

Snohomish County Land Use Consistency Draft Report

Prepared for:

**Snohomish County
Planning and Development Services**



Prepared by:



Jones & Stokes

September 19, 2005

Overview

The 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) addressed the potential impacts of three future land use alternatives (generally low, medium, and high growth) on land use patterns and plans and policies. The DEIS document is programmatic in nature given the countywide aspect of the proposal. In terms of land use patterns, areas along City/County boundaries and along the UGA in particular were described in terms of differences in intensities/bulk/scale and activity levels. In the “Relationship to Plans and Policies” section, Comprehensive Plan compatibility was described as a function of consistency with Countywide Planning Policies (DEIS page 3-220):

As required by the GMA and Snohomish County CPPs, the County and cities comprehensive plans must be consistent with each other. Snohomish County CPP Policy JP-3 establishes that the term “consistency” as defined in the GMA Procedural Criteria WAC 365-195 should be used to determine consistency between jurisdictions’ comprehensive plans.

WAC 365-195-520 describes interjurisdictional consistency. This section states that “Adopted Countywide planning policies are designed to ensure that city and county comprehensive plans are consistent. Each local comprehensive plan should demonstrate that such policies have been followed in its development.”

A potential mitigation measure in the “Plans & Policies” DEIS section suggested the following:

- Amend the (city or County) proposed land use maps as needed to achieve consistency with County and adjacent Municipal Plans.

This paper reviews potential conflicts that might result from inconsistent adjacent land uses associated with the Planning Commission’s Recommended Plan which was developed subsequent to the DEIS and adopted municipal or adjacent County land use designations. Three specific areas were examined, including: future land uses along the County’s border with Skagit and King Counties; the consistency of adjacent County and City future land uses within a UGA (we also noted areas where the City limit and UGA boundary are coterminous and if any adjacent land uses might be in conflict); and, the consistency of land use designations within a UGA for those cities that have chosen as part of their Comprehensive Planning process to designate future land uses outside of their city boundary.

Jones & Stokes provided a comprehensive and conservative review of adjacent land use inconsistencies. We identified areas of *potential* conflicts. Further review by the County may provide feedback that there are existing natural or manmade features or historic land use patterns that mitigate any potential conflict that could occur between seemingly inconsistent uses.

It is a given that some inconsistencies are bound to occur between adjacent urban and rural uses along an Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundary, given the opposing purposes of urban and rural land use planning. Transitions from one level of intensity to another may also occur within UGAs and between cities and counties, where cities may have experienced more intense development. In addition, uses of different intensities may be planned near one another based on existing land uses patterns or where and barriers such as major roads or topography changes occur. It is expected that full implementation of existing policies and regulations, or the development and implementation of new ones, will ensure that sensitive design and

development techniques are implemented in a cooperative manner between a City and County to buffer potentially incompatible uses.

Methodology

County GIS staff provided two maps of the Planning Commission's Recommended Future Land Use map (dated July 2005); one for south and one for north Snohomish County. (See attachment 4 & 5) These County maps included future land use classes for all incorporated Cities as well as for King and Skagit County. Jones and Stokes staff used the land use designations depicted on these maps provided by the County as the basis of our analysis of land use inconsistencies between adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas, and along the County's border with Skagit and King County. In addition, Jones & Stokes staff was also able to find on the worldwide web as of February 4, 2005, the Comprehensive Plan land use maps for Everett, Marysville, Mill Creek, Monroe, Mountlake Terrace and the City of Snohomish, which showed proposed land use designations for UGA areas outside of their City limits. Based on information provided by Snohomish County and Jones & Stokes staff's additional online review it is assumed that the remaining Cities (Arlington, Bothell, Brier, Darrington, Duval, Edmonds, Gold Bar, Index, Lake Stevens, Lynwood, Mukilteo, Stanwood, Sultan, and Woodway) within Snohomish County have not designated land uses outside their City boundaries. Jones & Stokes also used 2002 buildable lands information prepared by County staff to comment on the impact from inconsistent land use designations.

As a means identifying the inconsistencies that were identified three charts were developed:

- Attachment 1- Comparison of Land Uses along the shared Snohomish County border with adjacent counties;
- Attachment 2- Comparison of Incorporated Land Uses and adjacent County Land within the UGAs;
- Attachment 3- Comparison of County and City land use designations of unincorporated land within UGAs.

Any inconsistencies noted are briefly described in the charts along with a corresponding number or letter which provide a general reference point on the attached *Planning Commission's Recommended Plan - Future Land Use Map: Including Skagit/ King County and Incorporated City Designations* maps.

