ROW) and occasionally more depending on alignment geometrics.

Major collectors also have the main function of moving traffic. They are often established between principal arterials to reduce their traffic loads by accommodating trips of medium length. Major collectors also collect and distribute traffic from higher level highways to minor collectors and local access streets. Major collectors normally require 80 feet of ROW and, as is the case with principal arterials, may require curbs and gutters along the complete length of the highway in the urbanizing areas of the county. In the CMC planning area, 212th Street SE (Maltby Road) east to SR 522 and 180th Street SE east to SR 9 have been designated major collectors.

Minor collectors serve a dual purpose by providing both property access and traffic movement. Minor collector trips are medium length, providing service between higher and lower level highways. Minor collectors also serve traffic within neighborhoods and serve
major local traffic generators. Minor collector standards require a minimum right-of-way of 70 feet, at least two traffic lanes, and either shoulders and open stormwater drainage (ditch) in rural areas, or curb, gutter and sidewalks in urban and densely developed areas. In the CMC planning area, the following streets are designated minor collectors: 164th Street SE east of SR 9, 180th Street SE east of SR 9, the full length of Broadway, Elliott Road, Pales Road, Paradise Lake Road and Snoqualmie-King County/High Bridge Road (see Figure 6).

THE EXISTING ARTERIAL SYSTEM

Most of the highways in the CMC planning area are two lane roads with rural cross section. Rural cross section means that they have narrow gravel shoulders without curbs, gutters, storm drains, or sidewalks. All arterials in the CMC area generally operate at level of service (LOS) "B" or better during all hours of the day, except SR 522 from SR 9 east. This highway segment operates at LOS "C" during peak travel hours.

Level of service refers to the degree of congestion or ease of movement on a highway as one moves from place to place. According to the Highway Capacity Manual, 1965 Edition, LOS "A" describes a condition of high speeds and low volumes where traffic can move rapidly with little or no congestion or interference from other vehicles. LOS "B" is a stable flow with operating speeds beginning to be restricted somewhat by traffic conditions, but not unreasonably. LOS "C" is still stable flow but speeds and maneuverability are more closely controlled by higher volumes and drivers are restricted in terms of selecting their own speed, changing lanes, or passing. LOS "D" approaches unstable flow with tolerable operating speeds being maintained, though considerably affected by changes in operating conditions. Fluctuations in volume and temporary restrictions to flow may cause substantial drops in operating speeds. LOS "E" and "F" represent unstable flows. Stoppages are of momentary duration in LOS "E" and can be for long periods in LOS "F".

Unless major road improvements are made, the LOS on a road segment will normally decline as the volume of traffic increases. Consequently, a LOS "C" road is close to optimum. Even though during peak periods there is some delay and slight inconvenience for highway users, the road segment is being used efficiently from a cost-benefit perspective which is increasingly important to taxpayers. In essence, a LOS "C" highway moves the highest volume of traffic with an acceptable amount of user inconvenience. The county is trying to achieve and maintain a LOS "C" or better on all its roads. The county realizes that a level of service higher than "D" may be difficult to maintain during peak hours (6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 6:00 p.m.) at some locations in the county. Level of service "C" or higher is probable during the remaining hours of the day, however.

With the growth that is probable in the CMC planning area, traffic volumes will increase and LOS will probably decrease somewhat.
Table 4 describes traffic volumes on selected arterials in the CMC planning area. Traffic volumes will more than double during the 1980s on most area arterials. However, LOS is anticipated to be at least "C" or better on these arterials except along portions of SR 9. SR 9 will need to be widened between SR 522 and 212th Street SE and between 164th Street SE and Larimer Road. Intersection improvements will be necessary at SR 9 and 180th Street SE, SR 9 and 212th Street SE in order to maintain LOS "C" or better. The 1990 Transportation Plan shows intersection improvements also necessary at SR 522 and Maltby Road.

Table 4

DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON SELECTED ARTERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial</th>
<th>1980 Volumes</th>
<th>Projected 1990 Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 9 north of 180th St.</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 522 at Paradise Lake Road</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212th St. SE east of SR 9</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway north of SR 522</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180th St. SE east of SR 9</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164th St. SE east of SR 9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 Snohomish Subregional Transportation Study

Table 5

CMC AREA ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 132nd St. extension to SR 9</td>
<td>$ 5,321,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SR 9 from SR 522 to Maltby Road</td>
<td>$ 2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maltby Rd. &amp; SR 522 intersection improvements</td>
<td>$ 315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intersection improvement to 180th &amp; SR 9 and a climbing lane on SR 9</td>
<td>$ 2,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,582,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990 Snohomish Subregional Transportation Study
Table 5 describes, in 1980 dollars, estimated costs of the road improvement projects which will probably be necessary in the CMC planning area. The $10.5 million total cost for CMC projects is burdensome, but compared to the countywide project cost estimates, it is modest. The 1990 Subregional Transportation Plan indicates that in order to accommodate new residential, commercial and industrial growth, $60 million of road projects are necessary in the county's incorporated areas and $72.4 million in the unincorporated county. The entire local road needs in 1980 dollars have been estimated at $275 million; the needs on state highways were listed at $253 million. The $528 million total of transportation system needs is overwhelming. These numbers make it clear that state and local jurisdictions will have to construct the most necessary projects first and assign the priorities very carefully. Given the larger number of existing and projected road deficiencies, the high cost of making improvements, the scarcity of funds at the federal, state and local level, and the higher priority associated with projects in urban areas, it is doubtful that many road improvement projects will be considered in the CMC planning area before 1995.

These circumstances underscore the need to make land use decisions which are compatible with the capacity of the existing highway system. The CMC comprehensive plan recognizes the short-term limitations of local arterials and recommends no expansion of industrial or commercial land uses but only infill at existing industrial and commercial nodes. In addition, the plan recommends low density, rural residential south of SR 522 which will help to limit traffic increases to within projected levels and maintain LOS at an acceptable level on local highways. The specific policies listed at the beginning of this plan element should also help to minimize traffic impacts in this planning area.

EAST-WEST ARTERIALS

Based on the analysis which was conducted as part of the 1990 Snohomish Subregional Transportation Study and other similar studies, it is probable that the county will need an east-west arterial connection between Interstate 5 and the SR 9 corridor sometime after 1990. In 1980, most of the traffic originating in the planning area flowed south into the Seattle-Bellevue metropolitan areas. However, as job and shopping opportunities increase in the southwest county, as the Snohomish and Lake Stevens communities grow, and as local land use changes occur; east-west traffic flows through the south county will increase. A new arterial will ultimately be needed to handle this increase.

The extension of 132nd Street SE from Seattle Hill Road to SR 9 has been suggested as one feasible east-west connection. An EIS has been written for this road extension and alternative alignments for 132nd Street have been evaluated. However, many local residents have expressed their concerns about the impacts such a road extension would have on the planning area's rural character. Improved east-west access would substantially increase development pressures in the northern portions of the SR 9
corridor. Furthermore, some residents maintain that the only reason 132nd Street SE is being proposed for extension is to serve the Snohomish Cascade/Silver Firs Master Planned Community, a project they oppose as inconsistent with the rural and semi-rural character of the CMC area.

Based on an extensive review of the east-west road issue, the CMC Comprehensive Plan makes the following findings of fact and recommendations for future action. First, there is limited evidence that there will be sufficient regional traffic flow generated before 1990 to warrant construction of an east-west arterial connection between I-5 and SR 9. Second, a decision to construct an east-west connection should be based on regional traffic demand as opposed to local traffic demand. Third, at such time as regional traffic demand warrants construction of an east-west arterial, alternatives to the 132nd Street corridor should be considered and the most cost and service efficient and environmentally sound route selected.

This plan recommends that environmental and land use impacts be given substantial weight in the selection of a route. As a previous study was made on the extension of 132nd Street, more detailed information exists for this corridor versus other alternatives. In the case of the extension of 132nd, this plan would support choice of the southern alignment over the northern alignment as discussed in the 1979 EIS. The northern alignment intersects SR 9 at the Lowell-Larimer Road intersection and has a strong attraction for regional traffic. The northern alignment would also improve a dangerous intersection but would require four stream crossings, displace prime agricultural land, and require a longer distance at 6% grade or more than would the southern alignment.

The southern alignment for the extension of 132nd Street would join SR 9 near the entrance to the present Cathcart Sanitary Landfill. The southern alignment is primarily in upland areas, does not traverse prime agricultural lands, and crosses fewer streams. This intersection would be more difficult to design than the northern alternative. Overall, the cost of the two alternatives is approximately the same, although the southern alignment is slightly less costly. A substantial amount of ROW for either alignment would be acquired from the Snohomish Cascade Master Planned Community. However, construction of the southern alignment would be precluded if the preferred landfill site as identified in the landfill site selection study is developed in the eastern portions of the Snohomish Cascade holdings.

