

Table of Contents

Equity - Goal LU EQ 12

Urban Growth Areas – Goal LU 13

Urban Development Patterns – Goal LU 26

Centers – Goal LU 39

Urban Design – Goal LU 416

Small Area and Neighborhood Structure – Goal LU 519

Rural Lands – Goal LU 621

Agricultural Lands – Goal LU 726

Forest Lands – Goal LU 829

Mineral Lands – Goal LU 931

Open Space, Shoreline and Scenic Resources – Goal LU 1034

Cultural Resources – Goal LU 1135

Airport Compatibility – Goals LU 12 and LU 1335

Transfer and Purchase of Development Rights – Goal LU 1436

Future Land Use Map Designations37

DRAFT

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed (removed text)	Findings
<p>Equity</p> <p><u>Goal LU EQ 1 Equity, the framework in which all people can attain the resources and opportunities that improve their quality of life and enable them to reach their full potential, shall be incorporated into all aspects of land use planning.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) were amended in 2020 and Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) were amended in 2021 to focus more specifically on equity, and the addition of a new goal, objectives, and policies in the LU Element will help the element echo these important changes. • This new goal is in line with Vision 2050 that envisions a future where “All people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve their quality of life and enable them to reach their full potential.” Further, MPP-RC-2 states that the region should, “Prioritize services and access to opportunity for people of color, people with low incomes, and historically underserved communities to ensure all people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve quality of life and address past inequities.” • The text of the proposed goal combines a new CPP central principle with the definition of equity in the CPPs. The new CPP central principle reads that the county should, “Incorporate equity and inclusion into all aspects of countywide and local planning.” • The proposed goal is also consistent with new CPP Development Patterns (DP)-38 and revised CPP DP-40. The new CPP DP-38 states, “The County and cities should reduce disparities in access to opportunity for all residents through inclusive community planning and making investments that meet the needs of current and future residents and business.” • Revised DP-40 reads in part, “The County and cities should address the safety, health, and well-being of residents and employees in countywide and local planning through:...Incorporating a focus on health and well-being, including the reduction of existing disparities between population groups, into countywide and local decision-making processes.” • The proposed equity goal and subsequent objectives and policies also give special consideration to environmental justice as defined in and potentially required by ESHB 1181 that is working its way through the Washington State Senate and could be adopted in mid-April.
<p><u>Objective LU EQ 1.A Land use strategies shall work to eliminate barriers that have prevented the full participation of historically and currently marginalized communities in the development and implementation of policies and plans.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed objective to help implement the newly proposed equity goal. The proposed language is consistent with new and revised MPPs and CPPs including MPP-DP-8, CPP DP-38, CPP DP-39, and the new equity CPP central principle. • MPP-DP-8: “Conduct inclusive engagement to identify and address the diverse needs of the region’s residents. • CPP DP-39: “The County and cities should include measures in comprehensive plans, subarea plans, and development regulations that are intended to reduce and mitigate the impacts of displacement on marginalized residents and businesses as a result of development and redevelopment, particularly in regional, countywide, and other urban centers.” • Responsive to the Executive’s Proclamation dated June 12, 2020.
<p><u>Policy EQ 1.A.1 The county shall utilize geospatial analysis to help identify historically and currently marginalized communities within unincorporated Snohomish County to inform equitable policies, plans, and distribution of funding.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To implement the new equity goal and objectives it will be necessary to understand where disparities exist and where investments and planning are necessary to address past and current inequities. Proposed language of this policy is consistent with new and revised MPP and CPPs. • Equity mapping will help the county consider equity comprehensively and make more informed decisions.
<p><u>Policy EQ 1.A.2 The county shall reduce disparities in access to opportunity for all residents through inclusive community planning.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed language is from the new CPP DP-38 that is based on MPP-DP-2. CPP DP-38 is broken down into two proposed land use policies (A.2 and A.3) as there are two ideas that are important that could get lost if together in one policy.
<p><u>Policy EQ 1.A.3 The county shall make investments that meet the needs of current and future residents and employers, particularly in historically and currently marginalized communities.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language is partially from CPP DP-38 with a focus on historically and currently marginalized communities in order to address the newly proposed objective and to be consistent with MPP-RC-2.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<u>Policy EQ 1.A.4 The county shall create livable communities for those who live, work, and play in Snohomish County by directing growth into urban areas that are accessible, walkable, compact, and transit oriented; preserving and creating open spaces; and protecting rural and resource lands.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This language is primarily taken from the Development Pattern Goal within the CPPs.
<u>Policy EQ 1.A.5 The public may submit an application to propose amendments to the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan, including future land use, consistent with the county's docketing process.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The docketing process is a procedure for receiving and evaluating citizen-initiated proposals to amend the County's Comprehensive plan and development regulations. The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires counties and cities planning under GMA to maintain such a procedure for citizens interested in suggesting changes to their GMA-based comprehensive plans. The county has such a process, although there are not specific policies within the LU element that demonstrate this requirement beyond LU 7.A.2 and 8.A.4 that are focused on agricultural commercial forest lands. An overarching policy is appropriate to indicate that the public can request FLU amendments and comprehensive plan amendments more generally whether they are located within resource, rural, or urban areas. RCW 36.70A.470(2) requires that comprehensive plan amendment procedures allow interested persons, including applicants, citizens, hearing examiners, and staff of other agencies, to suggest amendments of comprehensive plans or development regulations.
<u>Objective EQ 1.B The county shall engage those affected by poverty, communities of color, and other historically and currently marginalized communities in decision-making processes, planning, and policy making.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This language is reflective of the definition of equity within the CPPs.
<u>Policy EQ 1.B.1 The appointed land use related boards and commissions of the county shall be diverse and represent the communities they serve.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed policy is in line with the goals of VISION 2050.
Urban Growth Areas	
Policy 1.A.1 UGAs shall contain sufficient land capacity for a variety of land uses and densities, including green belts and open space, in suitable locations to accommodate at least ((91.5%)) <u>95.5%</u> of the county's 20-year population and employment projections. No expansion of the UGA that increases population or employment capacity shall be permitted if the resulting total additional population capacity within the Snohomish County composite UGA as documented by both City and County comprehensive plans would exceed the total 20-year forecasted UGA population growth by more than 15 percent. A portion of the 20-year forecast UGA population may be reserved for allocation to Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) receiving areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The initial growth targets were approved by County Council on February 23rd, 2022, that change the necessary accommodation from 91.5% to 95.5%. The allocations were developed in compliance with GF-5 and GF-6 and the proposed revision would update the policy accordingly.
Policy 1.A.2 Snohomish County shall ensure no net loss of capacity to accommodate the amount and type of projected employment growth as adopted in ((Appendix D while ensuring an adequate supply of both new and existing affordable housing to meet the county's identified current and projected housing needs)) <u>the Population and Employment Element.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As written this policy implies that the no net loss of employment capacity should not be at the cost of reduced stock of affordable housing. This sets up a false equation in the reader's mind that employment growth and affordable housing are at odds. Then policy 1.A.3 that focuses on no net loss of housing capacity does not mention affordable housing as a necessary component of the housing capacity. Proposed revisions to both policies to separate the idea of affordable housing from projected employment growth and include it in the discussion of housing capacity.
Policy 1.A.3 Snohomish County shall ensure ((a)) no net loss of housing capacity that preserves the County's ability to accommodate the growth targets, as adopted in ((Appendix D)) <u>the Population and Employment Element, as well as an adequate supply of new and existing housing affordable to all economic segments of the population,</u> while pursuing compliance with all relevant federal, state, and local laws and regulations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same rationale as 1.A.2. Updated language from 1.A.2 around affordable housing to match the GMA housing goal.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
((Policy 1.A.6 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to remove all previously repealed policies in the land use element. This is a proposed housekeeping update that will renumber many policies throughout the element. An appendix will be devoted to showing the old 2015 policy numbers and new 2024 policy numbers for all elements to reduce confusion.
Policy ((1.A.7)) <u>1.A.6</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((1.A.8)) <u>1.A.7</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((1.A.9)) <u>1.A.8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((1.A.10)) <u>1.A.9</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((1.A.11)) <u>1.A.10</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>((Policy 1.A.12 Urban growth areas which are located within the floodplain, as identified in chapter 30.65 SCC (Special Flood Hazard Areas), shall comply with all provisions of that chapter. Annexation agreements shall ensure the continued implementation of this policy except that the annexing city or town may revise the list of allowed uses in the density fringe area once the area is annexed, provided that the city or town complies with the two percent maximum allowable density and the fifteen percent maximum allowable obstruction regulations in chapter 30.65 SCC and the purpose and intent of chapter 30.65 SCC are upheld.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed move verbatim to newly created annexation objective as LU policy 1.E.3.
((Policy 1.A.13 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of repealed policies
Policy ((1.A.14)) <u>1.A.11</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((1.A.15)) <u>1.A.12</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy 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)) shall be consistent with urban design characteristics when located within the UGA and with rural design characteristics when located outside of the UGA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed amendments remove reference to an outdated document and clarify that there should be a distinct edge along urban and rural areas. If areas along the current UGA boundary were to have unique design requirements/regulations, this would require a change in development code and may create long term issues if the UGA boundary were to ever change. Unique design regulations along UGA borders may also discourage urban infill of underutilized lands as supported by CPP DP-15, thus limiting the capacity of urban lands and reducing housing stock in the name of compatibility. Further, if the UGA boundary were ever to expand in these areas, the existing structures along the former UGA boundary could create a suburban like island surrounded by other urban areas and artificially limit the capacity of urban areas until redevelopment occurred in contradiction to GMA goals, CPP policies, and other policies within the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan. Changing the design requirements along UGA borders near city jurisdictions could create development patterns out of line with city development, and/or make the areas less attractive for annexation and the development community. There are few CPPs that discuss design outside of urban centers, although these are unchanged in the 2021 amendments and indicate that the county should determine appropriate design measures in UGAs in coordination with cities. For instance, JP-5 reads “The County and affected cities should collaborate on the development of appropriate urban design measures in unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.”
<p>((Policy 1.C.4 Annexations and planned urban densities shall be prohibited outside of the UGA boundary.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move, with additional clarifying language, to new annexation objective as LU policy 1.E.1.
Policy ((1.C.5)) <u>1.C.4</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Policy 1.D.2 UGA plans may be undertaken to provide greater detail as to the type and location of future land uses and shall address the following.</p> <p>Subsection (a) Analyze and designate locations for increased residential, commercial, and industrial densities.</p> <p>Subsection (b) Preserve and enhance unique and identifiable characteristics such as urban centers, cultural and historic resources, critical areas, open space areas and trails, distinctive development patterns, and neighborhood areas.</p> <p>Subsection (c) Provide for growth phasing areas within UGAs where appropriate.</p> <p>Subsection (d) Provide for any needed amendments to the ((General Policy Plan)) Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan following adoption of the UGA plan.</p> <p>Subsection (e) Consider open space, parks, and recreational facilities needed for urban growth.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping. Proposed reformatting in 2024 will mean that the Comprehensive Plan no longer has a separate GPP.
<p><u>Objective LU 1.E The County shall continue to support the annexation of unincorporated urban areas into cities and towns.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose moving all policies related to annexation within the LU element under this new objective so it is easier for the public and cities to find. Annexation related policies renumbered here include LU 1.C.4, 2.A.2, 1.A.12, 3.G.9, 14.A.13. Per revised CPP JP-1, “Coordination of county and municipal planning particularly for urban services, governance, and annexation is fundamental in implementing the Regional Growth Strategy and GMA directives related to urban growth areas in RCW 36.70A.110...” Collecting all annexation policies in one location will allow these important policies to be more easily located and ensure that policies are not accidentally overlooked during annexation review by either the city or county. A new objective is proposed to organize the renumbered policies.
<p><u>Policy 1.E.1 Annexations by cities and towns, and planned urban densities shall be prohibited outside of the UGA boundary.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is proposed to move from existing LU 1.C.4 with the addition of “by cities and towns” to clarify who is annexing land.
<p><u>Policy 1.E.2 The county shall not support any proposed annexation by a city unless and until an annexation agreement has been signed by the county and said city ensuring the continued implementation of Policy LU 2.A.1 for the area to be annexed.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moved verbatim from LU 2.A.2
<p><u>Policy 1.E.3 Urban growth areas which are located within the floodplain, as identified in chapter 30.65 SCC (Special Flood Hazard Areas), shall comply with all provisions of that chapter. Annexation agreements shall ensure the continued implementation of this policy except that the annexing city or town may revise the list of allowed uses in the density fringe area once the area is annexed, provided that the city or town complies with the two percent maximum allowable density and the fifteen percent maximum allowable obstruction regulations in chapter 30.65 SCC and the purpose and intent of chapter 30.65 SCC are upheld.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moved verbatim from LU 1.A.12
<p><u>Policy 1.E.4 Snohomish County shall support city annexation of areas designated Light Rail Community, Mixed-Use Corridor, Urban Center, or Urban Village after the annexing city and the county adopt an interlocal agreement consistent with the annexation principles developed by Snohomish County Tomorrow.</u></p> <p><u>Subsection (a) The interlocal agreement shall address the smooth transition of services from the county to the city and shall ensure that the city comprehensive plan and development regulations provide capacity for at least the same overall density and</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moved from LU 3.G.9 with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> minor housekeeping changes to match the rest of the document’s subsection formatting. housekeeping changes to the designations. The Transit Pedestrian Village designation is proposed for repeal within the 2024 Update and is removed here for consistency. Urban Centers located within the Urban Core Subarea will be redesignated Light Rail Communities. Mixed-Use Corridor is a newly proposed designation in the 2024 Update as “a higher density corridor within the Urban Core Subarea.”