For instance, in the Everett UGA, the County designates an area as Urban High Density Residential (12-24 DU/Acre) that is designated by the City as Multifamily (20-29 du/acre). For the purposes of this evaluation, this type of density discrepancy (where the allowed dwelling units per acre overlap and the allowed type of use is similar) is not typically listed as an inconsistency in the chart. However, there were other instances where inconsistencies were noted, such as were the County has designated an area as Urban High Density Residential (12-24 du/acre) that the City (for example see #C, in Everett) designated Single Family (5-10 du/acre).

As was noted previously, this comprehensive and conservative review identifies potential conflicts. We would expect that the County's staff will identify additional features such as topography, easements, etc., that may reduce the potential impacts from the land use pattern conflicts we identified.

Existing and Amended Policies

Individual UGAs have been designated to include each city in the county; nine cities in the Southwest County are included in one large UGA and unincorporated areas are divided into Municipal Urban Growth Areas where the Cities may annex land. Each UGA contains both incorporated and unincorporated area, except for the UGA of Maltby, which has no incorporated area within it. Cities and the County have worked together to develop and update the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP), which provides the framework for designating UGAs and directing urban growth patterns within the UGA. The County's Comprehensive Plan also provides additional direction, consistent with the CPP for urban growth.

Amendments to the 10 Year Comprehensive Plan include revisions to the existing Land Use and Interjurisdictional Coordination Elements. The Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Element is comprised of interrelated land use goals, which guide future land use decisions and provide policy support for implementing programs or regulations to reduce incompatible land uses. Goal LU 1 (as amended in the 10 year Update) of the Land Use Element is "Establish and maintain compact, clearly defined, well designed UGAs." Goal LU 4 (as amended in the 10 year Update) of the Land Use Element is "In cooperation with the cities and towns, create urban developments, which provide a safe and desirable environment for residents, shoppers and workers". Goal IC 1 of the Interjurisdictional Coordination Element is "Promote the coordination of planning, financing, and implementation programs between the county and local jurisdiction including tribal governments. The associated policies for these goals, as amended in the proposed updates to the General Policy Plan are listed below.

Objective LU 1.C Establish and maintain a UGA boundary that provides a distinct edge between urban and rural land uses.

LU Policies

- 1.C.1 Unique topographical and physical features such as watershed boundaries, streams, rivers, ridge lines, steep slopes, roads, railroad lines and transmission lines (where they follow property lines) and special purpose district boundaries shall be used, if possible, to delineate and define the boundary.
- 1.C.2 The design of development and the location of structures along the UGA boundary should use guidelines such as the Residential Development Handbook for Snohomish County Communities (Snohomish County Tomorrow, 1992), which includes cluster development techniques.
- 1.C.3 The designation and siting of new industrial, commercial, and public facility land uses along the UGA boundary shall include vegetative buffers.

Objective LU 4.A Develop and implement comprehensive design guidelines and a design review process that improves the quality of residential, commercial, and industrial development.

LU Policies

- 54.A.1 The county shall work with architects, builders and others to establish a design review process, innovative and flexible design guidelines and development regulations for site planning and the design of buildings, consistent with the urban design policies of the GPP and utilizing reports such as the reports referenced in the introduction to Goal LU 4.
- 4.A.2 The county shall explore and consider design guidelines for residential, commercial and industrial development that meet the following criteria:
 - (a) Residential developments that support family households and children by providing adequate and accessible open space and recreation, and encouraging opportunities for day care, preschool and after school care services within close proximity.
 - (b) Where increased density housing is proposed, the height, scale, design and architectural character should be compatible with the character of buildings in the surrounding area.

- (c) New buildings oriented onto the street, maintain or create streetscape and pedestrian qualities and reduce the visual impact of parking lots, garages and storage areas.
- (d) Where high rise buildings are developed, street level uses are limited to commercial activities, entertainment services, public services, and other related public-generating activities.
- (e) The appearance of existing areas that is improved by:
 - 1. encouraging well maintained landscaping on streets and in parking areas;
 - 2. reducing the visual clutter of utility poles, overhead power-lines, and suspended traffic signals;
 - 3. encouraging improvements to entrances, facades, and lighting; and
 - 4. grouping together signs and ensuring they are scaled and designed in a manner appropriate to the street frontage.
- (f) Developments that provide adequate setbacks, buffers and visual screens to make them compatible with abutting residential and other land uses.
- (g) Urban design that is sensitive to the preservation of existing cultural resources.