SECONDARY ACCESS TO SNOHOMISH CASCADE MASTER PLANNED COMMUNITY

Ever since the Snohomish Cascade Master Planned Community became a serious possibility, there has been heated controversy about the possible extension of 132nd Street SE, east to the SR 9 corridor. The controversy has been somewhat confusing because of the perceived association with Snohomish Cascade and the demand forecasts used in support of the proposed extension. The demand
forecasts describe a regional travel component and a local travel component.

The regional travel component was discussed in the preceeding subsection titled East-West Arterial. In summary, the projections do not show a regional travel demand sufficient to warrant an east-west arterial before 1990. After 1990, regional travel demand may require such construction. However, before any arterial is built, alternative corridors are to be studied and the most appropriate link for the regional transportation system selected.

The second travel demand component is local traffic. Many agencies have argued that urban development in this area of the county needs two arterials to serve it adequately. Snohomish School District, for example, has constructed a new junior high school to the east of Snohomish Cascade along 99th Avenue SE. An arterial connecting the urban area to the SR 9 corridor would improve access to their facility.

In response, the county originally proposed the extension of 132nd Street SE, east to SR 9. The extension and widening of 132nd Street would provide the recommended arterial, with access to the west, the I-5 corridor; and to the east, the SR 9 corridor. This proposal was strongly opposed by the local community because it would generate pressure for urbanization in the northern portion of the CMC planning area. The local community has been active in support of maintaining the rural and semi-rural character of their area and the proposed extension of 132nd Street SE has been extremely controversial.

This plan acknowledges that an east-west connection may result in increased development pressure and that this connection should be delayed until required to meet regional traffic needs. The intent of this plan through Policy C12, pg. 21, is to limit the amount of development authorized in Snohomish Cascade to a level which would not require the extension of 132nd to SR 9, based on local traffic needs during this planning period. Similarly, 152nd Street SE or 156th Street SE should not be extended west to provide a link between the urban area and the SR 9 corridor. However, this plan acknowledges that prior to 1995, urban growth in the vicinity of Snohomish Cascade may require a second access arterial to serve it. Policy F9 requires that arterial access have a westward orientation prior to 1995 unless a new east-west corridor study shows a regional need to construct a connection to SR 9 through Snohomish Cascade. If local urban travel demand is sufficient to require a secondary access, it might potentially be a "U" shaped arterial extending 132nd Street south and west in approximately the 152nd Street alignment.

A decision to build an east-west connection to SR 9 before 1995 will not necessarily result in the need for revisions to the CMC plan. While a design report may show a need for construction of a four- or five-lane primary arterial, the impacts are often spread over time by staged construction and improvement as traffic demand
is generated. The need to revise a comprehensive plan is usually indicated by not one, but a number of changed conditions from those existing at the time of plan formulation such as changes in population forecasts, public service availability, and transportation improvements.

MALTEB INDUSTRIAL AREA

The provisions of this plan allow infill of the present industrial area at Maltby, an area of about 317 acres. This points to the need for an analysis of public road needs for circulation both to and within the industrial site. Presently, all access to the industrial area is off Maltby Road via 87th Avenue SE or Bostian Road. A small area in the southwest of the site takes access from SR 9. This situation requires traffic coming from the south along SR 9 or SR 522 to travel north around the industrial area and enter off Maltby Road.

Access to the industrial site is difficult because the railroad tracks form a barrier by bisecting the property several times. In addition, SR 522 is a limited access highway. Potential access from SR 9 north of 228th Street SE would travel through areas planned for residential use, and the associated impacts would be inconsistent with those uses (see plan alternative for increased industrial area in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement).

Improvement to the intersection of Maltby Road and SR 522 is shown in the 1990 Transportation Plan. A design report will be necessary to determine the best alternative. A new alignment for the intersection may be necessary, possibly through the northeast corner of the industrial area.
G. PUBLIC SERVICES FACILITIES

GOAL:
Maintain public service and facilities at a level consistent with the planning area's rural and semi-rural character and situation.

GENERAL POLICIES:
G1. Public sewer service will not be available in the CMC area during the life of this plan except in the Snohomish Cascade Master Planned Community and on a very limited basis in the Maltby Industrial Area.

G2. Public utility system plans should be reasonably scaled to the population growth projected in this plan and consistent with the goals and policies discussed within this document.

G3. Discourage public service and facility improvements which are not consistent with the planning area's rural or semi-rural character.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:
G4. Development proposals will be approved commensurate with the availability of necessary public services and facilities, including schools, police and fire protection, electrical power, water, storm drainage and solid waste disposal facilities.

G5. Require all proposed development to pay its fair share of the capital improvement costs associated with growth.

G6. Encourage service purveyors to prepare and regularly update long-range plans for the distribution of their services in this planning area which are consistent with projections and land use assumptions contained in this plan.

G7. Public easements and rights-of-way should be considered multiple purpose utility corridors. New utility systems, including gas, power, water, and sewer transmission and distribution lines, should be located in existing public rights-of-way and easements where possible.

DISCUSSION
Residential, commercial, and industrial uses require a variety of support facilities and services such as sewage disposal, water service, transportation network, fire and police protection, schools, and park facilities. These services are primarily provided by different branches of government or special taxing districts.
Adequate public services have become an important element in land use planning and government decision making. Citizens are objecting to the fast pace of growth and the overall decline in the level of service for all kinds of services.

The county is hard pressed to provide the levels of police protection, park services, and road construction required by old and new residents because of limitations on its taxing powers. New growth will cost the county more in services than will be available in tax revenues given the current fiscal system.

The comprehensive plan can make the problems less severe in several ways, most importantly by encouraging efficient development patterns. Urban growth, which requires a full range of services, is encouraged to locate in urban portions of the county where it can make efficient use of existing facilities or logical extensions can be made cost-efficiently. Rural uses are encouraged in outlying areas, such as the area south of SR 522, where services and facilities are rudimentary and appropriate for only low density uses.

In addition, the county reviews development proposals to assure that an adequate level of required services exists to support the development. A project's impact on service providers is evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures can be established.

The county also reviews the comprehensive plans of service providers to assure that services are provided in compliance with the area's land use comprehensive plan. Facilities and improvements which would stimulate urban growth in rural or semi-rural areas, or would otherwise conflict with the comprehensive land use plan, are discouraged.

**SEWERS**

It is a general finding of the CMC comprehensive land use plan that public sewers should not be permitted in the CMC planning area outside of the Snohomish Cascade Master Planned Community before 1995. Public sewers would stimulate urban development in the area which is inconsistent with this comprehensive plan. In addition, there are far higher priority sewer projects in urban areas of the county which are competing for the same very limited capital improvement funds. Sewer service is premature and of low priority in the CMC area before 1995. The only exception to this policy is the possibility for a limited sewer extension to the properties designated as industrial in the Maltby area and property within the Residential Estate designation at the Wellington Hills Golf Course.
Background Comments

The Maltby Industrial Area has been designated and zoned industrial for many years. In several respects, this zoning can be considered premature and generally inconsistent with the goals and policies of not only this comprehensive plan, but with countywide goals as they have been articulated in other subarea comprehensive plans, including the North Creek area plan which abuts the CMC planning area. However, four characteristics of this industrial area can be cited to lend credence to the possibility of limited sewer ing of the industrially designated lands:

1. The lands in question have been zoned industrial for many years and have been partially developed with scattered industrial uses.

2. The types of industrial uses occurring in the area are generally land extensive rather than employee intensive. Auto wrecking, metal salvage, construction storage, and similar types of land extensive uses have located here, primarily because of the availability of low cost industrial properties and proximity to SR 522. There is a demonstrated public need to reserve areas for these types of uses which might not compatibly locate in more urbanized settings. Because these uses are land extensive rather than employee intensive, less impact is experienced on the poorly developed road system than would be the case with industries generating high commuter volumes.

3. Many of the properties within the designated industrial area have moderate to severe percolation limitations, thereby precluding usage of on-site waste water disposal systems and suggesting the need for sanitary sewers for further development.

4. The character of the industrial designated areas has been irreversibly established by existing uses. Changing existing zoning to other less intensive zones because of the prematurity of the industrial zoning would therefore be impractical.