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p><u>intensity of development provided by the county comprehensive plan and development regulations.</u></p> <p><u>Subsection (b) If the area to be annexed includes an area designated as a receiving area under the county’s Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, then the interlocal agreement shall also ensure that the area remains a TDR receiving area or that other areas of the city are designated TDR receiving areas so that the city development regulations provide equivalent or greater capacity for receiving TDR certificates and equivalent or greater incentives for the use of TDR certificates.</u></p>	
<p><u>Policy 1.E.5 Snohomish County shall support city annexation of a TDR receiving area only when an adopted interlocal agreement provides that the area shall remain a TDR receiving area or that other areas of the city shall be designated as TDR receiving areas so that the city will provide equivalent or greater capacity for receiving TDR credits as provided by the county for that area.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moved verbatim from LU 14.A.13.
Urban Development Patterns	
<p>Policy 2.A.1 Maintain development regulations that will require that new residential subdivisions achieve a minimum net density of ((4)) 6 dwelling units per acre in all unincorporated UGAs, except (1) in the UGAs of Darrington, Index, and Gold Bar as long as those cities do not have sanitary sewer systems and (2) in areas without sanitary sewers which the sewer purveyor with jurisdiction, or in nearest reasonable servicing proximity will certify are either an unsewered urban enclave or are not capable of being connected to public sewers via annexation within the next six years or by the improvements provided pursuant to its adopted six year capital facilities plan, ((3) where regulations for development on steep slopes require reduced lot or dwelling unit yields,)) or ((4)) (3) where a lower density is necessary because of the existence of critical areas that are large in scope, with a high rank order value, and are complex in structure and function. Lot size averaging, planned residential developments, sewerage regulations and other techniques may be used to maintain minimum density or to ((insure)) ensure later development at minimum densities is not inhibited when sanitary sewers become available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revision to increase the minimum net density is a tool that could help urban infill and redevelopment to be denser consistent with the reasonable measures table of the CPPs. Net density is defined within SCC 30.91N.035 as, “the density of residential development excluding roads, critical areas and required buffers, drainage detention/retention areas, biofiltration swales, and areas required for public use.” This definition of net density allows for urban properties that are encumbered with critical areas or would need substantial road or drainage areas to still be able to develop and meet the higher minimum net density. In compiling data on all preliminarily approved land use proposals (2018 through 2021) and finalled projects (1998 through 2017) within unincorporated Snohomish County, the majority of all projects have an approved minimum net density of 6 dwelling units per net acre or higher. Between 2018 and 2021, between 79 and 93 percent of all projects had an approved minimum net density of 6 dwelling units per net acre or higher. The average approved net density for projects between 2018 and 2021 is over 11 dwelling units per net acre. The proposed increase to minimum net density requirements will not negatively impact the ability of infill developments to retain existing dwelling units during redevelopment. When separating out the approved net densities of those projects that retained an existing dwelling unit versus those that proposed all new dwelling units between 2018 and 2021, the net density for those who chose to retain an existing dwelling unit is lower than the net density for projects that proposed all new units, although the average is still over 7 dwelling units per net acre for each year examined (2018 through 2021). Based on recent information on completed projects, 7 to 21% of them would have had to add dwelling units if this requirement had been in place at the time of their original application. The County therefore anticipates that implementing this change in future will result in minimal increases in infill densities. This proposed amendment could also help ensure that areas annexed by cities retain a capacity necessary to meet urban growth targets per LU 2.A.2 (proposed renumbering to LU 1.E.2). Proposed repeal of (3) is to help the policy be consistent with newly effective code (Ordinance 22-020) that repealed SCC 30.41A.250 and SCC 30.41B.210
<p>((Policy 2.A.2 The county shall not support any proposed annexation by a city unless and until an annexation agreement has been signed by the county and said city ensuring the continued implementation of Policy LU 2.A.1 for the area to be annexed.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move this policy verbatim to newly created annexation objective within the UGA subsection as policy LU 1.E.2.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Policy ((2.A.3)) <u>2.A.2</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbered
Policy ((2.A.4)) <u>2.A.3</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbered
Policy ((2.A.5)) <u>2.A.4</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbered
((Policy 2.A.6 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove repealed policies.
<p><u>Policy 2.A.5 The county shall encourage urban residential infill and redevelopment in underutilized lands, centers, and other appropriate areas within UGAs.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While LU objective 2.C and policies focus on revitalization of commercial and industrial areas, there is not a similarly focused policy for residential urban areas to fully implement CPP DP-15. The proposed policy helps implement this CPP. • CPP DP-14 was revised in 2021 to expand the focus of compact growth to include, “local centers, countywide centers, regional centers, and transit emphasis corridors.” The newly proposed policy incorporates centers as a place to encourage residential infill to help implement this CPP. • CPP DP-15 states that, “The County and cities should adopt policies, development regulations, and design guidelines that allow for infill and redevelopment of underutilized lands and other appropriate areas.” This CPP was revised in 2021 to focus infill and redevelopment within underutilized lands as opposed to just appropriate areas, and this is echoed in the newly proposed policy. • Further, MPP-RGS-6 states that the region should, “Encourage efficient use of urban land by optimizing the development potential of existing urban lands and increasing density in the urban growth area in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.”
<p>Policy 2.B.1 In association with affected local, regional, tribal, and state agencies, the county shall pursue integrated land use and transportation planning along transit emphasis corridors. Corridor planning and corridor plans will include the following features consistent with the direction in the Transportation ((chapter)) <u>Element</u>, and may also address other topics relevant to each particular corridor:</p> <p>Subsection (a) Potential comprehensive plan changes along the corridor – and particularly around stations/stops - to strengthen ridership on existing and planned transit services;</p> <p>Subsection (b) Potential land use regulation changes along the corridor, including the development of one or more new zoning classifications and/or overlays appropriate to mixed-use development; possible regulatory changes may address height and bulk limits, incentives for public amenities, mixing of uses and transit-supportive features, parking requirements, and permitted and prohibited uses;</p> <p>Subsection (c) Any appropriate adjustments to UGA and/or MUGA boundaries;</p> <p>Subsection (d) Potential changes to transit service or facility design to improve connections with neighboring development to stations and stops;</p> <p>Subsection (e) Phasing of land use and regulatory changes with planned transit service additions/enhancements and capital facility improvements;</p> <p>Subsection (f) Non-motorized facility improvements within and adjacent to the corridor needed to strengthen neighborhood connections with transit facilities and corridor businesses.</p> <p>Subsection (g) Other transportation improvements and policy implementation measures consistent with the direction in the Transportation Element.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housekeeping amendment to align with reformatting changes for the comprehensive plan in 2024, there will not be different components or chapters, all will be elements.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Policy 2.B.3 Through corridor-based planning, the county shall identify opportunities for mixed use and medium and high density residential development (including housing for the elderly and ((disabled)) people with disabilities). These uses shall be encouraged to locate within walking distance of transit facilities, particularly along transit emphasis corridors, and, where possible, in close proximity to medical facilities, urban centers, parks, and recreational amenities. <u>Corridor planning should also help identify those locations where higher densities and mixed uses can best support transit and non-motorized access.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding language from policy LU 3.H.1 to streamline duplicative corridor planning policies. • Housekeeping amendment to include more inclusive language.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.4 Transit service shall be supported by planning for the appropriate mix of development that includes both employment and housing uses.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy currently exists as written in the TE as TR policy 2.E.2, and is more appropriate for the LU element. The TE will retain the idea of encouraging transit service in appropriate areas. • The TE will focus on identification of transit emphasis corridors (TECs) and the infrastructure within the corridors, whereas the LU element will focus on the land use planning necessary in the corridors. The TE will retain the map of the TECs as well as the criteria for TECs.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.5 Transit-compatible and transit-oriented land uses and densities within transit emphasis corridors shall be implemented that recognize and reflect appropriate activity zones and walking distances, generally within ¼ to ½ mile of the transit emphasis corridor.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy currently exists as written in the TE as policy TR 2.C.1 and is more appropriate for the LU element. The TE will focus on identification of TECs and the infrastructure within the corridors, whereas the LU element will focus on the land use planning necessary in the corridors.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.6 The county shall work to link new and existing neighborhoods within and near identified transit emphasis corridors creating a sense of community and shall include sidewalks and paths, where practicable, for safe passage to schools and other places of activity in the community.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy currently exists as written as policy LU 3.D.3 in the Centers subelement. Not all TECs are located in Centers, and moving this policy here allows the action described in the policy to not be exclusively considered within Centers. This policy better fits within the Urban Development Patterns subsection and objective around consistent land use and transportation planning.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.7 Projects within or near designated centers or along transit emphasis corridors shall provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit facilities and/or the center to encourage pedestrian activity, support transit use and decrease auto trips.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved verbatim from policy 3.H.2 so that all transit emphasis corridor policies were grouped in one location.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.8 The county shall work with affected cities, transit service providers, and other key parties to pursue integrated land use and transportation planning along identified transit emphasis corridors, consistent with policy direction concerning these corridors in the Transportation Element.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is currently policy LU 3.D.1 in the Centers subsection where the proposed language revision is to replace “stakeholders” with “key parties” and “chapter” with “element” to reflect the reorganization of the comprehensive plan. • As TECs are not limited to Centers, working with other agencies to integrate land use and transportation planning within TECs should not be exclusive to Centers. This policy better fits within the Urban Development Patterns subsection and objective around consistent land use and transportation planning.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.9 The county and cities should encourage transit supportive land uses in non-contiguous UGAs in order to help preserve transit service between non-contiguous cities.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved verbatim from TR 5.D.5. This policy was moved from the transportation to development patterns topic areas in the CPP, and this move within the comprehensive plan will echo the CPPs.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.10 In advance of market activities that may limit future potential public benefits, the county should pursue zoning and other strategies around transit oriented development (TOD) sites in UGAs to guide sustainable and equitable development patterns that incorporate production of housing affordable to all economic segments of the population.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved from LU 3.H.3, with revisions, so that all land use and transit related policies are grouped in one location. • Updated language to add reference to “in UGAs” for TOD sites and added reference to housing affordable to all economic segments of the population, consistent with the GMA housing goal.
<p><u>Policy 2.B.11 Land use types and densities shall be established around rail stations in Urban Growth Areas that support freight and passenger rail transportation consistent with other elements of the plan.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved from TR 10.D.4 because it is more related to land use than transportation. • Updated language around rail stations versus rail corridors, as the necessary land use planning to help the rail and freight should focus at the stations.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
((Objective 2.D Preserve mobile and manufactured home parks within urban growth areas.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move objective to Housing where mobile home parks are discussed in more detail.
((Policy 2.D.1 The county shall maintain development regulations to encourage the preservation of mobile and manufactured home parks.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose move policy to the Housing Element to be combined with LU 2.D.2 and HO 1.B.3.
((Policy 2.D.2 Whether to allow the rezoning of mobile and manufactured home parks to other zones should involve a balancing of the property rights of mobile home parks owners and the rights of owners of mobile homes who are renting space in mobile home parks. Some of the factors to consider are: (1) the cost to the mobile home park owner of maintaining the property as a mobile home park or related use; (2) the cost to the mobile home park tenant of the closure of a mobile home park; (3) whether the uses allowed under the proposed rezone are compatible with the existing neighborhood; (4) whether there are available spaces in other mobile home parks in the vicinity that can accommodate relocating the mobile home park tenants that would be displaced by the closure of the mobile home park; and (5) whether there is relocation or financial assistance for the parks' tenants.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move policy to the Housing Element. While zones and rezoning are land use actions, the protection of mobile and manufactured home parks are a tool to protect affordable housing in the county. There are also mobile and manufactured home policies in the HO element where this policy can fit.
Centers	
<u>Objective LU 3.A Plan for Countywide Centers consistent with VISION 2050, the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), and the CPPs.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countywide centers were newly added to the MPPs and CPPs, with Appendix I of the CPPs listing candidate countywide centers. A new objective and policies are necessary to incorporate this new designation into the LU Element and be consistent with the MPPs and CPPs. The proposed new objective is consistent with new language within the CPPs goals and narratives as well as DP-8, DP-14, and VISION 2050.
<u>Policy 3.A.1 The County shall designate Countywide Centers within UGAs consistent with the criteria in Appendix I of the CPPs.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with CPP DP-8 and MPP-DP-26 MPP-DP-21 Provide a regional framework for designating and evaluating regional growth centers.
<u>Policy 3.A.2 The County shall promote new, urban, compact, and mixed-use growth within Countywide Centers.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with CPP DP-14 and MPP-RC-8, MPP-RGS-11
<u>Policy 3.A.3 The county shall promote in Countywide Centers population and employment densities that support investments in infrastructure and transit.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with MPPs and CPPs related to countywide centers and is in line with the RGS and other policies discussing the need for growth that is well serviced by new and existing infrastructure. MPP-DP-22 Plan for densities that maximize benefits of transit investments in high-capacity transit station areas that are expected to attract significant new population or employment growth.
Objective LU ((3.A)) <u>3.B Plan for Urban Centers, Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridor</u> within unincorporated UGAs consistent with ((Vision 2040)) <u>VISION 2050</u> and the CPPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering existing objective based on new objective for countywide centers. Proposed amendments to incorporate the two new centers that will be located in unincorporated UGAs on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) within the Urban Core Subarea of Mixed-Use Corridor and LRC. There are two other center designations that will be on the FLUM that will be discussed within Objective 3.C (Urban Villages) and 3.D (Manufacturing/Industrial Center). The Urban Core Subarea Plan Element will introduce the Light Rail Communities and Mixed-Use Corridor designations to the County. These designations will serve as new center forms for Snohomish County. These centers are based on access to light rail and bus rapid transit stations.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Policy ((3.A.1)) 3.B.1 The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and UGA land use plans shall include designations and implementation measures for Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridor</u> based on the characteristics and criteria below.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering • Proposed amendments to incorporate the two new centers that will be located in unincorporated UGAs on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) within the Urban Core Subarea of Mixed-Use Corridor and LRC.
<p>Policy ((3.A.2)) 3.B.2 Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> shall be located within a UGA and:</p> <p>((a)) Subsection (a) Be sized up to 1.5 square miles;</p> <p>((b)) Subsection (b) Contain a mix of high-density residential and higher-intensity commercial, office, and public uses;</p> <p>((c)) Subsection (c) Be pedestrian and transit-oriented <u>and accessible for people with disabilities</u>;</p> <p>((d)) Subsection (d) Include urban services;</p> <p>((e)) Subsection (e) Reflect high quality urban design;</p> <p>((f)) Subsection (f) Emphasize open spaces, parks, and plazas to create a sense of place;</p> <p>((g)) Subsection (g) Develop/redevelop over time and in phases;</p> <p>((h)) Subsection (h) Plan for "complete streets" that are designed and operated to allow safe access for users of all modes and ability levels with a street center line mile average of no less than 30 center line miles per square mile, as a measure of street connectivity. Street grids should strive to have blocks no larger than three hundred feet by three hundred feet square. In areas where this is not possible, well-designed mid-block pedestrian and bicycle pathways could be used to accomplish a similar result;</p> <p>((i)) Subsection (i) Plan for sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure commensurate with population and traffic patterns, including measures of street type, vehicle volume and speeds;</p> <p>((j)) Subsection (j) Plan for housing affordable to ((low-income and moderate-income households)) <u>all economic segments of the population, including extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate- income households</u> ((commensurate with the identified need through Snohomish County's fair share housing methodology));</p> <p>((k)) Subsection (k) Include plans and regulations that encourage no net loss of affordable housing;</p> <p>((l)) Subsection (l) Plan and zone for a balance of residential, commercial, retail, and recreational uses. At least one housing unit shall be allowed for each employment unit in the center;</p> <p>((m)) Subsection (m) Develop with the community design guidelines and standards for buildings and streets that include criteria to make safe and active streetscapes, discourage uses and designs that disrupt pedestrian and bicycle flow and access, incorporate locally important characteristics and historic structures, and promote good building design;</p> <p>((n)) Subsection (n) Prohibit surface parking lots and at-grade parking, with the exception of on-street parking; and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housekeeping. Add subsection lettering a, b, c, etc. • Amendment to subsection (j) in line with the GMA housing goal and removing language as the County does not have a fair share housing methodology. Added nuance to indicate a county focus on the lowest income levels. • Renumbered • Revision to subsection c is proposed to ensure accessibility for people with disabilities is based on public input. • Revised the Centers language to be consistent with how centers are discussed in the CPPs and on the County FLUM. The Urban Core Subarea Plan element will introduce the Light Rail Communities and Mixed-Use Corridor designations to the County. These designations will serve as new center forms for Snohomish County. These centers are based on access to light rail and bus rapid transit stations. Urban Centers, Light Rail Community, and Mixed-Use Corridor will be different center types in Snohomish County.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((A)) Subsection (o) Have good access to the local and regional transportation and transit systems.</p>	
<p>Policy ((3.A.3)) 3.B.3 Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> shall be located adjacent to a principal arterial road((7)) and ((meet one of the following additional locational criteria (measured along existing road rights-of-way):)) <u>within ½ mile of a high capacity transit station.</u></p> <p>((A Be within 1/2 mile of an existing high capacity transit station; A Be within 1/2 mile of an existing transit center; or A Be within 1/4 mile of an existing bus stop on a major transportation corridor.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering • Propose to reduce the number of locational criteria for Snohomish County centers located in the UGA and to clarify that these centers shall be within ½ mile of a high capacity transit stations. • The Urban Core Subarea Plan element will introduce the Light Rail Communities and Mixed-Use Corridor designations to the County. These designations will serve as new center forms for Snohomish County. These centers are based on access to light rail and bus rapid transit stations.
<p>Policy ((3.A.4)) 3.B.4 Residential net densities shall not be less than 12 dwelling units per acre; maximum densities may be established as part of more detailed planning. Population and employment size will be consistent with criteria in the Countywide Planning Policies and ((General Policy Plan)) <u>the Plan.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering • Housekeeping update as there will no longer be a GPP.
<p>Policy ((3.A.5)) 3.B.5 Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> are designated on the FLUM and additional Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> may be designated in future amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering • Proposed amendments to incorporate the two new centers that will be located in unincorporated UGAs on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) within the Urban Core Subarea of Mixed-Use Corridor and LRC.
<p>Policy ((3.A.6)) 3.B.6 Desired growth within Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> shall be accomplished through:</p> <p>Subsection (a) Application of appropriate zoning classifications;</p> <p>Subsection (b) Provision of necessary services and public facilities, including transit, sewer, water, stormwater, roads and pedestrian improvements, parks, trails and open space, and protection of critical areas; and</p> <p>Subsection (c) ((The County will identify and apply)) <u>County identification and application of methods to facilitate development within designated Urban Centers, Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> including ((supportive)) transit, parks, road, and non-motorized improvements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housekeeping. Add subsection lettering a, b, c • Renumbering. • Proposed amendments to incorporate the two new centers that will be located in unincorporated UGAs on the FLUM within the Urban Core Subarea of Mixed-Use Corridor and LRC.
<p>Policy ((3.A.7)) 3.B.7 All Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> are designated as TDR receiving areas and all development approvals in Urban Centers, <u>Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors</u> shall be consistent with adopted TDR policies in this chapter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering • Proposed amendments to incorporate the two new centers that will be located in unincorporated UGAs on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) within the Urban Core Subarea of Mixed-Use Corridor and LRC.
<p>Policy 3.B.8 The County shall promote high-occupancy vehicle use and alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles in Urban Centers, Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors through higher density single-family and multi-family developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose to move this policy from the TE (TR 2.B.2) to the LU Element as it is focused on centers. Proposed changes from the existing policy include clarifying that the County shall promote this and include the three centers of Urban Centers, Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors.
<p>((Objective LU 3.B Plan for Transit Pedestrian Villages within Urban Centers.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transit Pedestrian Village centers designation will be removed as part of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update. The Urban Core Subarea Element will introduce the Light Rail Communities and Mixed-Use Corridor designations for urban centers within the Subarea.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((Policy 3.B.1 Transit Pedestrian Villages are areas that surround an existing or planned high-capacity transit center. Transit Pedestrian Villages may be designated on the FLUM.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal all Transit Pedestrian Village policies as this will no longer be a type of center in the county.
<p>((Policy 3.B.2 Transit Pedestrian Villages will be located around existing or planned transit centers.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal all Transit Pedestrian Village policies as this will no longer be a type of center in the county.
<p>((Policy 3.B.3 Minimum densities within Transit Pedestrian Villages shall be determined through more detailed planning and implementing development regulations.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal all Transit Pedestrian Village policies as this will no longer be a type of center in the county.
<p>((Policy 3.B.4 The county shall develop and adopt a detailed master plan for each Transit Pedestrian Village as an amendment to the GPP. State Environmental Policy Act review shall be conducted for each plan. The plan and planning process shall include the following elements:</p> <p>Subsection (a) a survey of local residents and property owners to identify local issues;</p> <p>Subsection (b) analysis of land use, including an assessment of vacant and redevelopment land potential, ownership patterns, and a ranking of sites based on their potential for development/redevelopment in the near and long terms;</p> <p>Subsection (c) analysis of demographic and market conditions, to help identify the most feasible mix of land uses;</p> <p>Subsection (d) assessment of environmental constraints and issues (e.g., wetlands, streams, views);</p> <p>Subsection (e) identification and mapping of the geographic boundaries for each Transit Pedestrian Village;</p> <p>Subsection (f) identification of and creation of a conceptual plan for each Transit Pedestrian Village, indicating the general location and emphasis of various land uses including residential, employment and the public realm, and any potential phases of development;</p> <p>Subsection (g) review and allocation or reallocation of targets for population and employment growth and affordable housing, in conjunction with land use planning;</p> <p>Subsection (h) identification of public service and capital facility needs (e.g., drainage, sewerage facilities, parks, cultural/educational facilities, transit facilities), and development of a targeted, phased capital improvement program;</p> <p>Subsection (i) development of a circulation plan, including street improvements, parking management, and pedestrian and bicycle improvements;</p> <p>Subsection (j) recommendations to address specific design concerns and planning or regulatory issues; and</p> <p>Subsection (k) analysis of existing and potential transit service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal all Transit Pedestrian Village policies as this will no longer be a type of center in the county.
<p>((Policy 3.B.5 Transit Pedestrian Villages shall be regulated through appropriate zoning classification(s).))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal all Transit Pedestrian Village policies as this will no longer be a type of center in the county.
<p>((Policy 3.B.6 Snohomish County will work with key service providers and agencies to develop coordinated capital facility plans for each designated Transit Pedestrian Village.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal all Transit Pedestrian Village policies as this will no longer be a type of center in the county.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>The county will also use its budgeting process to target and prioritize provision of adequate county services and facilities to designated centers.)</p> <p>Policy 3.C.1 Urban Villages shall be planned as compact pedestrian-oriented areas within designated Urban Growth Areas. Urban Villages are generally at a smaller scale than an Urban Center, Light Rail Communities, and Mixed-Use Corridors and provide an intermediate level of commercial or other services for an existing community, or take advantage of unique characteristics of an area that provide opportunities for higher intensity development with public benefits of open space or other public amenities.</p> <p>Subsection (a) ((The development)) Development will include a variety of small-scale commercial and office uses, public buildings, high-density residential units, and public open space ((+)) ;</p> <p>Subsection (b) ((Pedestrian orientation includes)) Development should be pedestrian orientated in circulation, scale, and convenience, with connections between neighborhoods, communities, and other centers ((+)) ;</p> <p>Subsection (c) Urban Villages should also include urban services and reflect high quality urban design ((+)) ;</p> <p>Subsection (d) Urban Villages shall serve several neighborhoods within a radius of about two miles ((+)) ; and</p> <p>Subsection (e) Urban Villages ((will)) should develop/redevelop over time and may develop in phases.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add subsection lettering a, b, c, etc. • Clarifying that urban villages are generally at a smaller scale than other centers designations. • The CPPs under the Reasonable Measures List supports encouraging the development of Urban Centers and Urban Villages. The goal of urban centers and villages is to create integrated, more complete, and inter-related neighborhoods. Such concepts are often implemented through specific area or downtown plans and may require public investment. • Proposed amendments to incorporate the two new centers that will be located in unincorporated UGAs on the FLUM within the Urban Core Subarea of Mixed-Use Corridor and LRC.
<p>Policy 3.C.2 Urban Villages shall be located where access to transportation facilities is available or can be improved based on the demands of the specific site and intensity of development and shall be designed to maximize use of nearby transit facilities.</p> <p>Subsection (a) Locations may be on or adjacent to a minor arterial road ((, or)) ;</p> <p>Subsection (b) ((within)) Within one-fourth mile of existing or planned access to local transit service ((+)) ; or</p> <p>Subsection (c) ((within)) Within one-half mile of a high capacity transit station.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add subsection lettering a, b, c
<p>Policy 3.C.5 ((Urban Villages will be implemented through)) County planning processes shall direct development in Urban Villages by:</p> <p>Subsection (a) The application of appropriate zoning classifications((+)) ;</p> <p>Subsection (b) ((provision of necessary services and public facilities (including)) Planning improvements to public facilities and services such as transit, sewer, water, stormwater, roads and pedestrian improvements, parks, trails, ((and)) open space, ((+)) and protection of critical areas ((+)) ;</p> <p>Subsection (c) The ((county will identify and apply methods to)) identification and application of new public facilities and services such as transit, park, and road improvements to facilitate development within designated Urban Villages ((, including targeting of public facilities such as transit, parks and road improvements.)) ;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housekeeping amendment to add subsection lettering a, b, c, etc. • The proposed revisions are related to findings in the RCW regarding Capital Facility Plans of municipalities and service providers. Service Providers should follow the direction outlined in the municipalities Capital Facility Plans. The proposed revisions are similar to the county's discussions with the water and waste water service providers in the Subarea.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Subsection (d) ((Provision of needed public services provided by entities other than the county shall be incorporated in the Capital Facilities Plans of the service providers and)) Working with public service providers and other entities to ensure that their Capital Facility Plans meet future service demands. These improvements may be planned and programmed in phases ((,)) ; <u>and</u></p> <p>Subsection (e) Requiring Capital Facilities Plans ((shall)) to provide for urban services needed at the time of development approval of specific phases of a project. The intensity of development may be tied to implementation of specific elements of Capital Facilities Plans including <u>the</u> provision of roadway, transit, utility and public service facilities.</p>	
<p>((Objective LU 3.D Identify and plan a network of transit emphasis corridors to link significant concentrations of population and employment, which may be in new and redeveloped neighborhoods, centers, or existing neighborhoods, commercial development, and employment areas.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TE identifies the transit emphasis corridors (TECs) of the County and provides the definition. This objective is duplicative of that work and should be repealed from the LU Element to be incorporated as necessary into the TE.
<p>((Policy 3.D.1 The county shall work with affected cities, transit service providers, and other stakeholders to pursue integrated land use and transportation planning along identified transit emphasis corridors, consistent with policy direction concerning these corridors in the Transportation chapter.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not only required in Centers, and can be incorporated as LU 2.B.8 above with other urban development pattern policies focused on TEC
<p>((Policy 3.D.2 The county shall work to create pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation linkages between new and redeveloped areas within the corridors and adjacent neighborhoods to reduce the dependence on the automobile and promote improved human health through increased physical activity.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy discusses the infrastructure needs to link corridors and urban places. This idea will be moved to the TE as that element focuses on infrastructure needs.
<p>((Policy 3.D.3 The county shall work to link new and existing neighborhoods within and near identified transit emphasis corridors creating a sense of community and shall include sidewalks and paths, where practicable, for safe passage to schools and other places of activity in the community.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not only required in Centers, and can be moved verbatim and presented as policy 2.B.6 above with other urban development pattern policies focused on TEC.