Objective LU 4.B Establish and implement specific design guidelines for mixed use areas - Urban Centers and Urban Villages.

Interjurisdictional Coordination Policies

- 1.B.5 The county and affected cities should collaborate on the development of appropriate urban design measures, such as: pedestrian, bicycle and transit orientation; compatibility and access among adjacent developments; appropriate open spaces and gathering places; adequate landscaping; and streetscapes and parking arrangements.
- 1.B.6 The county should consider interlocal agreements with cities to coordinate county and municipal planning under GMA within UGAs. These planning processes should emphasize public participation and the role of elected officials in local decision-making. Such interlocal agreements may address the following interjurisdictional issues:
 - (a) Transition processes for planning and development projects and capital facilities projects;
 - (b) Provision of clear, adequate public participation processes;
 - (c) Provision for fiscal equity between the county and the cities and identification of funding sources, fees, and revenue sharing;
 - (d) Coordination between and delineation of tasks and schedules for staff, planning commissions and councils in the review, adoption and appeal process;
 - (e) Development of application procedures and determination of applicable regulations and standards to be used; and
 - (f) Other issues such as SEPA review, appeals, transportation concurrency, surface water, solid waste and public safety.

Land Use inconsistencies

Adjacent Counties

Skagit County

Land uses along the northern border of Snohomish County abutting Skagit County appear to be consistent. The majority of land along the border is designated Forest or in USFS land. There is some land along the western portion of the border which is designated as Agriculture by Skagit County adjacent to land designated Riverway Commercial Farmland by Snohomish County, as well as, land designated Rural Resource (1 du/ 40 acres) in Skagit County adjacent

to land designated Rural Residential in Snohomish County (1 du/5 acres). Based on the types of uses allowed in each these are considered consistent uses.

King County

The southern border of the County is adjacent to King County, which includes five cities in both Counties. In general, the adjacent future land uses tend to be single family with varying levels of density. Two potential inconsistencies between land use designations in King County and Snohomish County were noted. The *Planning Commission's Recommended Plan* proposes to expand the Maltby UGA and redesignate the land just north of Woodinville to Urban Industrial, which would abut land designated Low Density Residential (1du/acre) in Woodinville (See Map #1a on Attachment 4). County Land Use Policy LU.1.C.3 addresses some of the impact this industrial land use designation may impose on adjacent residential uses outside of the UGA. Specifically, it states "The designation and siting of new industrial, commercial, and public facility land uses along the UGA boundary shall include vegetative buffers." This policy provides a means of buffering residential uses to the south within Woodinville's UGA. In addition, LU policy 4.A.2.f states that the County will consider design guidelines for industrial development that will provide adequate setbacks, buffers and visual screens to make it compatible with abutting residential uses.

Another potential inconsistency is an area of unincorporated land designated Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12du/acre) just north of Kenmore in King County where the adjacent incorporated land is designated a much lower density of Residential (1du/acre). (See attachment 1 & 4) This area is located in the Swamp Creek Area, which has had flooding issues in the past and has some other critical areas. Potential mitigation will occur with the implementation of Critical Area regulations, and use of SEPA authority to provide buffering between these different uses.

Incorporated Land Uses and Adjacent Unincorporated Land within the UGAs

Approximately 28 potential inconsistencies were identified between incorporated land and the adjacent County land within an UGA. Numbers and/or letters on the attached table and maps identify these inconsistencies and their corresponding locations (See attachment 2, 4 & 5). In some instances, potentially inconsistent uses are located on either side of a road, which, depending on the volume of traffic and width, could act as a buffer between uses. The most common inconsistency noted was a low-density residential land use adjacent to a medium-density land use. These designations of higher densities were made by either the Cities or the County.

In some instances, the UGA boundary and the incorporated area's boundary are the same. The County has designated land outside of the UGA and adjacent to several cities, such as Arlington, Granite Falls, Lake Stevens, Monroe, and portions of Marysville, Sultan and Snohomish with Rural/Urban Transition Area Overlays or Transfer of Development Rights Sending Area Overlay which may address the urban rural interface and guide the appropriate levels of development that may occur in these areas close to incorporated land. In other areas, consistent with Snohomish County Policies LU 1.C.1 the UGA is defined and delineated by unique topographical and physical features, such as rivers, and roads, which provides a separation between uses. (See attachment 2, page 7 for comments related to coterminous UGA and City borders.)