Because of these characteristics, it is realistic to consider a limited sewer ing of the area. However, any sewer system proposed for the industrial area should be carefully planned to avoid undesirable impacts or effects beyond the industrially zoned lands as well as within the industrial areas themselves. Several reasons can be cited to support the contention that sewer opportunities to the industrial designation should be limited and restricted to the industrial properties only:

1. Sewering of the Maltby valley is generally inconsistent with county policies and plans:
a. The North Creek plan which abuts the CMC plan indicates that no sewers will be provided to rural designated lands within the Bear Creek Valley during the life of the plan;

b. Snohomish County has identified the Swamp Creek interceptor as the number one priority for sewers within unincorporated Snohomish County. Urbanization which is planned for the Swamp Creek corridor cannot occur without sewers;

c. Snohomish County has limited capital improvement monies which should be earmarked for areas which can best satisfy urban growth demands. Such areas which will be dependent on major capital expenditures if growth is to occur, including the Paine Field area, west North Creek, the Marysville area and the environs surrounding the Hewlett-Packard site. Premature development which competes for limited capital improvement revenues should be avoided.

2. The area in question is not within any sewer district. No sewer district comprehensive plans project any significant sewering plans for this area during the next 10 years. Extension of sewer would require establishment of a sewer authority covering this area in Snohomish County. The Metro Bear Creek interceptor would need to be extended approximately 3,000 feet through King County Water District 104 to the Snohomish County line. Institutional problems concerning sewer authority, line location, and cost of extension will likely deter major sewer extension in the near term.

3. The Metro Wastewater Management Plan for the Lake Washington/Green River Basins (which includes Little Bear Creek) assumes that sewer service to that portion of the Little Bear Creek Valley north of the King-Snohomish County line is "uncertain". Metro's strategy was to apply this nomenclature whenever local land use plans did not anticipate sewers within their planning horizon, and Metro's policy with respect thereto is "until and unless local land use agencies designate these areas for sewer service, on-site and/or community systems will continue to be the preferred methods for waste water management" (pg. 5 Metro 201 study).

4. The lands in question have not been available for land intensive uses primarily because of the absence of urban services such as water, adequate fire flow, and sewers. Once these services are provided, these properties may command prices which are in excess of those supported by existing types of users. Thus, alternative areas will have to be identified for land extensive industrial users.
Recommendations

The background comments underscore the dilemma of having to recognize the pre-existing major industrial designation within an area which is not projected to substantially change within the next 10 years. However, this contradiction can be minimized if the extension of sewers is limited to the industrially designated properties and the size and capacity of the lines extended do not lead to an alteration of the land extensive types of industrial uses which are presently there. Therefore, in order to allow a greater utilization of the industrially designated area while minimizing the externalities of this development, the following conditions of sewer extension are recommended by the plan:

1. Sewer access will be limited to presently industrially designated lands in the North Creek plan, and those so designated by this plan.

2. The size and capacity of the sewer extension will be predicated upon the land extensive flow characteristics of the types of industrial users now in the valley.

3. Individual rezones and building permit review of new industrial users in the valley will consider appropriateness of the new use in light of limited public water and road systems deficiencies which presently exist. This review will be conducted on a case-by-case basis through the SEPA process.

4. Prior to any sewer extension into the Maltby Industrial Area, the sewer authority proposing service shall amend their comprehensive sewage plan in compliance with the plan review and amendment requirements of Title 56, RCW. In the event the properties are sewered via direct connection to the Metro trunk sewer, the affected property owners shall obtain prior approval of Snohomish County for any agreement between said property owners and Metro.

Wellington Hills Area

A Residential Estate designation has been provided at the Wellington Hills Golf Course. This designation allows clustered residential development, while providing for the golf course to be dedicated and maintained as open space. Allowed development could require the extension of sanitary sewer, which raises the issue of impacts to surrounding residential areas which are planned to remain rural for at least the next 10-15 years. The challenge is to recognize the unique recreational value of the golf course, yet prevent impacts to adjoining rural areas.

As discussed under the Maltby Industrial Area, (page 56, Items 1, 2, and 3) sewers in this area are generally premature and inconsistent with county policies and plans. Based on this, sewer extension should be limited in nature and carefully planned to
avoid undesirable impacts or effects beyond the Residential Estate designated area.

The following conditions of sewer extension are recommended by the plan:

1. Sewer access will be limited to property within the Residential Estate designation.

2. The size and capacity of the sewer extension will be limited to that necessary to serve development within the Residential Estate designation.

3. Prior to any sewer extension, the sewer authority proposing service shall amend their comprehensive sewage plan in compliance with the plan review and amendment requirements of Title 56, RCW.

WATER

Public water is available from two sources in the planning area, Cross Valley Water Association and Water District No. 104 (see Figure 7). District 104 provides service to industrial users along SR 522 near the south Snohomish County line. The district also maintains service to a small area west of 115th Avenue SE. The Cross Valley Water Association serves the rest of the planning area. Water supply from the association should be adequate to serve the growth projected in this rural and semi-rural area. Cross Valley Water Association has a capital improvement program underway to upgrade system reliability, including closed loop lines throughout. In addition, Cross Valley will be replacing undersized lines, particularly in the Maltby Industrial Area, to increase water pressure and eliminate low fire flows.

SCHOOLS

Three school districts, Northshore No. 417, Monroe No. 103 and Snohomish No. 201, provide education services to the CMC planning area (Figure 7). All three districts have grown significantly since 1975-76 and some of that enrollment growth originated in the CMC planning area.

The Snohomish School District completed a future growth and facilities plan in 1981. The district's plan makes the assumption that the CMC planning area will remain basically rural at least until 1990. The Snohomish School District operates two schools in the planning area, Cathcart Elementary and Valley View Junior High. Cathcart Elementary is located at 8201 188th Street SE and had a 1984 enrollment of 414 students. The district projects an enrollment increase to 742 students by 1990 which is 269 students above the school's rated capacity. They anticipate needing additional classrooms equivalent to half an elementary school to accommodate projected enrollment increases. Valley View Junior High at Broadway and 140th Street SE has a rated capacity of 722 students. By 1990, projected enrollment will exceed the school's
capacity by more than 350 students. The district can change the
grade configuration and attendance areas within the system to
realize some better utilization of facilities over time, however,
new schools will be necessary to accommodate growth in the
district, some of which will occur in the CMC planning area.

Monroe School District No. 103 has one elementary school in the
planning area. It had a 1984 enrollment of 475 students with a
building capacity of 600. Enrollments throughout the district are
increasing and additional schools may be needed in the planning
area or adjacent to it to accommodate projected local growth.
With sufficient lead time and the growth projections contained in
this plan, District No. 103 should be able to serve their student
population.

The Northshore School District serves about 2.5 square miles in
the southwest portion of the planning area near SR 9 and SR 522.
The district does not operate any schools located in the planning
area and is anticipating only a moderate increase in enrollment
for this area of their district.

The rural designation utilized in this plan south of SR 522 should
help to discourage sprawl in this area. Less population growth in
outlying rural areas should help to reduce the need for extensive
bussing and thereby make the cost of education more economical.
In addition, growth which does not occur in rural areas may be
attracted to local urban areas, such as Snohomish, Monroe or
Bothell, where higher densities and more closely spaced schools
will minimize the need for bussing.

FIRE PROTECTION

Figure 8 describes the service area for the four fire districts
which provide protection for the CMC planning area. Fire
District No. 7 is the dominant one in the sense that it provides
protection to about 80% of the planning area and operates four
fire stations. In 1985, there were still portions of the planning
area which were not part of a fire district and were consequently
without fire protection.

Like most fire districts throughout the county, CMC area districts
are short of revenues to support services. Tax revenues from new
development are often not available for up to 28 months after the
occupancy of new homes even though the demand for service could
begin immediately. In addition, special levies and bond issues
for needed capital improvements may often fail. Finally, the levy
rates per $1000 of assessed valuation are statutorily set and are
very low. Consequently, revenues for fire districts are seldom
adequate to provide necessary fire protection. In the face of
these revenue constraints, inflation erodes the purchasing power
of available funds, and population growth increases the demand for
service.

The rural designation recommended south of SR 522 should lessen
future service demands in this area. In addition, new
subdivisions in the CMC planning area should be closely analyzed for their impact on fire districts.

POLICE PROTECTION

The County Sheriff has frequently stated that police protection in the county, including the CMC area, is inadequate due to the lack of funds which contribute to the low officer-to-population ratio. In 1980, there were approximately 0.63 officers per 1000 population which is well below the accepted national standard of 2.0 officers/1000. In the CMC area, this translates into less than one patrol car per work shift.