<p>Objective LU ((3-E)) <u>3.D</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy ((3-E.1)) <u>3.D.1</u> Preserve existing Manufacturing and Industrial Centers ((shall allow a mix of nonresidential)) by restricting incompatible land uses ((that or support the center and its employees)) from locating in or adjacent to these centers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VISION 2050 states that incompatible land uses should be restricted to preserve existing centers of intensive manufacturing and industrial activity. The proposed revisions to this policy will be consistent with VISION 2050. The County should protect manufacturing/industrial centers from the encroachment of incompatible uses within and adjacent to these centers. MPP-RC-7: Give funding priority – both for transportation infrastructure and for economic development – to support designated regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers, consistent with the regional vision. Regional funds are prioritized to regional centers. MPP-DP-50: Protect industrial zoning and manufacturing/industrial centers from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land. Further, the revisions are consistent with CPP DP-42: The County and cities should conserve designated industrial land for future industries and related jobs by...protecting industrial land from encroachment by incompatible uses and development on adjacent land.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ordinance 22-014 allows some residential uses as an allowed use in the Business Park zone if sites are a minimum of 25 acres and meet other requirements. There might be future proposals in light industrial areas where the focus will be restricting incompatible uses verses residential.
Policy ((3-E.2)) <u>3.D.2</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-E.3)) <u>3.D.3</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-E.4)) <u>3.D.4</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-E.5)) <u>3.D.5</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-E.6)) <u>3.D.6</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-E.7)) <u>3.D.7</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Objective LU ((3-F)) <u>3.E</u> Support ((city)) efforts to preserve, enhance, or develop urban or small town centers and main streets <u>within the UGA</u> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts to preserve, enhance, or develop urban or small town centers can occur within the unincorporated areas of UGAs in the county. The proposed amendment makes this clear and is consistent with CPP DP-8 and DP-14. CPP DP-8 states that the County and cities shall designate and provide for the development of local, countywide, and regional centers consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy, the Regional Centers Framework, and the Countywide Center Criteria contained in Appendix I. CPP DP-14: The County and cities should promote and focus new compact urban growth in local centers, countywide centers, regional centers, and transit emphasis corridors. Public comment revision to clarify that this could only occur within the UGA.
Policy ((3-F.1)) <u>3.E.1</u> Coordinate land use planning efforts with <u>cities, towns, and</u> ((cities and)) <u>urban unincorporated areas to</u> encourage development ((within the unincorporated area)) that enhances the vitality of ((a city's)) <u>centers</u> ((or)) <u>and</u> main street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed amendments are consistent with CPP DP-9: Jurisdictions that have designated regional growth centers and manufacturing/ industrial centers shall direct a significant share of population and employment growth to those areas through the provision of land use policies and infrastructure investments that support growth levels and densities consistent with the regional vision.
Objective LU ((3-G)) <u>3.F</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-G.1)) <u>3.F.1</u> The county shall ((recognize the importance of centers)) <u>coordinate with transit service and other service providers</u> in setting high priorities for development and installation of capital improvements within ((urban)) centers ((, and shall encourage similar recognition by other service providers)) .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with CPP DP-10: The County and cities shall coordinate the designation and planning of regional, countywide, and local centers with transit service and other service providers to promote well-designed and transit oriented developments that enhance economic development opportunities for all residents, address environmental goals, and reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.
Policy ((3-G.2)) <u>3.F.2</u> The county shall coordinate the design and development of centers and their connecting transit emphasis corridors in unincorporated areas with developers, transit planning agencies, and service providers, and other ((stakeholders)) <u>key parties</u> to achieve compatibility of land use, transportation, and capital facility objectives within centers. (See Urban Design Section)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace “stakeholders” with “key parties” to incorporate more respectful and inclusive language in the element.
Policy ((3-G.3)) <u>3.F.3</u> The county shall ((develop and implement)) <u>support the development and implementation of</u> techniques within designated centers that allow the phasing of development and ensure the centers’ long-term development potential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the last comprehensive plan update, these techniques have been developed and implemented. Proposed amendments change the tense to ensure continued support of these techniques.
Policy ((3-G.4)) <u>3.F.4</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Policy ((3-G.5)) 3.F.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-G.6)) 3.F.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-G.7)) 3.F.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
((Policy 3-G.8 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	
((Policy 3-G.9 Snohomish County shall support city annexation of areas designated Urban Center, Transit Pedestrian Village, or Urban Village after the annexing city and the county adopt an interlocal agreement consistent with the annexation principles developed by Snohomish County Tomorrow. The interlocal agreement shall address the smooth transition of services from the county to the city and shall ensure that the city comprehensive plan and development regulations provide capacity for at least the same overall density and intensity of development provided by the county comprehensive plan and development regulations. If the area to be annexed includes an area designated as a receiving area under the county's Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, then the interlocal agreement shall also ensure that the area remains a TDR receiving area or that other areas of the city are designated TDR receiving areas so that the city development regulations provide equivalent or greater capacity for receiving TDR certificates and equivalent or greater incentives for the use of TDR certificates.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move, with revisions, to newly created annexation objective in UGA subsection as LU 1.E.4
Policy ((3-G.10)) 3.F.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
Policy ((3-G.11)) 3.F.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
((Objective LU 3.H Encourage transit supportive land uses that are compatible with adjacent neighborhoods to locate and intensify within designated centers and along transit emphasis corridors.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal as objective 2.B adequately encapsulates this objective.
((Policy 3.H.1 The county shall encourage mixed use and/or higher density residential development in appropriate locations along transit emphasis corridors. Corridor planning can help identify those locations where higher densities and mixed uses can best support transit and non-motorized access.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal as the intent of the first part of this policy is captured in LU 2.B.3, and the second sentence from this policy has been added to policy 2.B.3.
((Policy 3.H.2 Projects within or near designated centers or along transit emphasis corridors shall provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit facilities and/or the center to encourage pedestrian activity, support transit use and decrease auto trips.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move verbatim under objective 2.B so all transit planning and land use policies are in one location (will be LU 2.B.7).
((Policy 3.H.3 In advance of market activities that may limit future potential public benefits, the county should pursue zoning and other strategies around transit-oriented development (TOD) sites to guide sustainable and equitable development patterns that incorporate affordable housing production.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move, with revisions, under objective 2.B so all transit planning and land use policies are in one location (will be LU 2.B.10).
Urban Design	
Policy 4.A.1 The county shall work with architects, builders, and others to ensure that the design review process, innovative and flexible design standards, and development regulations for site planning and the design of buildings are consistent with the urban design policies of the ((GPP)) Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping. Reformatting of the Comprehensive Plan in 2024 to no longer include separate GPP.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Policy 4.A.2 The county shall ensure that design standards for residential, commercial, and industrial development meet the following criteria:</p> <p>Subsection (a) Residential developments should support family households and children <u>of all ages</u> by providing adequate and accessible open space and recreation, and encouraging opportunities for day care, preschool and after school care services within close proximity.</p> <p>Subsection (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.</p> <p>Subsection (c) New buildings oriented onto the street <u>shall</u> ((,)) maintain or create streetscape and pedestrian <u>scale</u> qualities and reduce the visual impact of parking lots, garages, and storage areas.</p> <p>Subsection (d) Where high rise buildings are developed, street level uses ((are)) <u>shall be</u> limited to commercial activities, entertainment services, public services, and other related public-generating activities.</p> <p>Subsection (e) The appearance of existing areas should be improved by:</p> <p>((1-)) <u>i.</u> encouraging well maintained landscaping on streets and in parking areas;</p> <p>((2-)) <u>ii.</u> reducing the visual clutter of utility poles, overhead power-lines, and suspended traffic signals;</p> <p>((3-)) <u>iii.</u> encouraging improvements to <u>building</u> entrances, facades, and lighting; ((and))</p> <p>((4-)) <u>iv.</u> grouping together signs and ensuring they are scaled and designed in a manner appropriate to the street frontage((,));</p> <p><u>v. encouraging public art installations and open space areas for the public to gather; and</u></p> <p><u>vi. locating bike parking and places to sit.</u></p> <p>Subsection (f) Developments should provide adequate setbacks, buffers, and visual screens to make them compatible with abutting residential and other land uses.</p> <p>Subsection (g) Urban design <u>that</u> is sensitive to the preservation of existing cultural resources.</p> <p>Subsection (h) Consideration of design guidelines should include consideration of costs and impacts on affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Subsection (i) Building design that is highly energy efficient, environmentally sensitive, and creates healthy indoor environments through practices such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and passive building design.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed edits to subsection (b) to allow for areas to become denser through a larger scale development that could be taller than surrounding buildings while still designed to be compatible. This is consistent with revised CPP HO-1 that requests jurisdictions to consider the strategy of supporting “the creation of additional housing options in single-family neighborhoods to provide for more diverse housing types and choices to meet the various needs of all economic segments of the population.” • There are missing words in subsections (c), (e), and (g). Stylistic changes are also proposed to be consistent with the rest of the element and Comprehensive Plan update. • Proposed additions to subsection (e) to provide other options to improve existing areas. Edits consistent with MPP-DP-9, “Support urban design, historic preservation, and arts to enhance quality of life, support local culture, improve the natural and human-made environments, promote health and well-being, contribute to a prosperous economy, and increase the region’s resiliency in adapting to changes or adverse events.” Also consistent with CPP DP-40 by supporting infrastructure that promotes physical activity. • Proposed addition of subsection (i) to promote green building design. There are several CPPs that ask the county to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, green building design is one method. For instance, GF-3 was revised to read, “Decisions on land use, transportation, and economic and social infrastructure should consider impacts on climate change and provide solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions...” Further, CPP DP-40 states that the county should adopt development standards to encourage design and construction of healthy buildings and facilities. MPPs also discuss environmentally sensitive development such as MPP-EN-5 and MPP-CC-2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MPP-En-5, “Locate development in a manner that minimizes impacts to natural features. Promote the use of innovative environmentally sensitive development practices, including design, materials, construction, and on-going maintenance.” ○ MPP-CC-2, “Reduce building energy use through green building and retrofit of existing buildings.” • Proposed revision to subsection (a) to include all children based on public input.
<p>Policy 4.A.3 <u>The Snohomish County Health Department and the community should coordinate on policies and initiatives which promote physical activity and a greater understanding of the relationships between land use planning, the built environment, transportation, and human and environmental health in Snohomish County.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving policy IC 1.G.2 to the land use element with some revisions as the Health District is now the Health Department and a part of the County. Proposed revisions are consistent with CPP DP-40.
<p>Policy 4.B.1 The county shall work with neighboring cities, architects, builders, and others to ensure that the design review process, innovative and flexible design standards,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housekeeping. Reformatting of the Comprehensive Plan in 2024 to no longer include separate GPP.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>development regulations, and incentives for the development of Urban Centers and Urban Villages, are consistent with the urban design policies of the ((GPP)) <u>Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan</u>. Where appropriate, the design review process may include an administrative design review panel composed of qualified design professionals to review and make recommendations on design standards, development regulations, and incentives.</p>	
<p>Policy 4.B.2 The county shall ensure that design standards for urban centers and villages achieve the following objectives:</p> <p>Subsection (a) Centers that are visible and accessible to pedestrians from the streets and clearly defined through lighting, landscaping, street furniture, landmarks, changes in land use, and/or open space.</p> <p>Subsection (b) The design of new buildings that result in the creation of quality pedestrian spaces and that are compatible with planned architectural scale, massing, building orientation, height, articulation, and materials.</p> <p>Subsection (c) Open spaces that are incorporated into the design of centers and situated in a manner that complements other land uses.</p> <p>Subsection (d) Where increased density housing is proposed, the ((height, scale,)) design ((,)) and architectural character of the proposed units ((is)) <u>should be</u> compatible with the character of buildings in the surrounding area and ((may require)) taller buildings <u>are encouraged</u> to be located in the core of the Village or Center, or at an edge adjacent to non-residential uses, with heights stepping down towards existing lower density housing.</p> <p>Subsection (e) High quality developments and a mix of housing and commercial uses that allows for the use of creative and innovative design and fosters joint development strategies.</p> <p>Subsection (f) Building setbacks that create public spaces with visual interest.</p> <p>Subsection (g) Off-street parking that is within structures or underground, where feasible. Where underground parking or structures are not feasible, off-street surface parking within a center should be located at the sides or the rear of buildings and well landscaped to reduce the visual impact of large parking areas. Surface parking in front of a building (between the building and the street) should be avoided, whenever possible.</p> <p>Subsection (h) Shared parking among various land uses and provision of bicycle parking.</p> <p>Subsection (i) Centers that are connected with nearby residential, parks, schools and employment areas by well landscaped and barrier free pedestrian, bicycle, and transit linkages (see also transportation element).</p> <p>Subsection (j) Well designed urban centers and urban villages that are sensitive to natural and cultural resources so as to preserve them.</p> <p>Subsection (k) Emphasis shall be placed on the public realm, which may include parks, plazas, play area and trails, such that they create a sense of place within centers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The density of UC development will likely always be taller than surrounding non-UC development. Propose to remove the need for UC development to ensure height and scale is compatible with surrounding uses and focus on design. This is supported by CPP HO-1 and the rationale is further described above in LU 4.A.2. • Proposed revisions within subsection (m) because health relates to more than just physical activity and this is represented in Vision 2050, “Health. Communities promote physical, social, and mental well-being so that all people can live healthier and more active lives.” Proposed revisions are also consistent with CPP DP-40.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Subsection (l) Consideration of design guidelines should include consideration of costs and impacts on affordable housing.</p> <p>Subsection (m) Centers that support healthy, active lifestyles among residents, shoppers, and workers by providing opportunities for regular physical activity, <u>social interaction, and mental restoration.</u></p>	
Small Area and Neighborhood Structure	
<p>Goal LU 5 Encourage land use patterns that create connected, identifiable neighborhoods and communities in UGAs ((through a consolidated system of past and future neighborhood plans)).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The county does not create neighborhood plans, although there is the potential for the county to help in the creation of neighborhood plans in the future to implement this goal of identifiable urban neighborhoods. The most likely location of future neighborhood plans are within the subarea, or through a joint planning process with a city, or under a special grant program rather than as normal course of business. Additionally, encouraging connected, identifiable neighborhoods does not need to be dependent on the creation of neighborhood plans.
<p>Objective LU 5.A ((Revitalize or create)) Create or ensure the vitality of identifiable, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood areas with focal points, mixed-use centers, and employment areas that are linked with each other.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment to be consistent with the language in Goal HO 2, “Ensure the vitality and character of existing residential neighborhoods.”
<p>((Policies 5.A.1 – 5.A.4 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129:))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies LU 5.A.1 through 5.A.4 were repealed in 2014 through Amended Ordinance No. 14-129. The current LU Element includes the policy numbers and indicates they were repealed. The 2024 Update proposes to remove these policies and references to the repeal.
<p>Policy ((5.A.5)) 5.A.1 For planning and zoning proposed within Urban Growth Areas, more detailed planning processes may be developed, <u>pending available resources</u>, for identified neighborhoods. <u>The more detailed planning shall be done in partnership with community residents, organizations, and businesses to support neighborhoods</u> with the following characteristics:</p> <p>((Subsection (a) areas encompassing 200 to 500 acres and a population of 4,000 to 8,000 people;))</p> <p>Subsection ((b)) (a) varied densities, <u>commercial and residential uses</u>, and character <u>to foster community</u>;</p> <p>Subsection ((c)) (b) a mix of housing types, <u>including multifamily</u>, ((and architecturally compatible styles)) yielding an average of at least ((6)) 8 dwelling units per acre; ((and))</p> <p><u>Subsection (c) a variety of small scale commercial uses, public buildings, and mixed use development within one half mile or a fifteen minute walking distance for the majority of neighborhood residents;</u></p> <p>Subsection (d) focal points such as parks, meeting halls, churches, libraries, fire stations, schools, and other uses within one quarter mile of neighborhood residents <u>and businesses</u> ((:));</p> <p><u>Subsection (e) service by public transportation; and</u></p> <p><u>Subsection (f) urban food production practices, distribution, and marketing such as community gardens and farmers markets.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The county does not create neighborhood plans, although there is the potential for the county to help in the creation of neighborhood plans in the future if funding and time become available. With the removal of the text in LU 5 regarding the neighborhood plans, it is necessary to explain the potential scope of “more detailed planning processes.” Without this information and caveat of funding, this could be requested of the county more frequently than resources could match. Without edits, the policy does not appear to work towards creating “identifiable, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood areas” and instead focuses on revitalizing or further advancing areas that already have those qualities described in the criteria. By clarifying that the characteristics should be supported in the plans, the amended policy could better achieve the objective. Addition of subsection (f) is to be consistent with and helps implement CPP DP-41 that reads “The County and cities should adopt policies that create opportunities for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting urban food production practices, distribution, and marketing such as community gardens and farmers markets; and Increasing the local agricultural economy’s capacity to produce, market, and distribute fresh and minimally processed foods Proposed edits also supported by MPP-RGS-6, CPP DP-14, and CPP DP-15. There is not a discernable reason to have separate policies related to neighborhood commercial centers and commercial centers, especially with the proposed removal of the size limitation/requirement. Combined former 5.A.5 (renumbered 5.A.1), 5.A.6, and 5.A.7 into 5.A.1. See finding in 5.A.7 for further detail.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((Policy 5.A.6 For planning and zoning proposed within Urban Growth Areas more detailed planning processes may be developed for identified Neighborhood Commercial Centers with the following characteristics:</p> <p>Subsection (a) a variety of small scale commercial uses, public buildings, and mixed use development within one half mile or a fifteen minute walking distance for the majority of neighborhood residents;</p> <p>Subsection (b) approximately 3 acres in size;</p> <p>Subsection (c) served by public transportation; and</p> <p>Subsection (d) compatible with adjacent uses.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove and incorporate with 5.A.1 above.
<p>((Policy 5.A.7 For planning and zoning purposes within Urban Growth Areas, more detailed planning processes may be developed for identified Commercial Centers with the following characteristics:</p> <p>Subsection (a) approximately 20 to 25 acres in size;</p> <p>Subsection (b) serving several neighborhoods within a radius of approximately two miles;</p> <p>Subsection (c) providing for public open space;</p> <p>Subsection (d) accommodate mixed use commercial and multi-family residential; and</p> <p>Subsection (e) served by public transportation, including connections between neighborhoods and major urban centers.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This subelement focuses on the creation and revitalization of neighborhoods and communities. The revitalization of commercial areas is already addressed within Objective 2.C, where policy 2.C.2 also indicates that the majority of new commercial development should be within urban centers, urban villages, and TECs. This policy proposed to be removed, with elements incorporated into policy 5.A.1, so that the subelement focuses on the small areas and neighborhoods.
<p>Policy ((5.A.8)) <u>5.A.2</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy ((5.A.9)) <u>5.A.3</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy ((5.A.10)) <u>5.A.4</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy ((5.A.11)) <u>5.A.5</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy ((5.A.12)) <u>5.A.6</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Objective LU 5.B Recognize unique land use issues within specific Urban Growth Areas ((as identified in previously adopted sub-area plans and/or studies)).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to revise the policy to remove reference to previously adopted sub-area plans and studies. This is hold over language from when the small neighborhoods subelement was first created in the Comprehensive Plan in 1995 out of the previous subarea plans. These plans are now too out-of-date to reference and still be accurate or relevant.
<p>((Policy 5.B.1 New development on property within the Snohomish UGA and designated Urban Industrial and zoned General Commercial (GC) shall be approved with site development plan according to the standards and procedures for the Planned Community Business (PCB) zone. The site development plan shall delineate limited access points to properties and demonstrate compatibility with existing adjacent commercial and residential uses through such measures as landscaping, natural buffers, berms, fencing, sign and lighting control.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a UGA specific policy that is proposed for repeal as it is no longer necessary. Staff determined it is not necessary to require GC projects to apply for a site development plan and receive administrative and conditional use permits when the same standards can be ensured with a commercial building permit and site plan. There is a desire to amend Chapter 30.31B and 30.31A SCC to streamline the procedures for GC projects. This proposed repeal would allow this code amendment project to occur. Streamlining GC project review could help the county achieve GMA, MPP, and CPP goals and policies around promoting businesses and recruiting new businesses such as CPP DP-38. There are not any properties currently zoned GC in the unincorporated UGA.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((Policy 5.B.2 Industrial development within the Mill Creek UGA that involves construction of new building, expansion of existing buildings, or a change of use that is clearly visible from adjacent residential property shall provide adequate screening and buffering along the common property lines. Adequate screening and buffering shall generally mean any one or combination of dense plantings, decorative walls or solid fences, and landscaped berms that serve to visually screen and acoustically shield the residential property from the industrial uses.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial development adjacent to residential development is required to include perimeter landscaping per SCC 30.25.020 regardless of whether it is inside the Mill Creek UGA. This UGA specific policy is not necessary and proposed for repeal.
<p>((Policies 5.B.3 – 5.B.5 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies LU 5.B.3 through 5.B.5 were repealed in 2014 through Amended Ordinance No. 14-129. The current LU Element includes the policy numbers and indicates they were repealed. The 2024 Update proposes to remove these policies and references to the repeal.
<p>((Policy 5.B.6a REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove repealed policies.
<p>Policy ((5.B.6)) <u>5.B.1</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>Policy ((5.B.7)) <u>5.B.2</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>((Policy 5.B.8 Within the Maltby UGA, the Urban Industrial plan designation shall be implemented through the Light Industrial or Industrial Park zones. Areas zoned Light Industrial are those areas located (1) under the Bonneville power line transmission easement and between Broadway and the eastern boundary of the SR-522 right-of-way, (2) between 206th St. SE, Broadway, 207th St. SE, and 88th Dr. SE or their extensions; (3) north of 212th St. SE in which the Light Industrial zone existed as of December 12, 1996; and (4) south of 212th St. SE and designated Urban Industrial by the Future Land Use Map. The Urban Commercial plan designations within the Maltby UGA shall be implemented through the Planned Community Business zone.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move Maltby UGA specific implementing zone language to the Future Land Use Map designations for Urban Industrial and Urban Commercial so this information is collected in one consistent location. Propose to repeal the site specific information in this policy.
<p>Policy ((5.B.9)) <u>5.B.3</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered
<p>((Policy 5.B.10 Within the Maltby UGA, any future development of urban industrial land which abuts the UGA boundary shall provide the following undeveloped buffer: visual screening comprised of dense plantings, decorative walls, landscaped berming and/or other buffering techniques to make urban development compatible with adjacent rural residential uses.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial development adjacent to residential development and some rural zoned properties is required to include perimeter landscaping per SCC 30.25.020 regardless of whether it is inside the Maltby Creek UGA. This UGA specific policy is not necessary and proposed for repeal.
<p>((Policies 5.B.11 – 5.B.13 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies LU 5.B.11 through 5.B.13 were repealed in 2014 through Amended Ordinance No. 14-129. The current LU Element includes the policy numbers and indicates they were repealed. The 2024 Update proposes to remove these policies and references to the repeal.
<p>Policy 5.C.2 Vacant or under-utilized properties designated Reservation Commercial shall be zoned General Commercial. All new development on any property designated Reservation Commercial shall be approved with an official site plan ((according to the requirements of Chapter 30.31B SCC)).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to remove references to specific code that can change.
<p>Rural Lands</p>	
<p>Policy 6.A.1 ((To help ensure that the)) The County shall manage and reduce the rural population ((target is not exceeded,)) growth rate over time, consistent with VISION 2050, so that the population growth outside of the UGA does not exceed 4.5% of projected countywide growth. ((rural)) Rural growth ((trends)) rates shall be monitored using the process and criteria established under Objective PE 2.B and strategies shall be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed policy amendment to reduce rural growth target consistent with the RGS and VISION 2050.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>developed to limit rural population growth to 4.5% of the 20-year projection. If rural growth trends indicate that the rural population target may be exceeded, the county shall evaluate whether additional incentive programs or adjustments to planned densities or land uses are necessary to bring rural growth trends back into alignment with the adopted target.</p>	
<p>((Policy 6.A.3 The Warm Beach Health Care Center/Senior Community may be expanded into an area that includes parcels with the following tax account numbers: 183104-1-002, 2-007, 2-008, 2-009, 2-018, and 2-022. Densities within the expansion area may exceed the density allowed by the GPP Future Land Use Map and/or the zoning classification for these parcels but may not exceed 2 dwelling units per acre, provided that a planned residential development (PRD) consistent with this density allowance is approved for the site prior to the issuance of building permits. The official site plan required by the PRD shall meet applicable requirements of the zoning code. The following additional requirements shall be met:</p> <p>Subsection (a) no new lots are created;</p> <p>Subsection (b) housing shall be limited to rental housing units for senior citizens;</p> <p>Subsection (c) senior housing does not unduly disrupt or alter the visual character of rural uses in the immediate vicinity;</p> <p>Subsection (d) impacts concerning traffic, sewage disposal, water supply, and nearby wells are mitigated consistent with county code and policies; and</p> <p>Subsection (e) the development will not lead to more non-rural development.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed repeal of this policy is consistent with amended LU Policy 6.A.1 to reduce rural growth to help achieve the new target consistent with VISION 2050. This site-specific policy was adopted in 2006 and the listed parcels are the only ones outside of a UGA on which a planned residential development (PRD) is permitted under the county’s development regulations. The development code was subsequently amended to only allow a PRD on R-5 zoned land when consistent with Policy LU 6.A.3 (SCC 30.42B.020(3)) The purpose of this policy was to allow an exception to the five acre or larger lot size mandated by the Growth Management Hearings Board. The initial adoption of the County’s General Policy Plan (GPP) in 1995 included a High Density Rural Residential-HDRR (1 to 2 DU/Acre) FLU map designation that applied to rural properties with existing densities of one or more dwelling units per acre. In response to the Growth Board’s remand in the <i>Sky Valley, et al.</i> case, the county removed the HDRR designation from all lands on the FLU map including the Warm Beach Senior Community (WBSC) and replaced it with the Rural Residential (RR) designation which has a base density of one DU/5 acres. The Board subsequently found that LU Policy 6.A.3, added to the GPP as part of the 2005 plan update, was in compliance with the prior <i>Sky Valley, et al.</i> remand based on the county council’s conclusion that the WBSC is an exception to rural residential development as a facility that is reserved for senior care and housing. In 2008 a request to revise a conditional use permit, shoreline substantial development permit and a planned residential development official site plan for a 100-unit development on several of the parcels listed in the policy was denied with prejudice by the Snohomish County Hearing Examiner and an appeal of the FEIS for the project was granted by the HE. However, since the project was denied, no new EIS was necessary. There have been no subsequent development applications for a PRD on any of the listed parcels since that decision.
<p>Policy 6.B.1 Use of a clustering subdivision technique ((should be encouraged)) may be permitted by the County in rural residential areas to 1) preserve the rural character of Snohomish County; 2) avoid interference with resource land uses; 3) minimize impacts upon critical areas; 4) allow for future expansion of the UGAs, where appropriate, and 5) support the provision of more affordable housing in rural areas. The primary benefit of clustering is the preservation of open space and rural character. Modest density incentives should be provided in a manner which ((encourages)) permits use of the technique and maximum preservation of open space and maintenance of rural character. The open space tracts in rural cluster subdivisions shall be preserved in perpetuity, except for those located now or in the future within the Rural/Urban Transition Area. In the Rural/Urban Transition area, open space tracts shall be preserved until such time as the subdivision is included within a UGA, so that it may be used for future urban development. Rural cluster subdivision regulations implementing this policy shall include performance standards to ensure that:</p> <p>Subsection ((1,)) (a) The number, location, and configuration of lots will constitute compact rural development rather than urban growth. Performance standards shall include the following:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revisions will continue to allow rural cluster development. However, given the VISION 2050 rural growth target for the county there is no need to encourage rural cluster development with its density bonus of up to 35%. The amended policy provides more emphasis on the use of the rural cluster development to maintain and preserve rural character. Propose to delete specific development criteria in the policy which are implemented in Chapter 30.41C SCC and written more as specific code requirements than policy. Housekeeping amendments proposed to be consistent with formatting throughout the element.