County and City Land Use Designations of Unincorporated Land within UGAs

Of the twenty incorporated cities within Snohomish County, six Cities appear to have as part of their Comprehensive Plan designated future land uses for areas in their unincorporated UGA. The attached chart identifies these inconsistencies (Attachment #3) with corresponding lettering on the County's *Planning Commission's Recommended Plan Future Land Use*: Including Skagit/King County and Incorporated City Designations Map (Attachment 4 &5). It is expected that in the next few years many of the Cities located within the Southwest UGA will be updating their future land use designations of unincorporated land within their UGA.

Some of the inconsistencies noted were minor density differences or slightly different boundaries for similar uses, which do not exactly match with the other jurisdictions designation. For the most part land designated residential use by the County, is also designated a similar residential density by the City.

Conclusion

This analysis identified potential land use inconsistencies along the County's border with Skagit and King Counties; adjacent County and City land uses within a UGA; and the consistency of land use designations within a UGA for those cities that have chosen as part of their Comprehensive Planning process to designate future land uses for unincorporated land within their UGA. Our review was a broad and conservative attempt to note major land use differences and does not consider all land use features or other characteristics that may mitigate impacts. The County should use this information as a starting point to for further discussion to highlight and pin point actual conflicts between adjacent uses.

Three policies (as amended in this 10 Year Update), LU 1.C.3, LU 4.A.2.b & f, provide the basis for requiring regulations that will create a more compatible development when it is adjacent to a different use or a use with more or less density.

LU 1.C.3The designation and siting of new industrial, commercial, and public facility land uses along the UGA boundary shall include vegetative buffers.

LU 4.A.2.The County shall explore and consider design guidelines for residential, commercial and industrial development that meets the following criteria:

- b.** Where increased density housing is proposed, the height, scale, design and architectural character should be compatible with the character of buildings in the surrounding area.
- f.** Developments that provide adequate setbacks, buffers and visual screens to make them compatible with abutting residential and other land uses.

In addition, the County has developed new policies in the Interjurisdictional Coordination Element, which if implemented will result in design guidelines and more coordination between the County and cities on planning issues and development in the UGAs.

IG 1.B.5. The county and affected cities should collaborate on the development of appropriate urban design measures, such as: pedestrian, bicycle and transit orientation; compatibility and access among adjacent developments; appropriate open spaces and gathering places; adequate landscaping; and streetscapes and parking arrangements.

IG 1.B.6. The county should consider interlocal agreements with cities to coordinate county and municipal planning under GMA within UGAs. These planning processes should emphasize public participation and the role of elected officials in local decision-making.

Attachments:

1. Comparison of Land Uses along the shared Snohomish County border with adjacent counties;
2. Comparison of Incorporated Land Uses and adjacent County Land within the UGAs;
3. Comparison of County and City land use designations of unincorporated land within UGAs;
4. South County Map-*Planning Commission's Recommended Plan* Future Land Use: Including King County and Incorporated City Designations;
5. North County Map-*Planning Commission's Recommended Plan* Future Land Use: Including King County and Incorporated City Designations.

Attachment #1--COMPARISON OF LAND USE ALONG THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY BORDER WITH ADJACENT COUNTIES

Map #	Inconsistent Land Uses		Comments
1	King County including the municipalities of Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell and Woodinville.	Yes	<p>In general, the abutting land uses between King County (both incorporated and unincorporated land) and Snohomish tended to be single-family low or medium density residential uses adjacent to other residential uses with similar densities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There may be inconsistencies associated with an UGA expansion just north of Woodinville’s city limit in Snohomish County. The expansion would be an unincorporated area designated Industrial adjacent to Low Density Residential land in Woodinville. b) County land designated Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 DU/Acre) abuts land designated by the City of Kenmore in King County as Residential (1 du/acre), in the Swamp Creek Area. <p>Note that the color section for land use categories within Lake Forest Park make the densities appear greater than the abutting jurisdictions even though the actual dwelling units per acre allowed and existing land use pattern are similar.</p>
2	Skagit County	Minor Rural Residential Density Differences	<p>The land use designations along the County line between Skagit and Snohomish County are basically consistent. Current land use designations are comprised of Commercial Farmland (Agricultural), Rural Residential, or Forest. There are some differences in the planned rural densities between the Counties.</p>

Attachment #2

INCORPORATED LAND USES AND ADJACENT COUNTY LAND WITHIN THE UGAs

The letters listed below correspond with the letters on the attached maps-Planning Commissions Recommended Plan Future Land Use: Including King/Skagit County and Incorporated City Designations.