This plan does not offer a complete solution to this dilemma. However, the rural designations for portions of the plan should help to stabilize the calls for service from these areas by slowing the development rate of scattered subdivisions.
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H. AGRICULTURAL LAND USE

GOAL:

Preserve agricultural land as an irreplaceable natural resource with economic and cultural value to Snohomish County.

GENERAL POLICY:

H1. Maintain an agriculture designation and Agriculture 10-Acre zoning on all lands in the Snohomish and Snoqualmie River flood plains which have been designated as lands of primary importance in the Agricultural Preservation Plan.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:

H2. Implement recommendations of the Transition Area section of the Agricultural Preservation Plan.

H3. Require those developments proposed for agriculture transition areas to mitigate potential adverse impacts to adjacent farmland.

H4. Support all governmental or private actions which will maintain or increase the viability of farming in this planning area.

H5. Discourage all actions which would directly or indirectly encourage the conversion of farmland in the Rural and Agriculture designated areas.

DISCUSSION

Agriculture is an important land use in the CMC planning area. In 1980, there were approximately 3,300 acres of land in some form of agricultural production in this planning area. Not only does this land make a significant economic contribution to Snohomish County, it also helps to create and maintain the rural lifestyle which is highly valued by many residents. For these reasons, this plan recommends land use designations and policies which support, preserve, and maintain agricultural activities in this planning area. This land use element is dependent on the information contained in the county's Agricultural Preservation Plan and is consistent with the recommendations in that document.

The Soil Conservation Service (SCS) describes soil types for, among other things, their ability to support agricultural activities. SCS has defined seven soil productivity classifications and calls Class II and III soils prime agricultural soils. These soils are best suited for producing food, feed, forage, fibre, and oil seed crops. In addition, these lands are available and have the "quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops economically when treated and managed, including water management, according to modern farming methods (SCS)."
The major concentration of Class II and III soils, the prime agricultural lands, are located in the eastern periphery of the planning area (Figure 9). The flood plain of the Snohomish River east of Connelly Road and the Cathcart/Snoqualmie Road is one important area. The soils at this location are predominantly productivity Class II and the land is currently in agricultural use. The other large concentration of Class II soil is east of High Bridge Road at approximately 230th Street SE, in the Snoqualmie River flood plain. These lands are also in agricultural use. The Agricultural Preservation Plan, adopted by Snohomish County in 1982, identified both of these areas as "Agricultural land of Primary Importance." Primary areas are lands identified as important to the long-term viability of agriculture in the county. The plan recommends an Agriculture designation for these areas which should remain in farm use well into the future consistent with the recommendations of the Agricultural Preservation Plan.

The Agricultural Plan also recognizes the importance of ensuring compatibility of uses adjacent to farmlands through the adoption of transition area policies. Policies are provided to be used at both the comprehensive planning and development review level. The large rural lot sizes south of SR 522 adjacent to portions of the agriculturally designated areas in this CMC plan will help to minimize the potential conflicts between agriculture and adjacent residential uses. Transition area policies will be applied to development in the Residential Estate area directly adjoining agricultural lands. These policies promote clustering of residential uses and use of physical and visual screens to prevent farm land trespass and minimize nuisance complaints.

There are upland areas in the planning area which also have Class II or III soils. These areas are small and tend to be long, linear areas along stream corridors. For the most part, the upland prime agricultural soils are not being used for agriculture. However, as illustrated in Figure 9, there are many other upland portions of CMC which are being used for agriculture. Predominantly, the upland soils are productivity Class IV and support berry fields, beef and sheep pasture, mink or chicken ranches, and other similar small agricultural operations.

The Agriculture designation has not been applied to any upland areas. However, one of the important justifications for the Rural designation in this plan is the existence of agricultural activities in the CMC area. The Rural designation and proposed Rural Conservation zoning will permit existing agricultural uses to continue. In addition, the low density designation and zoning will preclude small lot residential development during the planning period and thereby help to preserve upland agricultural uses. Like agricultural use everywhere, upland agricultural lands are severely impacted by adjacent residential uses. Children and domestic pets harass livestock, and residents complain of noise, odors, and other farm management practices.
I. **ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

**GOAL:**

Encourage development in the CMC area which is compatible with and sensitive to the elements of the natural physical environment, particularly on steep slopes, wetlands, and in stream corridors, shorelines and flood plains.

**GENERAL POLICIES:**

I1. To encourage a careful environmental review, this plan defines and maps environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) such as flood hazard areas, slopes in excess of 15%, a 200-foot corridor along streams, shorelines, and wetlands.

I2. Condition development in environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) so that it is compatible with normal functioning of the ecosystem.

**SPECIFIC POLICIES:**

I3. Ensure that development along streams, lakes and wetlands maintains setbacks and natural vegetation buffers adequate to avoid any adverse environmental impact to the hydrologic system.

I4. Ensure that developments along stream corridors maintain minimum greenbelt widths of 50 to 100 feet from the stream bank as shown in Figure 10. A mix of overstory and understory plants should be maintained or planted within the required greenbelt width. Native vegetation is preferred: water tolerant species in the flood hazard area and less water tolerant ones farther up the bank.

I5. Require that all development be in strict compliance with the county's Slope Policy.

I6. Require that all development be in strict compliance with the county's Drainage Ordinance.

I7. Development should not be permitted on peat soils which are necessary for ground water storage and maintenance of year-round stream flows and lake levels.

I8. Development should be designed and situated such that it minimizes the amount of impervious surface required to build the project.

I9. Whenever there is a conflict between using a renewable resource and a nonrenewable resource, using the renewable resource should normally take precedence.
DISCUSSION

One of the important reasons for the extensive rural and semi-rural designations is to protect valuable natural resources and avoid adverse environmental impacts in the CMC planning area. In urban areas, where more intensive development is deemed appropriate, some relaxation of environmental standards may be necessary or permissible in order to economically accommodate new growth and development. In rural areas, on the other hand, high density growth is being discouraged in favor of maintaining natural resources, including clean air and water, open space, wildlife habitat, forestry and agricultural lands. Consequently, the intent of this element is to identify common environmental problems associated with development and to recommend standards such that we minimize impacts on the physical environment and maintain stability in the ecosystem. The following pages discuss these problems and recommend appropriate mitigating measures.

THE HYDROLOGIC SYSTEM

Unregulated development can have very serious negative consequences for the hydrologic system. Consequently, it is important to understand how water flows through the ecosystem and how the various elements in that system are inter-related. When precipitation falls to the earth, one of three things can happen to the water. It will either soak into the earth in a process called infiltration, be returned to the atmosphere by evaporation (or evapotranspiration if it goes through a plant first), or it will flow downhill into a lake, river, stream, or other water body.

In a natural area, very little of the moisture which falls to the ground runs off directly into water bodies. Much infiltrates into the soil where it is stored for later use by plants and transpired back into the atmosphere. Water not used by plants sinks deep into the subsoil and is stored as ground water. The storage component of infiltrated ground water is important because it is available for plant use between rains or flows underground into streams and lakes to maintain water levels during the dry season. Maintaining stream flows and water levels during the summer months is important for fish and other aquatic life. In addition, all the moisture that infiltrates or evaporates does not become runoff. Minimizing runoff is the key to reducing erosion, siltation, and flooding problems.

Traditional development techniques modify the hydrologic cycle in several ways. It is common for development to clear the vegetation from large tracts of land and after several months of soil exposure, replace the vegetation with pavement, rooftops, and other impervious surfaces. Impervious surfaces remove the possibility of infiltration or evapotranspiration. Consequently, most of the precipitation which falls, runs off rapidly and immediately into the local drainage system. After a storm, not only the volume of runoff increases but also its velocity. Local drainage courses become raging torrents. The high velocity in
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these streams has great erosive power, scouring stream beds and cutting into side slopes. If the storm is severe enough, normally placid streams are engorged with water and can damage roads, bridges, and buildings. Downstream, the combined runoff from a large tributary area flows out into the flood plain, inundating farms, homes and businesses. Repairing these damages and trying to prevent future storm runoff problems after they have begun is an expensive proposition. Therefore, one important objective of an environmental management element should be to minimize storm water runoff to avoid erosion, siltation, and downstream flooding problems.

The impacts of runoff on aquatic life are also to be avoided. As mentioned earlier, stored ground water is the source of dry season water which maintains lake levels and stream flows. Peat and other organic soils, for example, have high water storage capacity. They act like giant sponges which soak up large quantities of water during the wet season and then gradually release it during the dry season. In this way, there is adequate water flows during August when many species of fish are moving upstream to spawn. It also maintains water levels high enough so that juvenile fish can live and grow after they hatch. Consequently, minimizing the amount of impervious surface created as part of development is an important objective, particularly in areas with soils of high ground water storage capacity.