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((a)) <u>i.</u> Preservation of a substantial percentage of total site area in open space to be held in single ownership and in a separate tract or tracts;</p> <p>((b)) <u>ii.</u> Provision of a density incentive which is tied to the preservation of open space;</p> <p>((c)) <u>iii.</u> Connection of open space tracts with open space tracts on adjacent properties;</p> <p>((d)) <u>iv.</u> Density at no greater than the underlying zoning density together with a modest density bonus as an incentive for use of the clustering technique;</p> <p>((e)) <u>v.</u> Allowance of open space uses consistent with the character of the rural area;</p> <p>((f)) <u>vi.</u> Division of the development into physically separated clusters with a limitation on the maximum number of lots per cluster;</p> <p>((g)) <u>vii.</u> Physical separation between clusters consisting of a buffer of wind resistant vegetation;</p> <p>((h)) <u>viii.</u> Design that configures residential lots to the greatest extent possible to maintain rural character by ((i)) maximizing visibility of open space tract and minimizing visibility of clusters from adjoining collector roads, arterial roads, or state and federal highways through the placement of lots in the interior of the site and through vegetative buffers; and ((ii)) placing buildings and lots in a manner which does not intrude on the visual character of the rural landscape, in particular, avoiding placement of houses or buildings on forested ridgelines or other prominent physical features(i).</p> <p>((i)) Submittal of a planting and clearing plan to ensure that any planting or clearing proposed will not interfere with the rural character of the site;</p> <p>((j)) Submittal of a site plan to ensure that siting of lots and built areas will not interfere with the rural character of the site and is consistent with the performance standards of the ordinance. The site plan must include:</p> <p>((i)) location of clusters, roads and open space;</p> <p>((ii)) within clusters, location and placement of buildings, useable building areas, driveways, and drainage systems; and</p> <p>((iii)) location of critical areas and all buffers;))</p> <p>Subsection ((2-)) (b) The development minimizes adverse impacts to large-scale natural resource lands, such as forest lands, agricultural lands and critical areas. ((Performance standards shall include the following:</p> <p>((a)) Minimization of alterations to topography, critical areas, and drainage systems; and</p> <p>((b)) Adequate separation between rural buildings and clusters and designated natural resource lands;))</p> <p>Subsection ((3-)) (c) The development does not thwart the long-term flexibility to expand the UGA. In the Rural/Urban Transition area, open space tracts shall be preserved until such time as the subdivision is included within a UGA, so that the tract may be reserved for future urban development. When an open space tract is added to a UGA and adequate</p>	