M a p #	CITY	INCONSISTENCIES	COMMENTS
3	Arlington	Yes	a) Along the northern (NW) limits of the City, land is designated by the City as Airport or Airport Industrial and Medium Density Residential, which is separated by 188 th St NE & 47 th Ave NE, from unincorporated land with a County designation of Urban Low Density Residential. Land is designated as High Density Residential within the City, which is across 188 th St NE from land designated in the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan as Urban Industrial (the current FLUM designation for this unincorporated area is Urban Low Density Residential Urban Industrial). County buildable lands information shows some of the County land area within the UGA where these inconsistencies are identified is vacant. . The western limit of Arlington's incorporated area is demarcated by I-5, which provides a physical buffer between land uses of differing intensities.
4	Bothell	Yes	a) Along the City's incorporated area boundary there are several instances where incorporated land is classified by the City with low density land use designations (1-5du/net buildable area) adjacent to County designated Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12du/acre) or Urban High Density Residential (12-24du/acre). According to County buildable lands maps, some of these larger unincorporated areas of UMDR and UHDR are vacant. b) There is incorporated land designated as Medium Density adjacent to unincorporated land with a County designation of Urban Low Density Residential (4-6du/acre).

Map #	CITY	INCONSISTENCIES	COMMENTS
<i>Highlighting inconsistencies identified between the cities' land use designation of incorporated land and the Planning Commissions Recommended Plan land use designation of adjacent unincorporated land.</i>			
5	Brier	Yes	a) With the exception of one small area designated Neighborhood Business, Brier's incorporated land is designated Single Family (2 or 3.5 DU/acre) less than the typical GMA based density of 4du/acre. There are several instances along the north City limit where the Single Family designation abuts County land designated Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 DU/acre). County buildable lands maps indicate some of this County land is vacant.
6	Snohomish	Yes	a) Land along the western boundary of the City's incorporated area is designated as Industrial (Bonneville Power) adjacent to unincorporated land designated as Urban Low Density Residential. b) In the northwest portion of the City is incorporated land designated Commercial adjacent to unincorporated land classified as Urban Low Density Residential. c) City has incorporated land designated as Single Family Low Density Residential along its northern boundary adjacent to County land designated Urban Medium Density Residential.
7	Darrington	Yes	a) In the Southwest corner of the City, there is incorporated land designated Light Industrial adjacent to unincorporated County land designated Urban Low Density Residential.
8	Edmonds	Yes	a) A large island of County land within the City limit boundaries is designated Urban Medium Density Residential with a few lots on along SR 99 designated Urban Commercial which are adjacent to City land designated Single Family Small or Large Lot and Commercial.

Map #	CITY	INCONSISTENCIES	COMMENTS
9	Everett	Yes	<p>a) A large amount of incorporated land is designated Single Family Detached (12-15du/acre) or Multiple Family adjacent to County land designated Urban Low Density Residential (4-6 du/acre) or Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12du/acre).</p> <p>b) City land with Commercial land use designations adjacent to County land designated Urban Low and Medium Density Residential.</p>
10	Gold Bar	None identified	
11	Granite Falls	Yes	<p>a) Along the south side of the City, there is incorporated land with a High Urban or Urban Residential/Mixed Density designations adjacent to County land with an Urban Low Density Residential designation.</p> <p>b) There is City land on the west side designated Phased Suburban adjacent to County land with an Urban Commercial and Urban High Density Residential designations. The area is adjacent to or near State Route (SR) 92.</p>
12	Index	No	No UGA
13	Lake Stevens	Minor residential density inconsistencies noted	Most City land with Medium Density Residential land use designation is adjacent to unincorporated land within the UGA designated Urban Low Density Residential.

Map #	CITY	INCONSISTENCIES	COMMENTS
14	Lynnwood	Yes	<p><i>Highlighting inconsistencies identified between the cities' land use designation of incorporated land and the Planning Commissions Recommended Plan land use designation of adjacent unincorporated land.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Along the northern boundaries of the City land designated Low Density Single Family is adjacent to unincorporated land the County has designated Urban Medium Density Residential and Urban High Density Residential. b) There is also Low Density Single Family incorporated land adjacent to State Route 525; on the other side of SR 525 is land designated Industrial by the County. c) A small portion of Lynnwood extends across I-5 to the SE and has land use designations of Commercial and Mixed use adjacent to County land mostly designated Urban Low Density Residential some of which as part of the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan is proposed to be redesignated Urban Medium and High Density Residential.
15	Marysville	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) County land within the UGA abutting the City on the northeast side is predominately Urban Low Density Residential with some land proposed as part of the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan to be redesignated to Urban Medium or High Density Residential. The adjacent incorporated land is a variety of higher use land use designations including Industrial, Medium and High Density Single Family, Commercial, Mixed Use and some Multifamily land use designation. b) City land in the southeast, designated Medium and High Density Residential adjacent to County land designated Urban Low Density Residential. c) In the northern most portion of the City, land designated High Density Residential is adjacent to County land where the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan proposes to expand the UGA and redesignate it Industrial.