A second result of unregulated development is the introduction of pollutants to water systems. The sources of pollution are varied. A dependence on septic tanks for sewage treatment is one source. Too many drainfields may overwhelm the soil's ability to filter the waste water. The result is harmful bacteria entering the hydrologic system and endangering public health. A second source of harmful runoff is from lawns and gardens. This runoff is high in phosphorus and nitrogen which causes excessive plant growth and depletes the oxygen supply in lakes and streams. Runoff is also high in pesticides which introduces toxic materials into the system. The toxins and oxygen depletion are both harmful to aquatic life and the resulting damage to lakes and streams is unsightly. A third source of runoff pollution comes from the impervious surfaces themselves. Grease and oil from highway and parking lots, refuse and general litter from commercial centers all ends up in drainageways. This material is unsightly and can be harmful to aquatic life as well.

Loss of native vegetation has already been mentioned as contributing to increased urban runoff and water quality problems. Without plant cover, there is little to hold moisture in the soil and prevent it from running off into the drainage system, particularly during heavy rains. Furthermore, as runoff increases, so does the potential for soil erosion. Erosion not only removes topsoil from land surfaces where it is needed to support vegetation, but it also deposits soil... soils and clays... in streams where it is not needed. Silts and clays suspended in water endanger aquatic life if the turbidity level is high enough. In addition, when suspended materials settle, it may
blanket spawning gravels, smothering eggs and thereby reducing the productivity of a fishery.

Vegetative cover along streams and other water courses is also important because it helps to maintain nearly consistent water temperatures. Fish in particular can tolerate only small fluctuations in temperature. Without streamside vegetation, the water is more exposed to the sun and temperatures tend to rise at the expense of resident fish. For these reasons, it is important to retain as much vegetative cover as is possible, particularly along stream corridors. In addition to the water quality and flood control benefits, natural vegetation areas provide valuable habitat for wildlife and their contributions to the ecosystem.

Topography is another variable which can aggravate problems in the hydrologic system. Throughout the planning area there are numerous valleys which accommodate small streams and have steep side slopes. Some of the side slopes are in excess of 25%. The combination of steep slopes, moisture laden soils, and development activity can make these areas very unstable. Slides are an increasingly common problem. While it is probably true that almost any slope can be built upon with sufficient applications of sophisticated engineering and building technology, it is definitely not advisable. Steep slopes should not be developed. They should be left in their natural state to avoid the problems previously mentioned and as a natural amenity to be enjoyed by local residents. In addition, steep slopes with natural vegetative cover provide valuable wildlife habitat and migration corridors.

In the short term, the most important impacts of proper stream basin management are flood and erosion control. As discussed earlier, increased impervious surface from development increases storm water runoff and downstream flood hazard. Many south county residents have already experienced serious flooding from upstream development. Structural flood control measures are expensive as is repair of flood damage, and the county may have some liability in these matters. Therefore, the most cost-effective action is to avoid flooding problems by using good land development techniques in stream corridors and wetland areas.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

The CMC area has many fragile environments which need protection. Along the western boundary of the planning area are several important tributaries of Little Bear Creek. These streams flow west and south into the main channel of Little Bear Creek which parallels SR 9 and SR 522 from approximately 224th Street SE, south to the county line. Little Bear Creek enters the Sammamish River at Woodinville. In the south central portion of the planning area are tributary streams which are the headwaters of Bear Creek. These streams also flow generally south and are outlets for both Crystal and Echo Lakes. Bear Creek flows into the Sammamish River south of Redmond. Both Little Bear and Bear Creeks eventually flow into Lake Washington and from there into
Puget Sound. Little Bear and Bear Creeks support runs of Coho, Sockeye and Chinook salmon.

Along the northeast boundary of the planning area, the streams generally flow north into the Snoqualmie and Snohomish Rivers. Moving from the southeastern corner of the planning area, these streams include: a small creek which drains Treen and Long Lakes, Ricci Creek, Elliott Creek, Armstrong Creek, Evans Creek, and Thomas Creek in the northern corner of the planning area. Ricci, Elliott, Anderson, and Evans Creeks support Coho salmon and cutthroat trout. The Larimer pumping station is a barrier preventing salmon from utilizing Thomas Creek, however, native cutthroat are found. In addition to the lakes previously mentioned, the planning area includes Lost Lake, Lake Beecher, Shadow Lake, and many smaller lakes and wetlands. Figure 11 locates the streams and lakes in this planning area as accurately as is possible without field checking each water body by walking its complete length or periphery. If, during the review of a development application, additional unmapped water bodies are located, they will be subject to the same standards and conditions as set forth in this plan element.

A 200-foot wide corridor has been identified as an environmentally sensitive area along and around all water bodies and wetlands in this planning area. The clear intention in this plan is to avoid negative impacts for the hydrologic system. Consequently, development in the designated ESA can proceed only after the applicant has demonstrated that construction of a project will not have adverse impacts on the stream system or lake. Realistically, it will mean that building setbacks will be imposed so that natural vegetation buffers exist along all water bodies and courses in the planning area. In the case of stream corridors a 50- to 100-foot setback will be required. No minimum building setback or natural vegetation buffer width is included in this text for lakes and wetland areas other than to require setbacks and natural vegetation buffers adequate to maintain high environmental quality as discussed in this plan element. Depending on the situation, a narrow buffer may be adequate in one case while an extensive buffer may be necessary in a second situation. In all cases, the burden of proof is on the project proponent to demonstrate that a proposed buffer and building setback is adequate to avoid the environmental problems discussed in the previous pages. In addition, development projects must consider the cumulative impacts of their project. In other words, they must assess the total impact of development if most neighboring parcels were to undergo similar development.

As discussed in this element, wetlands and peat soil areas are also related to the hydrologic system in important ways. Consequently, Figure 11 locates wet soils and wetland areas and includes them in the ESA designation. The following list of soils were used in that definition:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Silty Clay Loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202–205</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>Fine Silt Loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Mc Kenna</td>
<td>Fine Silt Loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Norma</td>
<td>Fine Silt Loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Orcas</td>
<td>Fine Silt Loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Mukilteo</td>
<td>Peat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Soil Survey of Snohomish County Area, Washington

These soils are generally found in basins and the flat bottomlands associated with streams and lakes. They are characteristically the soils which form around the swamps and marshes at the headwaters of stream systems. These wet organic soils have high water holding capacity and store moisture during the rainy season for gradual release during the drier months. Consequently, these soils are vital to healthy streams flowing year-round.

Figure 11 shows the approximate location of most of these soils as they occur in the planning area. However, due to the scale at which this information is collected and mapped by SCS, it is possible that inclusions of nonsensitive soil will occur within the ESA designations and vice versa. Consequently, field checks will be used in all cases to determine building potential. Wetlands and wet soils are considered unbuildable in this planning area. Wet areas should not be drained, filled, or modified in any way that might cause problems in the hydrologic system. As in the previous example, the burden of proof is on the applicant to demonstrate that soils are not wet or that development would not cause imbalance in the hydrologic system. It should be noted that these development standards are in addition to those imposed by the Snohomish Health District for issuance of a sanitation permit.

Figure 11 also designates steep slopes as ESAs. For the purposes of this plan, steep slopes are defined as those 15% and above. The county has an existing Slope Policy which guides development in these areas. Consequently, the value of the ESA designation with regard to slope is informational. It identifies areas where development may be conditioned or limited in terms of development potential. Judicious application of the county's Slope Policy will help to avoid hydrologic problems in this plan element.

Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) designation does not automatically mean that property is undevelopable. Some of the designated lands may be undevelopable, other parcels may have reduced development potential, and a few may even be able to support full development potential based on the underlying comprehensive plan. In essence, the development potential of a parcel within the ESA designation will be decided on a case-by-
case basis primarily on the impact of proposed development on the physical environment. If a proposal has serious negative implications for water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, year-round water levels or storm water runoff which cannot be mitigated, then the development potential of the parcel in question may be reduced in recognition of environmental and physical restraints. If on the other hand, development can proceed with little or no adverse environmental impact, then the project will be defined as having moderate to high development potential.

In an ESA, the burden of proof lies with the project proponent. It is the applicant's responsibility to show that development can proceed without significant adverse environmental impact. In reviewing potential impacts, the county will carefully consider cumulative impacts under the assumption that neighboring parcels have the same development potential as the proposed project, all other things being equal. If the cumulative environmental impact is unacceptable, then proposed development must be modified or scaled down until it is compatible.