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>services can be provided, the County may allow redevelopment of the open space tract into additional lots to provide appropriate urban level density.</p> <p>((Subsection 4. The development has made adequate provision for impacts to transportation systems. Performance standards shall include:</p> <p>(a) controls for access to the rural cluster subdivision from public roads;</p> <p>(b) requirements to meet rural concurrency standards; and</p> <p>(c) requirement that the development be located within a rural fire district.))</p>	
<p>Policy 6.B.2 The retention of small forest <u>operations, crop and specialty</u> farming, horse ((farm)) farms, and other livestock-based farm operations and hobby farms shall be encouraged in rural areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revisions to add clarifying language that identifies smaller scale forest operations and specialty farms that should be encouraged in rural areas. The majority of farms in the county, based on the 2017 US Department of Agricultural Census, are 10 acres or less in size. Proposed addition is consistent with CPP DP-41.
<p>((Policy 6.B.6 Development standards in rural areas shall be consistent with the cultural resources policies in the plan so as to preserve them.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is unnecessary as the Cultural Resources subelement provides policy direction for protection of cultural resources throughout the county.
<p>((Policy 6.B.7 Except for athletic facilities located near urban growth areas, campgrounds, parks, recreational facilities, and trails shall consist of low intensity and density uses and be sited and designed to avoid adverse impacts on residents and the environment.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is implemented in Chapter 30.22 SCC and is no longer needed as policy direction.
<p>Policy ((6.B.8)) <u>6.B.6</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered due to deleted policies.
<p>Policy ((6.B.9)) <u>6.B.7</u> Planned rural development must be consistent with state law regarding available water resources and instream flow rules. <u>For rural development projects located within the service area of an existing public water system, project proponents should determine if water connection is available prior to drilling a new well for potable water.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered due to deleted policies. Added sentence related to water service in rural areas from public comments requesting that development be encouraged to hook up to existing systems that could provide water to rural development. This proposed addition is consistent with proposed amendments to Natural Environment Element policy 3.C.2.
<p>Policy 6.C.1 Designate as Low Density Rural Residential those areas which are currently zoned Forestry requiring 20 acre minimum lot sizes in new subdivisions but are not included in the Forestry designations of the ((General Policy)) <u>Snohomish County Comprehensive</u> Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping amendment to reflect that there will not be a separate GPP document after adoption of the 2024 comprehensive plan update.
<p>Policy 6.C.3 ((The)) Rural Resource Transition ((designation)) <u>lands</u> should ((initially)) incorporate the Low Density Rural Residential and Rural Residential-10 (Resource Transition) designations of the ((General Policy)) <u>Snohomish County Comprehensive</u> Plan and may include other lands which provide an appropriate transition between rural <u>residential</u> and <u>natural</u> resource lands.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed language to provide policy clarity. Housekeeping amendment to reflect that there will not be a separate GPP document after adoption of the 2024 comprehensive plan update.
<p>((Policy 6.C.5 Through subsequent implementation measures, rural cluster subdivision of Low Density Rural Residential and Rural Resource Transition lands shall be encouraged on tracts 40 acres or larger.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy is implemented in Chapter 30.41C SCC and proposed for repeal. Given the VISION 2050 rural growth target for the county there is no need for a policy statement that encourages rural cluster development with its density bonus of up to 35%.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Policy ((6.C.6)) 6.C.5 Designate as Rural Residential-10 (Resource Transition) those areas outside of the Tulalip Reservation which were formerly included in Forestry designations on pre-GMA subarea plans but not zoned Forestry. These areas shall not be subdivided into lots less than 10 acres except through the use of a rural cluster subdivision ((or housing demonstration program using PRD provisions)) at a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to remove reference to the previously sunsetted housing demonstration program. Renumbered due to deleted policy.
Policy 6.E.2 The county shall ((develop)) maintain Rural Business zoning and development standards that allow community facilities for the surrounding rural population and facilitate small-scale retail and service uses at appropriate locations within rural residential areas and minimize impacts to residential areas, resource lands, and critical areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rural Business (RB) zone and development standards have been developed; the County should now focus on maintaining existing RB zoned area in order to protect rural character.
((Policy 6.E.6 REPEALED BY ORDINANCE NO. 18-062))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove reference to repealed policy
Policy ((6.E.7)) 6.E.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered due to deleted policy.
Policy ((6.E.8)) 6.E.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered due to deleted policy.
((Policy 6.F.1 Within rural lands outside of urban growth areas (UGAs), and located along Interstate 5 at freeway interchanges, permit limited commercial uses that provide opportunities for retail sales and services to rural populations and the needs of the traveling public.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to delete and merge with Policy 6.F.2 (to be renumbered as Policy 6.F.1).
Policy ((6.F.2)) 6.F.1 The Rural Freeway Service designation shall apply to areas that are located at the Interstate 5 interchanges north and west of, and outside of, the Arlington/Marysville UGA. <u>This designation permits limited commercial uses that provide opportunities for retail sales and services to rural populations and the needs of the traveling public. These shall be small-scale and minimize impacts to rural residential areas, resource lands, and critical areas.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By combing text from LU 6.F.1, 6.F.2, and 6.F.4, the policy now provides intent and general location of the RFS designation within one location.
((Policy 6.F.3 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO.14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove repealed policy.
((Policy 6.F.4 Rural Freeway Service zoning and development, site, and locational criteria shall be adopted that facilitate small-scale retail and service uses at appropriate locations that minimize impacts to rural residential areas, resource lands, and critical areas.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal and add the language from this policy to renumbered LU 6.F.1.
Policy ((6.F.5)) 6.F.2 In order to ((maintain)) protect the rural character of the area, Rural Freeway Service development standards shall restrict the building size, height, and setback, the areas of impervious surfaces, and the size, location, and type of uses. <u>Rural Freeway Service development shall be limited to development that can be supported by services typically delivered at rural levels of service. These services may include domestic water, septic systems, and transportation facilities.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy emphasis should be the protection of rural character when applying development standards to RFS sites. In addition, merged a key portion of Policy 6.F.6 emphasizing that rural levels of service shall be provided to RFS sites.
((Policy 6.F.6 Rural Freeway Service development shall be limited to development that can be supported by services typically delivered at rural levels of service. These services may include domestic water, septic systems, and transportation facilities.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal policy and add language to policy 6.F.2 above.
Policy ((6.F.7)) 6.F.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered due to deleted policy.
Policy ((6.F.8)) 6.F.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbered due to deleted policy.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Policy 6.G.2 Recognize the existing rural industrial designations and zones in the county that contribute to the economic diversity of the rural unincorporated areas of the county and provide employment opportunities to nearby rural populations, including historically and currently marginalized communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to social equity to be consistent with the revised 2021 CPPs and Vision 2050. • Proposed revisions also add a clarification that this policy applies to rural unincorporated areas (as opposed to urban).
((Policy 6.G.3 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove repealed policies
Policy ((6.G.4)) 6.G.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumber to use policy placeholder number.
Policy ((6.G.5)) 6.G.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering.
Policy ((6.G.6)) 6.G.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy ((6.G.7)) 6.G.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy 6.H.1 Recognize the existing commercial and residential settlement pattern in the area of southeast Snohomish County along State Route 9 between 184th and 172nd Streets SE and at 164th Street SE as limited areas of more intense rural development (LAMIRD) that provide retail goods and services to the immediate rural population and a larger surrounding rural service area, and allow limited infill adjacent to existing commercial development provided that the impacts of new infill development or redevelopment be reduced where they impact adjacent rural residential areas and rural character.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose to add text to emphasize recognition that a LAMIRD is allowed if it is limited to serving surrounding rural population and service area in keeping with maintaining rural character.
Policy 6.H.4 Rural residents should have access to a mix of small scale retail sales, personal services and job opportunities within the Clearview Rural Commercial (CRC) designation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spelling out CRC as the 2015 LU policy 6.H.2 is proposed to be repealed and that is where it was previously spelled out.
Policy 6.H.5 Prevent ((strip)) the inappropriate conversion of vacant rural land to sprawling low density commercial development by minimizing and containing infill and redevelopment within the logical outer boundaries of two distinct commercial nodes in the Clearview area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amending policy for greater consistency with GMA provisions for allowing limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRDs) according to RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iv). • Proposed language is consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(5)(c)(iii) “Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area...”
Policy 6.H.6 The boundaries of the Clearview LAMIRDs are shown on the Future Land Use map. The boundaries ((are based on those found in the Cathcart-Maltby-Clearview area plan,)) generally follow parcel lines, and include parcels which meet the following criteria: Subsection (a) The area does not contain extensive critical areas, and Subsection (b) The area is developed with a commercial use which was in existence on or before July 1, 1990; or Subsection (c) The area is zoned Neighborhood Business or Community Business and is a cohesive part of the existing commercial settlement pattern; or Subsection (d) The remaining area constitutes infill, as it is located between and adjacent to two larger areas meeting criteria b) or c) above, or is along the boundary edge and its exclusion would create an irregular boundary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove unnecessary reference to an outdated pre-GMA plan as the criteria in the policy more accurately describes and references rationale for the Clearview LAMIRD boundaries.
Agricultural Lands	
Policy 7.A.3 The county shall designate farmland as required by the GMA, and consider the guidance provided for designating agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housekeeping amendments proposed to update the name of the US NRCS, and to add “subsection” and roman numerals to the policy to be consistent with the rest of the element’s formatting.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>adopted by the State. In addition, farmland designations and expansions of such designations on contiguous lands should be made considering all of the following criteria:</p> <p>Subsection (a) The land is prime farmland as defined by the U.S. ((Soil Conservation Service (SCS))) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) or consists of other Class III soils in the ((SCS)) NRCS capability classification;</p> <p>Subsection (b) The land is shown to be devoted to agriculture by:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">((1-)) i. the adopted future land use map;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">((2-)) ii. a current zoning classification of Agriculture-10 acre; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">((3-)) iii. was identified in the 1982 agriculture land inventory, the 1990 aerial photo interpretation, or the 1991 field identification of land devoted to agriculture;</p> <p>Subsection (c) The land is located outside a UGA;</p> <p>Subsection (d) The land is located outside a sewer service boundary; and</p> <p>Subsection (e) The land consists of a parcel of 10 acres or greater in areas designated as Upland Commercial Farmland or Local Commercial Farmland.</p>	
<p>Policy 7.B.7 The county shall coordinate the use of agricultural resource lands with the preservation and restoration of ecological functions and values by incorporating incentives into reach scale plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding habitat restoration to emphasize that this environmental activity occurs on agricultural designated lands.
<p><u>Policy 7.B.8 Restoring lands back to habitat for anadromous fish and other conservation work shall not be considered as an intrusion of non-agricultural uses into designated agricultural lands.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposed new policy is consistent with GMA planning goals that support farms, the environment, and fish with a special focus on anadromous fish. The county is in the best position to decide, based on local conditions, how to balance competing needs and benefits all planning goals. The policy is also consistent with the MPPs and CPPs such as MPP-DP-32, MPP-DP-39, MPP-DP-41, and CPP CC-4. • One issue of concern to the natural environment in the county is the historic conversion of natural estuary areas into farmland by constructing flood control structures, and the subsequent removal or breaching of these control structures to allow the return of natural inundation processes restoring habitat for anadromous fish. • This policy would allow for the return of estuary habitat along with other habitat within existing agricultural lands. This could provide benefits of additional wildlife habitat, carbon sequestration, and other ecological benefits.
<p>((Policy 7.C.4 The county shall ensure that permitted uses in designated agricultural lands adjacent to airports are compatible with airport operations and requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is proposed for repeal because it is not necessary. It has been implemented in chapter 30.32E SCC and Goal 12 of the Land Use Element consistent with Federal Aviation Administration regulations that impose certain limitations on the height of proposed construction or alteration of structures within an airport compatibility area.
<p>Policy ((7.C.5)) <u>7.C.4</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
<p>Policy ((7.C.6)) <u>7.C.5</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
<p>Policy ((7.C.7)) <u>7.C.6</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
<p>Policy ((7.C.8)) <u>7.C.7</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
<p>Policy ((7.C.9)) <u>7.C.8</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
<p>Policy ((7.C.10)) <u>7.C.9</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Policy ((7.C.11)) 7.C.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
Policy ((7.C.12)) 7.C.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering due to removal of repealed policy.
Policy ((7.C.13)) 7.C.12 The county should promote and encourage the <u>availability and</u> use of Snohomish County agricultural products in local institutions and venues, <u>and in historically and currently marginalized communities.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose to amend policy to prioritize social equity in county programs that promote and market local farm products. Consistent with CPP DP-41 as well as DP-38 and DP-40.
Policy 7.C.13 <u>The county shall support habitat restoration and other conservation projects in agricultural areas where such projects are consistent with integrated floodplain management goals; reduce flooding, stormwater, or channel migration impacts on nearby farmlands up or down stream; mitigate water quality impacts; or support aquifer recharge.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposed new policy is consistent with GMA planning goals that support farms, the environment, and fish with a special focus on anadromous fish. It will be consistent with and support newly proposed policy 7.B.8 by providing more criteria for the habitat restoration and other conservation efforts.
Policy 7.D.1 The county shall continue to study the effectiveness of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program for conservation of agricultural land in the county <u>and implement findings from such studies through policy and regulatory measures that improve the effectiveness of the TDR program, such as reducing barriers to participation, increasing demand, and creating more receiving area capacity within urban areas.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed policy amendment is more assertive and connects findings from studies into action measures. The proposed amendment also provides direction regarding study findings.
((Policy 7.D.7 The county shall conduct a traffic study to identify and assess where traffic interferes with farming.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose to repeal policy as Public Works conducts traffic studies on specific rural arterials on a case by case basis and such issues should be addressed at that time.
Policy ((7.D.8)) 7.D.7 The county shall <u>continue to</u> study methods to decrease and mitigate the negative effects of residential development adjacent to or on designated agricultural land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy as written has been implemented in Chapter 30.32B SCC. Propose to revise policy to encourage further study of potential measures to protect designated farmlands.
Policy 7.D.8 <u>The county shall evaluate and implement strategies that support the preservation of designated farmland. Such strategies to consider include increasing the minimum lot size of the Agriculture-10 acre zone and developing a mitigation process for farms impacted by public projects.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agricultural lands goal in LU 7 is to conserve agriculture and agricultural land through a variety of planning techniques, and objective 7.D indicates that the county shall initiate and continue studies that may result in conservation of agricultural lands. This new policy is proposed to specifically require the county to investigate and then implement strategies to protect farmland. This is consistent with GMA planning goal 8, public input, and the CPPs. • The county received several public comments regarding the need to protect working farms from development in the county. The primary method recommended by the public was to increase of the minimum lot size in the Agriculture-10 acre (A-10) zone to be 40 acres. • The Washington State Food Policy Forum Land Use Policy Action Team with Snohomish County representation recently published a document titled “Land Use Policy Solutions to Stem Agricultural Land Loss” with several land use recommendations, including requiring agricultural impact studies and mitigation when projects would reduce the number of agricultural acres in the county. ¹ • CPP DP-31 states that “The County shall develop strategies and programs to support agricultural and forest activities...Strategies should reduce pressure to convert resource and rural lands...”
Policy 7.D.9 The county shall investigate programs that have the potential to convert farmland for habitat restoration, mitigation, or flood storage, and their resulting long-term effects on agriculture. This investigation shall provide the basis for a subsequent analysis of the effects of such programs on farmland and shall be followed with appropriate policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on investigation of habitat restoration and flood control programs, appropriate policies and regulations must seek to protect both designated farmland and habitat for endangered species particularly anadromous fish.