Map #	CITY	INCONSISTENCIES	COMMENTS
16	Mill Creek	Yes	<p data-bbox="814 267 1900 349"><i>Highlighting inconsistencies identified between the cities' land use designation of incorporated land and the Planning Commissions Recommended Plan land use designation of adjacent unincorporated land.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="861 446 1900 511">a) Land along the northeastern City limits is designated Medium Density Residential adjacent to County land designated Urban Low Density Residential. <li data-bbox="861 511 1900 609">b) City land designated Commercial in the north, that is currently adjacent to County land with a Urban Low Density Residential designation which the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan redesignates as Urban Medium and High Density Residential. <li data-bbox="861 609 1900 722">c) In the southern portion of the City land designated Commercial is adjacent to County land classified as Urban Low and Medium Density Residential. The Planning Commission's Recommended Plan is redesignating some of this County land to Urban High Density Residential where it borders the Bothell Everett Highway.
17	Monroe	Some inconsistencies resulting from existing uses such as the Fairground, High School and Jail being adjacent to or separated by a road from residential land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="861 803 1900 901">a) In the south part of the City, land designated Special Regional Use (a correctional facility & High School) is adjacent to County land to the west designated Urban Medium Density Residential or Low Density Residential. <li data-bbox="861 901 1900 990">b) City land adjacent to US Highway 2 is designated Industrial, is across the street from land used as the County Fairgrounds and designated "Other Land Uses" by the County. Also adjacent to the County Fairgrounds is City land designated Commercial, Industrial and Special Regional Use.
18	Mountlake Terrace	Some minor residential density inconsistencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="861 1291 1900 1380">a) Small islands of County land scattered throughout the City are designated Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 du/acre) adjacent to City land with Urban Low Density Residential (which would permit approx. 5-6 DU/acres)

Map #	CITY	INCONSISTENCIES	COMMENTS
19	Mukilteo	Yes	a) Along the south side of the City is incorporated land designated Mixed Use adjacent to County land designated Urban Low Density Residential.
20	Stanwood	Yes	<p>a) Along the southern limits of the incorporated area there is a small area designated as Low Density Residential by the City adjacent to unincorporated area designated by the County as an industrial land use (mineral lands).</p> <p>b) North of the City is County land proposed in the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan to be redesignated Urban Medium Density Residential adjacent to land designated by the City as Low Density Residential.</p>
21	Sultan	Yes	There are several locations where City land is designated Residential Medium Density adjacent to County land designated Urban Low Density.
22	Woodway	No inconsistencies noted	

Inconsistencies along coterminous UGA and City boundaries.

Map #	City	Inconsistencies	Comments
3	Arlington	No RUTA Overlays and TDR designations address the urban/rural interface.	Unincorporated County land located to the north of Arlington's UGA and City limits is primarily Riverway Commercial Farmland with a Transfer of Development Rights Sending Area Overlay. Along the east side is land designated by the County as Rural Residential land with a Rural/Urban Transition Area Overlay. The City's designations are urban in character given the UGA boundary.
6	Snohomish	No-Pilchuck River provides a buffer to the urban/rural interface.	The eastern limits of the City and its UGA are the same, which coincides with the location of Pilchuck River, which provides a buffer between any potentially inconsistent City and County land use designations.