The environmentally sensitive designation also means that all development proposals must comply with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) statute. SEPA does identify some types of projects which are exempt from SEPA compliance. However, if projects are proposed for environmentally sensitive areas, there are very few exemptions. This designation will ensure that potential negative impacts and mitigating measures are considered during the development process for all development proposals in sensitive areas.

In summary, the objectives of this environment and resource management element in the environmentally sensitive areas are:

1. minimize the amount of impervious surface to allow infiltration and avoid runoff;
2. retain a natural vegetation buffer on both stream banks adequate to maintain normal water temperatures, to reduce erosion, to moderate runoff velocity, to encourage infiltration, to allow filtration of runoff;
3. promote substantial building setbacks from the stream corridor to reduce the amount of impervious surface and the probability of pollutants such as fertilizers, toxins, grease, oil, and sediment from entering streams;
4. require adequate storm water detention systems; and
5. prevent filling and draining of wetlands associated with stream corridors and lake fronts because of their value as breeding, spawning, and rearing habitat for a wide variety of plant and animal life, and for their water holding capacity and help in maintaining year-round stream flows.

To accomplish these objectives, the policies listed at the beginning of this plan element will be rigorously applied during the review of all proposed development, particularly in environmentally sensitive areas.
J. PARK, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

GOAL:

Provide park lands, recreational facilities and open space areas consistent with the rural and residential estate designation and adequate to meet local needs.

GENERAL POLICIES:

J1. Park and recreational planning should consider natural features, topography, user population, land use conflicts, and opportunities with neighboring property, access, and parking.

J2. The community should make maximum use of school land, utility easements and other public lands for parks, trails and open space.

J3. To the extent possible, park and recreational facilities should be developed, operated, and maintained as a joint effort of the county and neighboring municipalities.

SPECIFIC POLICIES:

J4. New development must pay its fair share of the cost of acquiring and developing new park facilities.

J5. The policies and recommendations of the Snohomish County Park and Recreation Plan should guide public and private recreational development in this planning area.

DISCUSSION

Presently, there is no public park land located within the CMC area. Some would argue that park and recreational facilities are not necessary in rural and semi-rural areas. In terms of passive recreation and open space, the argument has validity. There is usually adequate space on the typical rural large lot to hike, bird watch, or picnic. However, residents of small lot residential developments tend to use neighboring privately owned vacant properties for passive recreation. Even worse is the tendency to trespass on private farm lands and occasionally vandalize or disrupt agricultural operations.

More troublesome is the question of demand for active park spaces, such as basketball courts, swimming pools, baseball and soccer fields. Active park lands are needed but will not generally be located in rural areas. From an economic and efficiency perspective, the most appropriate location for active recreational facilities is in the closest urban center which serves the rural and semi-rural population.

The county has just completed a new Park Plan. The plan includes an inventory of existing facilities, projections for needed future
facilities and a discussion of appropriate roles for the county in recreational development. The plan recommends that the county concentrate its efforts in providing facilities that either are not or cannot be provided by other agencies, with emphasis on developing trail systems in different parts of the county.

The plan also discusses the severe fiscal constraints imposed on the county as it attempts to provide for recreational opportunities. Present financing methods will not meet the development and maintenance costs of existing sites, much less development of new facilities. Based on these realities, the plan examines alternative financing methods such as user fees and bond issues which link costs to those who are benefitted. This will allow county residents a direct choice in facilities they are willing to support.
Chapter III

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
Chapter 3

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation is the term used for the process of converting the goals and policies outlined in this plan into specific and legally binding regulations, controls, and requirements. There are several types of legal controls affected by this plan. They include zoning, conditional and special use permits, building permits, subdivision controls, and capital improvements programming.

A. ZONING

The relationship between the comprehensive plan and the zoning map is fundamental to community planning and often not fully appreciated by the general public. The comprehensive plan, text and map, provide basic recommendations about long-term land use for general areas. Based on several explicitly stated reasons, the plan might recommend that single family residential use at a density of one dwelling unit per acre is in the best interest of the community and the county for a specific portion of this planning area.

A zoning code and map are different from a comprehensive plan text and map. While the plan is general and refers to generalized map areas, the zoning ordinance is very specific in terms of uses and refers to legally defined and described parcels. The comprehensive plan reflects community discussion and provides rationale and direction. Zoning consists of very specific requirements that are applied without background discussion.

In spite of these differences, zoning and comprehensive plans are related in the sense that the zoning map for an area must be in agreement or consistent with the recommendations contained in the comprehensive plan for that area. In the above cited example, the county's single family residential zone, SA 1-Acre, is compatible with the comprehensive plan recommendation. The following Table 7 compares the comprehensive plan designations used in the CMC area with compatible zoning categories. It is important to note, however, that in most cases the plan text identifies the appropriate implementing zoning for each plan designation as that designation is discussed in each land use element.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Density Range</th>
<th>Highest Zoning Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Rural</td>
<td>1 du*/10 Acres</td>
<td>Agriculture 10-Acre (A-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Estate (north of SR 522)</td>
<td>1 du/2.3-5 Acres</td>
<td>Rural Conservation (RC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Estate (Wellington Hills)</td>
<td>Up to 1 du/acre</td>
<td>SA-1 Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4-2 du/acre</td>
<td>Planned Residential Development 20,000 (PRD 20,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Residential Development - Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture 1-acre (PRD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA 1-Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planned Community</td>
<td>1-4 du/Acre</td>
<td>Planned Residential Development 9600 (PRD 9600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Business (CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Community Business (PCB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Business (NB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light Industrial (LI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Park (IP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*du – dwelling unit

After the adoption of this comprehensive plan, the county will begin rezone proceedings to bring the zoning map into conformance with the comprehensive plan text and, as appropriate, the plan map. Essentially, the county will rezone all areas designated for residential use to an appropriate zoning category. In some cases, this will mean a county-initiated rezone to Rural Conservation (RC). This represents a substantial density reduction since most of the CMC planning area was zoned RR 20,000 during the 1970s.

For areas designated commercial or industrial, the policy is not to rezone the relevant areas to a compatible zone immediately or at county initiative. These rezone actions are left for the individual property owners at the time they wish to use their property. This procedure will save landowners money in tax assessments and allows the county to require market justification and good site design as a condition of rezone. The appropriate holding zone for the commercial and industrial designated areas is Rural Conservation or SA-1 Acre depending on the surrounding residential plan designation. These zones should be imposed at the time this plan is implemented.
In addition to the area zoned RR 20,000, the county may consider downzoning other specific property as part of an areawide rezone to implement this comprehensive plan. Downzones may be appropriate on vacant parcels where the pre-existing zoning is wholly inconsistent with the intent of the plan. Where development under that zoning would jeopardize the plan and create incompatible land use for neighboring properties, the county may initiate downzones to an appropriate category.

Rezone proposals initiated by private citizens will be considered throughout the life of this comprehensive plan. Citizen-initiated rezones will be judged on their merits and their general agreement with the plan map, text and policies. Rezones which are logical, address existing site problems and are consistent with this comprehensive plan, will most likely be approved. However, conflict with this plan is sufficient grounds for the county to deny a rezone proposal.

During the life of this comprehensive plan, the process of revising zoning and making rezone decisions will be precedent setting and further refine the goals and policies of the plan. It is therefore important that the citizens involved in the comprehensive plan preparation continue to participate in rezone actions to ensure that the intent of the plan is carried out during its implementation. To this end, the county notifies adjacent property owners and identifiable community groups of pending rezones and other land use hearings and invites their comments and suggestions.

B. SUBDIVISION

The comprehensive plan has also been designated as a guideline for subdivision (plats, short plats, and large tract segregations) approval. State law requires all subdivisions of land to conform to the comprehensive plan. The subdivision process is therefore another tool for implementing the plan. Such plan policies as requiring adequate drainage, setbacks from streams or greenbelts will be enforced through specific subdivision requirements applied to individual sites. While some of these requirements may seem unnecessary when viewed from the perspective of individual property owners, they are important elements of the overall plan to protect the environment and permit growth. This comprehensive, large scale perspective makes the plan a necessary reference when making individual rezone and subdivision decisions for seemingly isolated and unrelated parcels of land.

C. CONDITIONAL OR SPECIAL USE PERMITS

Conditional use and special use permits require conformance with the comprehensive plan. The conditions imposed by the county on the use of properties for certain activities should reflect the plan goals and policies. In some cases, granting a conditional/special use permit would allow activities which violate a comprehensive plan policy and aggravate a problem identified in the plan. A special or conditional use permit may
be denied if it adversely affects the implementation of the comprehensive plan.

D. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Capital improvement programs (CIPs) are long-range plans for spending public or semi-public funds to improve or extend public facilities such as roads, sewers, power lines, parks and schools. Improvements often have a dramatic effect on the value and potential uses for land, particularly in the case of road improvements. Consequently, it is important that CIPs adopted by utility and service districts within a land use planning area are compatible with that land use plan. As discussed in the Public Services and Utilities element and in the associated environmental impact statement (EIS), the available CIPs for utility districts within the CMC area have been carefully reviewed for their ability to support the level of population growth projected for this community. It is the further recommendation of this plan that continued review and coordination between the county and the service and utility districts be maintained.

Throughout this plan, the growing cost-revenue imbalance problem has been discussed in connection with all types of public services and facilities. Snohomish County is currently considering a wide variety of new revenue sources which could be used to help build and improve new schools, roads, fire protection facilities, and park lands. These new sources include developer contributions, local option taxes, special levies and general obligation bonds which will help in alleviating some of the cost-revenue imbalance problems. However, it will still be necessary to make the delivery of services and facilities as efficient as possible to minimize the costs. Consequently, this plan recommends that the county continue to improve the level of coordination and cooperation which exists between itself and the agencies charged with the task of providing public services in the CMC area.

E. PLAN AMENDMENT AND REVIEW

This document is intended to guide land use decisions and change in the unincorporated portion of the planning area. The arguments and policies it contains should answer many of the questions and address most of the problems that have been anticipated for the next decade. In addition, all assumptions on which the plan is based have been identified. The assumptions are conservative and therefore provide for a large margin of error. Consequently, this plan can easily respond to changing conditions without requiring amendment.

After several years, however, unexpected change in the planning area may prove to be of such a magnitude that some of the assumptions may have to be revised. This could lead to plan modifications and amendments. However, plan amendments should not be used as a means of circumventing the general intent and purpose of this comprehensive plan. An amendment should only be considered if basic plan assumptions are proven to be incorrect.
after several years of plan implementation, and if the amendment substantially improves the usefulness of the entire plan.

County officials should periodically review this comprehensive plan and discuss its continued usefulness. Most of the population and demand forecasts are for the period 1985-1995. The county may decide that this plan has outlived its usefulness before 1995. On the other hand, the plan might be easily modified to serve beyond that time.
APPENDIX 1

Board of County Commissioners
SHOHOISI COUNTY, WASHINGTON

RESOLUTION NO. 79-9
REZONE GRANTED CONDITIONALLY

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners has held hearings and reviewed all exhibits on the application of ALBERT MOSS and LCF ASSOCIATES, (SHOHOISI-CASCADE VIEW PROPERTIES), R 48-78, for rezone from Rural Use, RR 20,000 and Suburban Agriculture 1-acre to RMD 9600 with Contract of property described as follows:

Application R 48-78 of ALBERT MOSS, AS TRUSTEE, AND LCF ASSOCIATES (SHOHOISI CASCADE VIEW PROPERTIES) for the rezoning from RURAL RESIDENTIAL 20,000, RURAL USE, RURAL CONSERVATION AND SUBURBAN AGRICULTURE 1-ACRE to PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 9600 of the property described as:

SHOHOISI CASCADE #1.

Six parcel unimproved real property (approx. 1,039 ac), Shoohomish Co., WA, DAP:

PARCEL A.

Parcel A, N 1/2 of Gov lot 3; Gov lot 4; SW 1/4 of NW 1/4, ECF Co. rd; W 1/2 of NW 1/4 of SW 1/4, ECF Co. rd; all in Sec 2, Twp 27N, RSE, W.M.; Parcel B, Gov lots 1 & 2 & S 1/2 of NE 1/4 & N 1/2 of SE 1/4; all in Sec 3, Twp 27N, RSE, W.M.; Parcel C, SE 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 34, Twp 38N, RSE, W.M.; Parcel D, SW 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Sec 35, Twp 38N, RSE, W.M.; Parcel E, Lot 47, W 1/2 of SW 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Sec 35, Twp 38N, RSE, W.M.; Parcel F, Lot 48 & W 1/2 of lot 49, Plat of City Farm, acre to plat that res Vol 13 of Plat, p 13, sec of Shoohomish Co.; Parcel G, NE 1/4 of NW 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Sec 2, Twp 27N, RSE, W.M., EXC S 140' of N 335' of E 135' thof, Shoohomish Co., WA.

PARCEL B.

SW 1/4 of NW 1/4; S 1/2 of SE 1/4 of NW 1/4; NW 1/4 of SW 1/4, NE 1/4 of SW 1/4; & SE 1/4 of SW 1/4; all in Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., situated in sk Co.

PARCEL C.

E 3/4 of E 1/2 of SE 1/4, EXC S 60' thof for rd, & SE 1/4 of NE 1/4, EXC W 20 rd; all in Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M.

PARCEL D.

SE 1/4 of NE 1/4 of Sec 34, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M.

PARCEL E.

SW 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., LESS rd.
PARCEL F.

Parcel A. NE 1/4 of NE 1/4, Sec 34, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M. Parcel B. E 1/2 of SE 1/4 of Sec 27, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M. Parcel C. All ptns of NW 1/4 of NW 1/4 of Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M. DAF: Beg at cor commn to Secs 26, 27, 34 & 35; th N 39°49'30" S 90' alg N of sec 35; th S 21°26'35"W 1,431.76'; th S 9°48'48"W 70' to Sec 35; th N 5°08'50"E 1,331' to POB.

Parcel D. All ptns of W 1/2 of SW 1/4 of Sec 26, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M. DAF: Beg AAP on W ln of 30' S of W 1/4 cor of Sec 26, th TPB; th N 89°59'40"W 80'; th S 8°20'50"E TAP on S ln of Sec 26 that is 590' E of SW cor of Sec; th W 590' to SW cor of Sec 26; th N alg W sec 1n to TPB.

SNOHOMISH CASCADE #2.

Par of unimproved real property (approx. 200 ac), Snohomish Co., WA, DAF:

PARCEL A.
NW 1/4 of NW 1/4 of Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA, EXCL PDP
thn: Beg at cor commn to Secs 26, 27, 34 & 35; th N 89°49'E 596' alg N of sec 35; th S 21°26'35"W 1,431.76'; th S 9°48'48"W 70' to W ln of Sec 35; th N 5°08'50"E 1,331' alg sec 1n to POB.

PARCEL B. Beg at W 1/4 cor of Sec 26, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA; th E to NE cor of NW 1/4 of SW 1/4; th E to NW cor of S 1/2 of NE 1/4 of SW 1/4; th E 330'; th S to N ln of SW 1/4 of SW 1/4; th W 511' m1 TAP wh is 278.59' W of NE cor of SW 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Sec 26; th N 89°59'40"W TAP wh is 430.2' S of N ln of NW 1/4 of SW 1/4; th W to W ln of sec 1n; th N alg W ln of sec 430.2' to POB, EXCL a strip of land 40' wide convyed for rd. x/W. ABN 508751.

PARCEL C. All ptns of W 1/2 of SW 1/4 of Sec 26, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA, DAF: Beg 430.2' S of W 1/4 cor of sec 1n; th N 89°59'E 810' to TPB; th S 21°26'35"W 1,431.76'; th S 9°49'23"W 78.59' to 1/16th sec 1n; th N 89°59'40"W alg 1/16th ln 1,306.14' m1 to S ln of sec; th S 9°49'W alg sec 1n to pt 590' E of sec cor commn to Secs 26, 27, 34 & 35; th S 8°20'50"E 2,193.63' to TPB.

PARCEL D. SE 1/4 of SW 1/4 of Sec 26, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA. NW 1/4 of NE 1/4 of Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA.

SNOHOMISH CASCADE #3.

Par of unimproved real property (approx. 40 ac) Snohomish Co., WA, DAF: NE 1/4 of SE 1/4 of Sec 34, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA.

SNOHOMISH CASCADE #4.

Par of unimproved real property (approx. 40 ac), Snohomish Co., WA. DAF: NE 1/4 of NE 1/4 of Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M., Snohomish Co., WA.

SNOHOMISH CASCADE #5.