¹ “Land Use Policy Solutions to Stem Agricultural Land Loss.” *Washington State Food Policy Forum*. December 2022, https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5faf8a950cdaa224e61edad9/639a0526beb8fd8e739605e7_Forum_Land%20Use%20Policy%20Recommendations%20Dec22.pdf

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
and regulations to protect designated commercial farmlands <u>and habitat for threatened or endangered species, primarily anadromous fish.</u>	
Policy 7.D.11 The county shall support habitat restoration and other conservation planning efforts that provide multiple benefits for agriculture and anadromous fish while also recognizing the goals in the Growth Management Act, the Shoreline Management Act, Tribal sovereign rights and Tribal fish habitat restoration planning, locally adopted salmon recovery plans, the Puget Sound Partnership’s Action Agenda, the Southern Resident Killer Whale recovery plans, and locally relevant biological opinions prepared and published by National Marine Fisheries Service in compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposed new policy is consistent with GMA planning goals that support farms, the environment, and fish with a special focus on anadromous fish. It will be consistent and support new proposed policies 7.B.8 and 7.C.13 by acknowledging the regulatory framework around restoration work. • Policy language modified based on public comment suggestions to be inclusive.
((Objective 7.E REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete reference to repealed policies
((Policies 7.E.1 – 7.E.6 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 14-129.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete reference to repealed policies
Forest Lands	
<p>Policy 8.A.2 Commercial Forest and Local Forest lands ((were evaluated considering the factors listed in RCW 36.70A.030(8) and are designated)) shall be designated pursuant to the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.040) ((because they meet all of)) <u>and</u> the following applicable criteria:</p> <p>Subsection (a) Parcel Size (Commercial Forest and Local Forest): (a) A minimum of 40 acres or 1/16th of a section; or (b) parcels less than 40 acres which are zoned Forestry when at least 40 acres are contiguously owned and the land is in a deferred forest or exempt tax status.</p> <p>Subsection (b) Peninsula Width (Commercial Forest only): Peninsulas shall be more than one quarter mile wide.</p> <p>Subsection (c) Island Size (Commercial Forest only): Islands shall be a minimum of 2,000 acres, except that islands shall be a minimum of 40 acres if permanently protected from residential development through the Transfer of Development Rights program.</p> <p>Subsection (d) Tax Classification (Commercial Forest only): Parcels shall currently be in a deferred forest tax status pursuant to RCW 84.33 or RCW 84.34.</p> <p>Subsection (e) Primary Use (Commercial Forest and Local Forest): Land shall be primarily devoted to growing trees for long-term commercial timber production; any FPA permit issued within seven years prior to the date of review of these criteria on a site shall have been issued for commercial forest.</p> <p>Subsection (f) History of Development Permits (Commercial Forest and Local Forest): The land shall not be subject to any vested development applications containing residential lots or densities higher than one unit per 40 acres for Commercial Forest lands and one unit per 20 acres for Local Forest Lands.</p> <p>Subsection (g) Forest Land Cover (Commercial Forest and Local Forest): The land should consist of large forested areas, unless logged within seven years under an FPA permit that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose to amend policy to recognize that the criteria in this policy are to be used for any designation of Commercial and Local Forest Lands beyond the recognition of these criteria as the basis for the original designation of forest resource lands as part of the adoption of the first county GMA comprehensive plan.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>did not indicate change of use, and may not contain densely built residential or agricultural areas.</p> <p>Subsection (h) Forest Land Grades (Commercial Forest and Local Forest): The land should consist primarily of Forest Land Grades one through three as mapped by the Department of Natural Resources.</p> <p>Subsection (i) Exceptions: The only exceptions to these criteria are isolated and uncommon inholdings (parcels surrounded by commercial forest land on all sides).</p>	
<p>Policy 8.A.4 Landowner requests for changes to the Commercial Forest land designation of their property shall be reviewed for their suitability as Commercial Forest land in accordance with the criteria contained in ((GPP)) <u>Land Use</u> policy 8.A.2 as part of the county's ((annual)) <u>docket process to amend the</u> GMA comprehensive plan ((amendment process)).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review of any changes is conducted through the county docket process in Chapter 30.74 SCC. Proposed revisions to policy reflect this process as well as reformatting changes to the Comprehensive Plan.
<p>((Policy 8.B.3 The builders of new dwellings proposed to be located on designated Commercial Forest lands or on parcels adjacent to designated Commercial Forest lands shall provide adequate access for fire vehicles.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is proposed for repeal because it is unnecessary. It is implemented in the county fire code, Chapter 30.53A SCC, and Policy LU 8.C.2, as amended, includes a requirement for fire protection of new dwellings on forest lands.
<p>Policy ((8.B.4)) <u>8.B.3</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to deleted policies.
<p>Policy ((8.B.5)) <u>8.B.4</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to deleted policies.
<p>Policy ((8.B.6)) <u>8.B.5</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to deleted policies.
<p>Policy ((8.B.7)) <u>8.B.6</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to deleted policies
<p>Policy 8.C.2 Residential development should be strongly discouraged within designated Commercial Forest lands. However, nothing in this policy shall be construed to prevent the owner of designated Commercial Forest land from living on ((his/her)) <u>their</u> land, provided that applicable building <u>and fire protection</u> requirements are met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to retain policy and combine with intent of Policy LU 8.D.3. Proposed revision to make language more inclusive.
<p>Policy 8.C.4 ((Incentives should be established)) <u>The county shall consider incentives</u> to encourage landowners to continue commercial forest management of designated Commercial Forest lands.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to retain policy direction to encourage consideration of additional incentives to promote commercial forest land management.
<p>((Policy 8.D.2 Designated Commercial Forest land and land adjacent to designated Commercial Forest land that was previously subdivided but not yet developed for residential use should be considered for replat as a rural cluster subdivision.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy unnecessary and outdated, proposed for repeal. Option is always available to landowner to develop per the regulations, although rural cluster subdivisions are not permitted in Commercial Forest land pursuant to Chapter 30.41C SCC.
<p>((Policy 8.D.3 New dwellings on all designated commercial forest lands and lands adjacent to designated Commercial Forest lands shall meet fire protection standards.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal and combine with LU Policy 8.C.2.
<p>((Policy 8.D.4 Land uses on or adjacent to designated Commercial Forest land shall be sited and designed to minimize trespassing, dumping of garbage, forest fire hazards, and complaints against forest management activities.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal policy. Policy implemented through code enforcement of illegal land uses, criminal activities, public hazards, and nuisances in Chapter 30.85 SCC and through the notice and disclosure requirements in Chapter 30.32A SCC which is provided to adjacent property owners.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Mineral Lands</p> <p>Policy 9.A.1 The county shall use the "Prospect Identification and Preliminary Classification" inventory report and maps completed December 1998, and as subsequently revised and updated based on further site-specific geologic data, to identify sand, gravel and bedrock resources potentially eligible for designation as mineral resource land. Determination of eligibility for designation considers the following criteria:</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (a) physical properties of the resource including quality and type;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (b) depth of the resource;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (c) depth of the overburden; and</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (d) life of the resource.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping amendment to match formatting with the rest of the element.
<p>Policy 9.A.2 The county shall exclude selected mineral resources identified on the inventory from potential designation because of legal, environmental or policy conflicts. Lands which shall be excluded are those:</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (a) located within incorporated city, Urban Growth Area, or National Forest boundaries;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (b) identified as Tribal Trust, including Tulalip Tribal Trust, and Restricted Fee Lands;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (c) developed at densities greater than or equal to 0.15 lot per acre (average lot size of 6.67 acres) in neighborhoods with 5 or more homes;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (d) containing hard-to-replace public facilities (cemeteries, schools/colleges, hospitals, libraries, parks and trails);</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (e) designated Riverway Commercial Farmland, Upland Commercial Farmland, or Local Commercial Farmland by the Snohomish County comprehensive plan;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (f) designated as a shoreline environment by the Snohomish County Shoreline Management Master Program;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (g) located within a 300-foot Chinook Salmon/Bull Trout corridor;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (h) located within a 100-year floodplain;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (i) isolated islands less than 10 acres, except as provided in 9.A.3; and/or</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (j) land with 5-acre or smaller underlying land use designation and/or zoning, except in cases in which the landowner requests mineral resource designation and the site otherwise meets the criteria in 9.A.1 and 9.A.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping amendment to match formatting with the rest of the element. Proposed amendment within subsection b to be responsive to public comments and more inclusive of different types of Tribal lands.
<p>Policy 9.A.3 The county shall consider proposals for mineral resource designations or extraction on islands less than 10 acres under the following conditions:</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (a) the resource is needed for emergency purposes;</p> <p>((•)) Subsection (b) the resource is of an exceptional quality needed to satisfy requirements of a specific project;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping amendment to match formatting with the rest of the element.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((*) Subsection (c) the resource, including precious metals, is part of an official mining claim within the boundaries of the National Forest; or</p> <p>((*) Subsection (d) the landowner requests mineral resource designation and the site otherwise meets all criteria in 9.A.1 and 9.A.2.</p>	
<p>Policy 9.A.9 Certain undesignated lands are eligible for permitting by the county under the following conditions:</p> <p>((*) Subsection (a) expansion of existing legally established mineral operations onto adjacent undesignated land where a portion of the existing site has been designated <u>MRO</u> ((or zoned Mineral Conservation)));</p> <p>((*) Subsection (b) private actions within National Forest boundaries for extraction of mineral resources, including precious metals, where the proponent's rights to the minerals have been acknowledged by the Bureau of Land Management; or</p> <p>((*) Subsection (c) mining activities allowed and subject to standards of the Shoreline Management Program as an integral part of certain projects, including, but not limited to:</p> <p>((*) i. Ecological restoration or enhancement</p> <p>((*) ii. Flood hazard management</p> <p>((*) iii. To alleviate an emergency situation</p> <p>((*) iv. For use in forest practices</p> <p>((*) v. Removal of mineral resources deposited above the ordinary high water mark by flood events onto designated agricultural lands under the county's comprehensive plan for the purpose of maintaining or restoring land for agricultural activities; or</p> <p>((*) vi. Dredging.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revisions to policy as the Mineral Conservation zone was deleted by Ord. 21-060. Housekeeping amendment to match formatting with the rest of the element.
<p>Policy 9.C.1 ((A mineral lands notice ordinance shall require that all)) <u>All</u> plats, short plats, development permits, and building permits issued for development activities on or within two thousand feet of lands designated as mineral resource <u>shall</u> contain a notice that the subject property is within or near designated mineral resource lands on which a variety of commercial activities may occur that are not compatible with residential development for certain periods of limited duration. ((The notice shall also inform that an application might be made for mining related activities, including mining, extraction, washing, crushing, stockpiling, blasting, transporting, and recycling of minerals.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to retain portions of this policy for code authorization. Chapter 30.32C SCC contains mineral lands notice and disclosure requirements.
<p>((Policy 9.C.2 The county shall maintain five-acre or larger minimum lot size comprehensive plan designations of rural lands adjacent to designated mineral resource lands.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is redundant as all rural residential land in the county is designated for one dwelling unit per 5 or more acres or larger according to the Future Land Use map. Revisions to the Future Land Use map to allow rural residential areas with densities greater than 1 du/5 acres would result in an increase of county's rural population capacity inconsistent with the Regional Growth strategy to reduce the county's rural population growth target.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>((Policy 9.C.3 The county shall require the use of rural cluster subdivision for subdivision of rural residential lands (e.g. 1 du/5 acres, 1 du/10 acres, or 1 du/20 acres) adjacent to designated mineral resource lands. Residential lots within the development shall be located as far as possible from designated resource lands.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose for repeal as policy has not been implemented and doing so may encourage an increase in rural population. An increase in the county's rural population capacity would be inconsistent with the Regional Growth strategy to reduce the county's rural population growth target.
<p>((Policy 9.C.4 The county shall consider open space, forestry, rural industry, agriculture or recreational uses as preferred land uses on parcels adjacent to designated mineral resource lands in future amendments to the comprehensive plan.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy has not been implemented and many of those listed land uses are currently allowed in rural and resource zones adjacent to mineral resource lands. Open space is not considered a land use. Further, mineral lands are not permanent as after aggregate is extracted and reclamation occurs, the MRO would be removed to allow for future uses. Recommend repeal of this policy.
<p>Policy 9.D.1 The county shall adequately address and mitigate on-site and off-site impacts of mineral operations and transporting in the permit review process. ((Impact assessment shall include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of impacts to the natural environment and critical areas both on and off-site with particular attention to geologic hazards, impacts to groundwater used for potable supply, and fish habitat; • Evaluation of impacts to adjacent properties including use compatibility, health, safety and welfare; and • Evaluation of traffic impacts including safety, congestion, road characteristics and conditions, and non-vehicular users along roads impacted by large trucks generated by mineral operations taking into consideration the size, weight and performance characteristics of the large trucks.)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to retain the policy intent and remove the regulation specific language.
<p>((Policy 9.D.2 As part of the permit review process for mineral extraction and processing uses, the county shall consider the impact analysis completed for this plan's environmental documents, which identifies areas with moderate to high land use, watershed and/or transportation impacts, when requesting information for permit applications, making threshold determinations or preparing site-specific environmental documents.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit review procedures guided by code and SEPA including the standards for excavation and processing of minerals in Chapter 30.32C SCC. Policy proposed for repeal.
<p>((Policy 9.D.3 The county will evaluate transportation and hauling impacts as part of an individual site specific permit application.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit review procedures guided by code and SEPA and include transportation analysis. Policy proposed for repeal.
<p>Policy ((9.D.4)) 9.D.2 The county shall continue to coordinate with the mineral industry and ((stake holder groups)) other key parties to ((develop)) maintain a mineral lands strategy addressing education and outreach; data collection and tracking; and economic development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to revise language to indicate that the strategy has been created, and now must be maintained. Housekeeping amendment to include more inclusive language.
<p>Policy ((9.D.5)) 9.D.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-number due to deleted policies.
<p>((Policy 9.D.6 Application of the criteria in policy 9.A.2 results in elimination of Shorelines of the State from mineral resource designation. Therefore, proposals including mineral operations within Shorelines of the State shall not be eligible for permits from the county.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCC 30.67.560 allows for some mining in the shoreline jurisdiction when integral to restoration, flood hazard management, emergency situations, forest practices, etc. Propose to repeal policy to be consistent with Shoreline Management Act and the County's Shoreline Management Plan.
<p>((Policy 9.E.3 The county shall coordinate with affected jurisdictions when reviewing new applications for mineral operations.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to repeal and combine with LU Policy 9.E.1