Map #	City	Inconsistencies	Comments
7	Darrington	Yes	<p data-bbox="705 290 1871 345"><i>Highlighting inconsistencies identified along the coterminous UGA & City limit with the land use designation of adjacent unincorporated land in the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan .</i></p> <p data-bbox="705 451 1885 570">7b) There are small areas north and south of the City and its UGA that is designated as Low Density Rural Residential (1 DU/20 acre) adjacent to incorporated land use designation of Light Industrial. 7c) Incorporated land designated Light Industrial adjacent to County land outside of the UGA with a Rural Residential (1DU/5 acres or 1DU/10 Acres Resource Transition) land use designation.</p> <p data-bbox="705 602 1902 662">Elsewhere, the County has a Commercial Forest–Forest Transition Area or Rural/Urban Transition Area Overlay designation where unincorporated land abuts the shared City and UGA boundary to address any potential land use inconsistencies.</p>
9	Everett	No Snohomish River and I-5 separate the urban/rural interface.	In the locations where the City limits and the UGA boundary are coterminous, they also tend to be along the Snohomish River or I-5, which provide a buffer and separation between potentially inconsistent land uses.
10	Gold Bar	Yes	<p data-bbox="705 1049 1892 1078">Gold Bar city limits abut US Highway 2 and the City's land use designation adjacent to Hwy-2 is predominately Commercial.</p> <p data-bbox="705 1078 1902 1138">10a) In some instances there is incorporated land designated commercial or community business by the City adjacent to or across the highway from County land with a Riverside Commercial Farmland or Rural Residential designation.</p>
11	Granite Falls	Yes	<p data-bbox="705 1222 1801 1284">11c) Land along the northeastern limits of the City and UGA has an Industrial land use designation adjacent to unincorporated land designated by the County as Low Density Rural Residential.</p> <p data-bbox="705 1312 1892 1370">The County has a Rural/Urban Transition Area Overlay on all of the Rural Residential County land that is located outside of the Granite Falls UGA.</p>

Map #	City	Inconsistencies	Comments
13	Lake Stevens	No RUTA Overlays address the urban/rural interface.	County land located outside of the UGA on the north, east and south side is designated Rural Residential with a Rural/Urban Transition Area Overlay.
15	Marysville	No I-5 and the slough provide separation between the urban/rural interface as well as the RUTA Overlay.	<p>A significant portion of Marysville and the corresponding UGA abuts I-5, which provides a buffer between potentially inconsistent uses. To the south, the City limits and UGA coincide with the slough, which provides a natural buffer between uses.</p> <p>County land northeast and southeast of Marysville has a Rural/ Urban Transition Area Overlay on Rural Residential land designations.</p>
17	Monroe	No-- the river provides separation between the urban/rural interface as well as the Transition Area Overlay.	City and UGA limits along the south side of Monroe are coterminous, segments of which also coincide with the Skykomish River, which provides a natural buffer between uses. The County has also placed a Rural/Urban Transition Area Overlay on County rural residential land to the north and adjacent to the Special Use district to the south.

**M
a
p
#**

City

Inconsistencies

Comments

Highlighting inconsistencies identified along the coterminous UGA & City limit with the land use designation of adjacent unincorporated land in the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan .

20

Stanwood

Yes

20d) In the southwest part of the City, there land designated as Medium Density Residential, and Industrial by the City adjacent to unincorporated land designated by the County as Riverway Commercial Farmland.
20e) City land designated Commercial is adjacent to unincorporated land designated by the County as Riverway Commercial Farmland.

Attachment 3--COMPARISON OF COUNTY AND CITY LAND USE DESIGNATIONS OF UNINCORPORATED LAND WITHIN UGAS

This chart identifies any inconsistencies between the County's land use designation for area within an UGA and the corresponding City's future land use designation of that unincorporated area within the UGA. Of the 20 incorporated cities within Snohomish County only six were identified as having provided in their Comprehensive Plans land use designations of County land within their UGA.

The letters listed below correspond with the letters on the attached maps- showing the Future Land Use from the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan: Including King/Skagit County and Incorporated City Designations.