Par of unimproved real property (approx. 100 ac), Snohomish Co., WA. DAF: NW 1/4 of SW 1/4 of SE 1/4; SW 1/4 of SE 1/4; W 1/4 of E 1/2 of SE 1/4; S 50' of E 3/4 of E 1/2 of SE 1/4, all in Sec 35, Twp 28N, RSE, W.M.
The property is generally located approx. 3 miles SE of Silver Lake, 1/2 mile S of the intersection of Seattle Hill Rd. & Bluff Rd., N of 156th St. SE, bounded on the W by Seattle City Light, Bonneville, Transmission Line & extending E’ly to 63rd Ave. SE, with the subject property being comprised of approx. 1,415 acres.

WHEREAS, the Board recognizes the precedence of their action on this project in setting the long term direction for County review of other development projects, and,

Recognizes that the North Creek Comprehensive Plan and Millman Area Plan contain both maps and policies which must be considered together in review of development proposals, and,

Understands the basis for the opposing staff and Planning Commission recommendations and finds merit with each, and,

Believes that Board action on this project must be consistently applied in findings on future projects containing similar development issues; and

Finds that, except for the large scale of this project, there are many similarities between the issues raised here and in other pending and future cases; and,

Finds particular merit with concern over the two issues of the equitable sharing of the cost of growth and the timing of the Cathcart, Maltby, Clearview Comprehensive Plan update; and,

Believes there is immediate need to address, in particular, the equitable sharing of the cost of growth caused by this and other developments; and

Recognizes it will take some additional time and analysis to fully resolve all issues regarding the cost of growth to be borne by current and future residents; and,

Believes it is neither necessary nor fair to this applicant to delay a decision on this project while awaiting a permanent growth policy; and,

Finds that the County has the authority to control the timing and conditions for development of all future sectors and subdivisions and possesses the authority to deny any subsequent development stages if not found to be in the public interest; and,

WHEREAS, the master plan submittals meet the requirements of the North Creek Comprehensive Plan and fulfill the prerequisite for master planing of the subject property; and,

WHEREAS, an Environmental Impact Statement, prepared and circulated in accordance with SEPA and SCERO, is attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof; and,

WHEREAS, the master plan meets the substantive requirements of the Planned Residential Development zone; and,

WHEREAS, master planning this area will better serve the public health, safety and welfare than piece-meal development of the property; and,
WHEREAS, the number, size and location of the school sites have been determined in cooperation with the Snohomish School District; and,

WHEREAS, the conceptual open space and recreation plan shows major open space areas and greenbelts that serve several purposes:

A. Retention of vegetation in sensitive areas of steep slopes and drainageways;
B. Pedestrian access to a community park;
C. Buffer areas along arterial roads and on the perimeter of the site;
D. Active recreational use such as playgrounds and playfields in suitable areas;

WHEREAS, the proposed network of trails will provide access to these open spaces as well as interconnect them in a logical way. A more detailed open space plan for the master plan area is a submission requirement for Sector I. It will further specify the type of trails and open space improvements to be provided. The applicants intend to offer the 250 acres of open space to the County for park purposes. The Snohomish County Park Board has conceptually approved this proposal. However, the Park Board also stated that it would like to postpone a decision on the acceptability of parcels for County parks to the sector planning level, and,

WHEREAS, the conceptual water and sewer plans are in conformance with County and utility district plans and will be refined at the sector and division of development planning level, and,

WHEREAS, the storm drainage concept assures conformance to County regulations. Storm water facilities will include retention/detention ponds and catch basins to regulate surface runoff to a rate comparable to natural flow and to protect water quality. A comprehensive drainage plan for the entire site will be submitted with the first sector, and,

WHEREAS, Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County has expressed a need for a substation in the master plan area of either Snohomish Cascade or Silver Firs. The developers have expressed their willingness to set aside a one-acre site for this purpose, and,

WHEREAS, the roadway section exhibit on page 36 of the design report shows sidewalks on one side only of the road for residential access and neighborhood collector roads. This proposal is only acceptable if the applicant can demonstrate at the sector level that an adequate trail system can functionally be substituted for an otherwise required second sidewalk, and,

WHEREAS, development authorized by the proposed rezones will be predicated upon compliance with the adopted County Road Policy. The design report proposes two alternative locations for the extension of 132nd Street S.E. Although the County has not concluded the process of determining a right-of-way corridor through the subject site, the two proposed alternatives are the most likely choices. Should the County select a substantially different corridor, the applicants will have to apply for a master plan modification to be heard by the Planning Commission and by the Board of County Commissioners, and,

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the historical relationship between new development and the timing and cost of providing public services to support such development is no longer acceptable in rapidly growing unincorporated Snohomish County, resulting in services not being present when first needed, and,
WHEREAS, the Board has determined that in order to find that approval of this project is in the public interest, it must apply an approach new to Snohomish County for resolving the issue of timing and cost of providing public services to developments, and said approach must apply to all future developments to insure equity and to adequately address this problem on a countywide basis.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that on the basis of the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Snohomish County Board of Commissioners does hereby APPROVE the CONTRACT REZONE between Albert Moss and Snohomish Cascade View Properties and Snohomish County, and APPROVES IN PART the prerequisite MASTER PLAN SUBJECT to the following conditions:

1. Full approval of the Master Plan is granted for Sectors 1 through 4 as depicted on page 35 of the Snohomish/Cascade Design Report, Revision #3, to coincide with the approximate boundary separating the North Creek and Hillman Area Comprehensive Plans.

2. Full approval is granted for the major open space designations.

3. Approval of the Master Plan is granted for Sectors 5 through 8 as depicted on page 35 of the Snohomish/Cascade Design Report, Revision #3, excluding the designations for dwelling unit count, density and type. At such time as the property owner desires to proceed with development in any of Sectors 5 through 8, application shall be made to the County for public hearing consideration by the Planning Commission and Board to establish the approved dwelling unit count, density and type for the entire area encompassed by Sectors 5 through 8. While the County is extending FPD 9600 zoning to the entire property, future consideration of Sectors 5 through 8 shall be based in part on the then current comprehensive plan, utility and public service availability, developer performance, then current growth policies, environmental assessment of project impacts and compatibility with the surrounding area.

4. Applicant shall comply with the policies and procedures set forth in the Interim Growth Management Policy which was adopted as part of this record, before recording of the first subdivision.

5. The rezone contract shall be executed concurrent with approval of the rezone by the Board of County Commissioners.

6. A one-acre site for a substation shall be made available to Public Utility District No. 1 at such time as the District needs to expand its power service capabilities.

7. The County's sidewalk standards shall be met at all planning and construction phases.

8. The southerly connection to 156th S.E. shall not be considered as part of this approval but shall be resolved at such time as the Sector plan containing that connection, or alternatives thereto, is submitted for public hearing approval.
9. Application of the Interim Policy to this project shall, at a minimum, require developer participation in the improvement of 132nd both within the project boundaries and between the project boundary and the Bothell/Everett Highway. Such participation shall also apply to other future development projects defined as primary beneficiaries of 132nd Street improvements as determined by the County Engineer. In addition, the developer shall be required to participate in the cost of improvement of any public park facilities within the project boundaries.

10. Rezone contract to be amended as follows:

a. Delete Section VIII H. Schools, p. 17.

b. Add new section VIII H. Drainage District Participation, to read:

Prior to the approval of any section plan, the applicant or his successor, must demonstrate participation in the Marshland Flood Control District, or other applicable drainage district, for all private land areas within the sector discharging storm drainage water into the Marshland drainage area.

c. Amend Section VIII I. Environmental Protection, p. 19, to read:

The APPLICANT covenants and agrees that all construction shall be accomplished commensurate with sound engineering practices and all County, State and Federal environmental requirements and development statutes, including implementation of appropriate mitigation measures determined by the County and APPLICANT as set forth in EIS's or other environmental analysis documents for the Master Plan, Sector Plans, and subsequent approval phases, in order to maintain and preserve the environmental integrity of Snohomish County.

d. Add new Section V C 2. (c) Supplemental Environmental Review, p. 8, to read:

A supplemental environmental impact statement or environmental analysis documents which shall include examination in detail of the impacts of that sector's development, including analysis of the public costs associated with such development and mitigation measures available to reduce or balance these costs against public benefits consistent with then existing general County practices and policies.

11. That said amended contract be submitted to the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners for his signature, after approval as to form by the deputy prosecuting attorney serving as advisor to the Planning Department, by April 1, 1979.

12. That failure by the applicant to submit the amended contract by April 1, 1979, will result in denial of their application for contract rezone.

Done in regular Session this 28th day of February 1979.

ATTEST:

HENRY B. WHALEN
County Auditor and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Board

By: Deputty Auditor

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Constituting the Board of County Commissioners of Snohomish County, Washington