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Open Space, Shoreline and Scenic Resources	
<p>Policy 10.A.1 The county shall consider the following features for inclusion in an open space system:</p> <p>Subsection (a) natural or scenic resource areas;</p> <p>Subsection (b) water supply protection areas (public watersheds) and natural drainage easements;</p> <p>Subsection (c) urban and rural landscaped areas, such as public or private golf courses, public or private school yards, cemeteries, ((active)) parks, and arboretums;</p> <p>Subsection (d) public and private ((low intensity)) park and recreation sites such as wildlife preserves, <u>priority habitat areas</u>, nature reservations, sanctuaries, or hiking, equestrian and biking trails;</p> <p>Subsection (e) land reserved as open space, <u>critical areas</u>, or <u>critical area</u> buffer as part of development;</p> <p>Subsection (f) cultural, archaeological, geologic, and historic sites;</p> <p>Subsection (g) major multi-functional river corridors (Snoqualmie, Snohomish, Skykomish and Stillaguamish valleys) and other water bodies including Puget Sound, major lakes, ((and)) major tributaries, <u>and associated floodplains</u>;</p> <p>Subsection (h) linear open space such as utility and trail corridors; Subsection (i) land designated open space under the Open Space General Criteria established according to SCC 4.28.040 for tax assessment purposes;</p> <p>Subsection (j) lands that link existing open space and recreation areas; and</p> <p>Subsection (k) lands that form open space corridors within and between urban growth areas; and ((+))</p> <p><u>Subsection (l) designated commercial forest and commercial farmland on the Future Land Use Map.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revisions to remove “active” and “low intensity” from the description of parks because non-active or passive as well as high intensity parks are all still open space and can therefore be considered a part of the open space network. Propose addition of priority habitat and critical areas in line with the Regional Open Space Plan’s “natural lands” designation that includes important habitat and species areas, land managed for ecological benefit, and regional parks. Proposed addition of floodplains in line with the Regional Open Space Plan’s “aquatic systems” designation that includes 100 or 500 year floodplain areas, areas within 200 feet of a river corridor important for salmon recovery, areas within 200 feet of a shoreline containing a feeder bluff, areas within 200 feet of a shoreline containing spawning areas for forage fish, land supporting source of drinking water tidelands, and sub-tidal containing eelgrass. <p>Proposed addition of designated commercial forest and commercial farmland because it is not clear that subsection (a) includes these areas specifically. Further, the addition is consistent with the Regional Open Space Plan’s “farmland” and “working forest” designations. The farmland designation is inclusive of areas designated for agriculture, lands currently farmed within ½ mile of ag zone, and lands currently farmed that contained at least 5 acres of prime farmland soil. The working forest designation is inclusive of privately owned timber lands, state owned timber land, and national forest timber lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilizing the Regional Open Space Plan within the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with MPP-En-12, “Identify, preserve, and enhance significant regional open space networks and linkages across jurisdictional boundaries through implementation and update of the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan.”
<p>Objective LU 10.B Develop plans and techniques to preserve open space, <u>green spaces</u>, and scenic resources <u>that incorporate the Puget Sound Regional Council Regional Open Space Conservation Plan.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revision consistent with new CPP Env-3 which states, “The County and cities shall work collaboratively to create goals and policies intended to implement and address the needs identified in the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan.”
<p>Policy 10.B.3 The county ((shall)) <u>should</u> pursue joint ventures with cities, school districts, <u>conservation districts, nonprofit organizations, Tribal partners</u>, and private land developers to ((exploit)) <u>create</u> joint use opportunities for <u>the preservation of</u> open space and ((recreation)) <u>public access areas</u>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revision consistent with what new CPP Env-3 states. Additionally, staff have heard from the public that there are opportunities to partner with non-profits and other agencies to help manage County land. Proposed to revise “shall” to “should” based on feedback from Parks that while they always reach out to partners, they don’t always receive responses. Proposing to revise word “exploit” as it comes with negative connotations.
<p>((Policy 10.B.4 The county shall work with cities to create an integrated system of passive and active parks, open spaces, and trails in areas which are accessible to all residents of the county and cities, and provide for a variety of recreational activities, and contribute to neighborhood or community identity.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move policy to the Parks and Recreation Element where it is a better fit.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Policy ((10.B.5)) <u>10.B.4</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy ((10.B.6)) <u>10.B.5</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy ((10.B.7)) <u>10.B.6</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy ((10.B.8)) <u>10.B.7</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy ((10.B.9)) <u>10.B.8</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
Policy ((10.B.10)) <u>10.B.9</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renumbering
<p><u>Policy 10.B.10 The County shall support the preservation of open spaces, especially in and near centers and within historically and currently marginalized communities.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing policies under objective 10.B do not discuss the preservation of urban open spaces or those near underserved communities. This new policy is supported by the new CPPs DP-35 and DP-38, as well as revised DP-40, Env-2, Env-3, and MPP-En-15. • New CPP DP-35 states, “Jurisdictions should identify and plan for the development of parks, civic places, and public spaces, especially in or adjacent to centers.” • New CPP DP-38 reads, “The County and cities should reduce disparities in access to opportunity for all residents through inclusive community planning and making investments that meet the needs of current and future residents and businesses.” • Revised CPP Env-2 ends with, “ensure that all residents have access to parks and open space.” • New CPP Env-3 reads, “The County and cities shall work collaboratively to create goals and policies intended to implement and address the needs identified in the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan.” • MPP-En-15, “Provide parks, trails, and open space within walking distance of urban residents. Prioritize historically underserved communities for open space improvements and investments.”
Cultural Resources	
<p>Policy 11.C.4 The county shall <u>continue to coordinate</u> ((cooperate)) with the Snohomish County Arts Commission in their discussions and research regarding the potential for cultural tourism, economic development, and acquisition of public art through the commission’s arts program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Snohomish County Arts Commission was previously a separate entity but has been incorporated into Snohomish County government as an advisory board. Revisions are proposed to reflect this shift.
Airport Compatibility	
<p>Policy 12.A.1 The county shall ((work with the owners and managers of public use airports to identify and designate)) <u>maintain</u> criteria identifying incompatible land uses in the vicinity of public use airports and how they should be discouraged through ((the adoption of)) zoning and development regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed revisions to reflect the County’s adoption of airport compatibility regulations in 2015.
<p>Policy 12.A.2 The county shall work with the owners and managers of public use airports <u>and the public</u> ((identify areas)) <u>maintain the airport compatibility area (ACA)</u> where incompatible uses ((should be)) <u>are</u> discouraged.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed revisions to reflect the County’s adoption of airport compatibility regulations in 2015. • Proposed revision to include the public in the process.
<p>Policy 12.B.1 The county shall ((develop a process to)) <u>maintain the process to</u> notify property owners within Airport Influence Areas that their property is located adjacent to a public use airport and may experience impacts from airport operations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed revisions to reflect the County’s adoption of airport compatibility regulations in 2015.
<p>Policy 12.C.2 The county shall ((consult with stakeholders to develop)) <u>maintain</u> regulations that require proof of an airspace analysis pursuant to Federal Aviation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed revisions to reflect the County’s adoption of airport compatibility regulations in 2015.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Administration regulations before issuing permits for projects that are developed adjacent to public use airports.	
Transfer of Development Rights	
Policy 14.A.4 The county may designate additional sending areas, <u>particularly eligible rural lands</u> , for the countywide TDR program by interlocal agreement, development agreement, or code amendment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed revisions to emphasize the need to consider eligible rural lands as potential TDR sending areas in order to protect high value rural designated resource lands.
Policy 14.A.5 The county council may by motion designate additional sending areas, particularly rural lands, if it finds that the area to be designated has significant conservation, watershed, habitat, open space, or natural resource values, or its conservation meets other state and regionally adopted priorities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposed amendment provides the policy direction to support SCC 30.35A.025(4) which authorizes the County Council to consider a landowner request to designate additional TDR sending areas, including rural areas, that meet one or more significant conservation, open space, habitat, watershed or resource values.
Policy ((14.A.5)) <u>14.A.6</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
Policy ((14.A.6)) <u>14.A.7</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
<p>Policy ((14.A.7)) 14.A.8 Receiving areas shall include:</p> <p>Subsection (a) ((+)) all cities, consistent with the regional program ((and)) <u>or</u> interlocal agreements;</p> <p>Subsection (b) ((+)) all county-designated urban centers;</p> <p>Subsection (c) ((+)) all rural areas where changes in zoning after the effective date of the countywide TDR program increase the maximum allowable number of residential lots or units; and</p> <p>Subsection (d) ((+)) all areas where legislative changes to the comprehensive plan or development regulations after the effective date of the countywide TDR program increase the maximum allowable number of multi-family residential units or provide other incentives for the use of TDR. Property designated or zoned for single family residential development and townhouse unit lot subdivisions are exempt from TDR requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This amendment is a proposed technical correction. As the county is a participant in the regional TDR program, it is not required to enter into an interlocal agreement with cities to allow the transfer of credits from county TDR sending areas unless the city so desires. An interlocal agreement is only an option if desired by either the county or the city. Proposed housekeeping to update the format of the subsections to match the rest of the Land Use element.
Policy ((14.A.8)) <u>14.A.9</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
Policy ((14.A.9)) <u>14.A.10</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
Policy ((14.A.10)) <u>14.A.11</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
Policy ((14.A.11)) <u>14.A.12</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
Policy ((14.A.12)) <u>14.A.13</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering
<p>((Policy 14.A.13 Snohomish County shall support city annexation of a TDR receiving area only when an adopted interlocal agreement provides that the area shall remain a TDR receiving area or that other areas of the city shall be designated as TDR receiving areas so that the city will provide equivalent or greater capacity for receiving TDR credits as provided by the county for that area.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose to move this policy verbatim to the new annexation objective (LU policy 1.E.5)
<p>((Policy 14.A.14 Create a citizens policy advisory committee to identify and recommend additional incentives for TDR, possibly including but not limited to a public benefit rating system, an in-lieu fee program as an alternative to purchasing TDR credits on the open</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This action item was completed and the policy can now be deleted. A TDR advisory committee was formed in 2017 and the committee presented its recommendations for additional TDR incentives to the County later that year.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
market, and form-based zoning. The advisory committee recommendations shall include a timeline for consideration of additional incentives.)	
((Objective 14.D REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 17-050.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove repealed objective.
((Policies 14.D.1 – 14.D.6 REPEALED BY AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 17-050.))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove repealed policy
Policy ((14.E)) 14.D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.1)) 14.D.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.2)) 14.D.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.3)) 14.D.3 Agricultural and forest lands as defined in RCW 36.70A.170 shall be eligible for conservation through the PDR program. Other lands, <u>particularly rural lands</u> having high natural resource, environmental or open space values, may also be determined eligible for conservation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposed amendment seeks to emphasize that rural lands, in addition to agricultural and forest lands, shall be considered for conservation through the TDR program. Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.4)) 14.D.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.5)) 14.D.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.6)) 14.D.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Policy ((14.E.7)) 14.D.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renumbering due to repealed objective and policies.
Future Land Use Map Designations	
<p>Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR).</p> <p>This designation allows a ((combination)) variety of housing types, including detached homes on small lots, townhouses, and apartments in medium density ((, multi-family residential)) developments. Implementing zones: MHP, LDMR, PRD-LDMR, Townhouse, R-7,200, PRD-7,200 and WFB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposed amendment clarifies the types of residential development that are allowed in the UMDR designation.
<p>((Supplemental Designations of ULDR Areas (Map 6) REPEALED BY ORDINANCE NO. 16-065.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping.
<p>Urban Commercial (UC).</p> <p>This designation identifies commercial designations within the UGA which allow a wide range of commercial as well as residential uses. Implementing zones: Neighborhood Business, Planned Community Business, Community Business, General Commercial, and Business Park. In the Southwest County UGA, no rezones to General Commercial shall be approved outside of the State Route 99 corridor. In the Maltby UGA, the implementing zoning is limited to the Planned Community Business Zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping. Moves the Maltby UGA specific implementing zone language from policy LU 5.B.8 to FLU Map designation section for consistency.
<p>Urban Industrial (UI).</p> <p>This designation identifies industrial and manufacturing areas in UGAs. Implementing zones: Business Park, Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial and Industrial Park. In the Lake Stevens UGA, the implementing zoning is limited to Business Park and Heavy Industrial, ((and)) in the Snohomish UGA ((,)) the implementing zoning is limited to Business Park and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping. Moves the Maltby UGA specific implementing zone language from policy LU 5.B.8 to FLU Map designation section for consistency.