Everett

Map dated 4/5/04

- A. The City has designated land in this area Single Family residential 5-10 du/acre in an area the County land use designation for land medium and high-density residential use designations which may not be consistent.
 - B. The County is proposing to redesignate land where SR 99 and the Mukilteo Speedway intersect as an Urban Center; the City has designated this area a combination of Multifamily (15-20 du/acre) and Mixed Use Commercial-Multifamily. Depending on the residential density allowed in the Urban Center these designations may result in similar development.
 - C. The County has designated an area as Urban High Density Residential (12-24du/acre) west of Ashway; this area is designated by Everett as Single Family (5-10 du/acre).
 - D. Between Gibson Road and 126th St the County has designated the area as Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 du/ac) the City has designated this area Multiple Family (20-29 du/acre).
 - E. North of 148th St., adjacent to I-5, the County has designated land, Urban Medium and High Density Residential, which the City has designated this area as Single Family Detached (10-12 du/acre).
 - F. At the intersection of 128th and I-5 the County has designated land as Urban Center, which the City has several designations for including Office and Industrial Park, Community Business, and Multiple Family (20-29 du/ac).
 - G. North of 112th St SW and south of the City limits the County is proposing as part of the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan to redesignate an area Urban High Density Residential or Urban Village/Village Center in an area the City has designated Single Family Detached (10-12 du/acre).
 - H. South of Silver Lake there is County land predominately designated Urban Low Density Residential, and the City has designated portions of that area Multiple Family (20-29du/ac).
 - I. Along the Mill Creek city boundary is property designated by the County as Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12du/ac); Everett has designated it Multiple Family (15-20du/ac).
 - J. There are two areas north of Mill Creek that the County has designated Urban High Density Residential (12-24du/ac), which Everett has designated Single Family Detached (10-12 du/ac).
 - K. The County has designated land west of 35th Ave SE as Urban Medium and High Density Residential in a location the City has designated Single Family Detached (5-10 du/ac).
 - L. The City has designated area north of SR 96 as Multiple Family (15-20du/ac) in a location the County designates as Urban Low Density Residential.
 - M. In the SE corner of the City's UGA along SR 96, the City has designated land Single Family Detached (5-10 du/ac). The County, has designated this area as Urban Commercial and Urban Medium Density Residential.
-

Marysville

Map dated Oct 2004
(same as the no action
map in their DEIS for their
Comp. Plan update)

- N. There are several locations along the northeast side of Marysville's UGA where the City has designated the land Medium (4-5 du/ac) and High (5-7du/ac) Density Single Family, which is only slightly inconsistent with the County's designation of the area as mostly Urban Low Density Residential (4-6du/ac). However, there are several infill areas within this UGA area adjacent to the City limits proposed in the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan redesignated as Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 du/ac), which is designated by the City as Medium Density Single Family.
- O. Moving south the City designated land primarily High Density Single Family (5-7 du/ac), this same area is primarily designated by the County as Urban Low Density Residential (4-6du/ac), with a few pockets of Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12du/ac).
- P. The Planning Commission's Recommended Plan redesignates an area as Urban Commercial, just south 84th St NE, which the City has classified as Medium Density Single Family (4-5 du/ac).
- Q. There is a small pocket of land in the southern part of the UGA, which the City has classified as Medium Density Single Family (4-5 du/ac) and the County has classified as Urban Commercial as well as, an adjacent redesignation to Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 du/ac).

Mill Creek

Map dated May 2004

- R. One potential minor inconsistency may be an area where Mill Creek has designated about ½ mile of land along SR 96, between 35th Ave SE and Seattle Hill Road as Community Business. In this same area, the County has designated of Urban Commercial and Urban Village/Village Center.
- S. The Planning Commission's Recommended Plan redesignates land along the south side of SR 96, between 25th Ave SE and 29th Ave SE, as Urban Medium Density Residential. Mill Creek's land use designation for this area is Low Density Residential.
- T. In the northwest corner of the Mill Creek UGA, the County is proposing to redesignate the land to Urban Center. This same area has been designated by the City as Open Space, Business Park, Community Business along with a small amount of Low Density Residential and High Density Residential.
- U. There is County land south of the City along SR 527, proposed as part of the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan redesignates Urban High Density Residential, this area is currently designated by the City as Medium Density Residential, Business Park and Neighborhood Business.

Monroe

Map dated Sept 2004

- V. Minor inconsistencies identified--there is a very small vacant parcel of land adjacent to the Monroe Correctional Facility (SE corner) that the City has designated as Special Regional Use and the County has mapped as Urban Horticultural.
- W. To the west of the Correctional Facility and High School on the other side of the SR 522 the City has land designated as Residential (3-5 DU/Acre) and Service Commercial, whereas the County has designated this area as Urban Medium Density Residential (6-12 DU/Acre).

Mountlake Terrace
Map dated Sept 2003

- X. Mountlake Terrace has several parcels that are islands of County land within the City limits all of which the City has designated as Urban Low Residential and the County appears for the most part to have designated those areas as Urban Medium Density Residential.

Snohomish
Map dated Jan 2003

- Y. North of the City limits is land currently designated by the City as Single Family Residential, which the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan redesignates as Urban Medium Density Residential.
 - Z. The City has designated the area southwest of Harvey Airfield as Airport Industrial, the Planning Commission's Recommended Plan is proposing to remove a portion of that area from the UGA. The City requested that this area be removed from the UGA and will need to update their Comprehensive Plan to reflect this change.
-