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
Industrial Park, <u>and in the Maltby UGA the implementing zoning is limited to the Light Industrial and Industrial Park zones.</u>	
<p>Mixed-Use Corridor (MUC).</p> <p><u>This designation identifies a higher density corridor within the Urban Core Subarea that contains a mix of residential and non-residential uses, and whose location and development are coordinated with the regional high capacity transportation system. The implementing zone is Mixed-Use Corridor.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing automobile-oriented commercial corridors served by current or planned bus rapid transit within the Urban Core Subarea which will have access to planned light rail stations provide an opportunity for infill and redevelopment of large surface parking areas to take advantage of improved accessibility and mobility for future residents and businesses.
<p>((Transit Pedestrian Village.</p> <p>This designation identifies a compact, walkable area around an existing or planned high capacity transit station. The county shall prepare and adopt a conceptual or master plan showing how the area could enhance and support the high capacity transit station. The implementing zone is Urban Center.))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transit pedestrian village concept is now obsolete given that light rail station-area planning is superseding this concept.
<p>Light Rail Community (LRC).</p> <p><u>This designation identifies a higher density area that contains a mix of residential and non-residential uses, served by local multi-modal and active transportation systems, and whose location and development are coordinated with the regional light rail transportation system. The implementing zone is Urban Center.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizes that current Urban Center designated areas around future light rail stations should be planned to support higher densities than existing or new Urban Center designated areas served by other types of transit.
<p>Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC).</p> <p>This overlay identifies the unincorporated portion of major regionally-designated employment areas. MICs are intended to include intensive, concentrated manufacturing and industrial land uses which are not easily mixed with other uses. Notwithstanding the ((Vision 2040)) <u>VISION 2050</u> guidelines for MIC designations, land uses and zoning of Paine Field continue to be governed by the Snohomish County Airport Paine Field Master Plan and Title 30 SCC consistent with federal aviation policies and grant obligations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping amendment to remove obsolete reference to Vision 2040.
<p>Subsection (2) Use of P/IU designation in conjunction with a UGA expansion.</p> <p>All residential, commercial, or industrial UGA expansions are subject to the requirements of LU ((1.A.10)) <u>1.A.9</u>. Institutional UGA expansions are allowed subject to the requirements of LU ((1.A.10)) <u>1.A.9</u>, provided that the land added to a UGA is designated P/IU concurrent with or prior to the UGA expansion. Subsequent re-designations of land added to a UGA under the P/IU designation are subject to the applicable requirements of LU ((1.A.10)) <u>1.A.9</u> for residential, commercial, or industrial UGA expansions. Where land added to a UGA is designated P/IU, the implementing zone will be R-7,200, R-8,400, or R-9,600. <u>For land added to the Darrington UGA or Gold Bar UGA as part of a UGA expansion or adjustment, the implementing zone may be R-12,500.</u> When applied to land designated P/IU concurrent with or prior to a UGA expansion, these implementing zones shall allow only churches, schools, parks, government buildings, utility plants and other government operations or properties unless the land is re-designated to urban commercial, residential, or industrial in compliance with the UGA expansion requirements of LU ((1.A.10)) <u>1.A.9</u>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision to account for the renumbering within Objective 1.A that changed LU policy 1.A.10 to 1.A.9. Allows for R-12,500 zoning to be applied as an implementing zone for P/IU designations applied in areas added to the Darrington and Gold Bar UGAs, which do not have sanitary sewer systems.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed ((removed text))	Findings
<p>Overlapping Designations.</p> <p>There may be sites within the UGA where more than one land use designation is appropriate to permit a greater range of potential implementing zones. In particular, some sites meeting the criteria enumerated in Policy LU ((2.C.1)) 2.E.1 may be appropriately developed or redeveloped for a land use permitted in the implementing zones for either designation. In these situations, the county may utilize overlapping land use designations for particular sites or areas on the Future Land Use Map. On sites having overlapping land use designations, a change of zoning from an implementing zone in one designation to an implementing zone in the other designation may <u>be</u> requested through a rezone application without the need for a comprehensive plan amendment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housekeeping. Current policy reference should have been to LU 2.E.1, not LU 2.C.1. The reference is erroneous because the designation references overlapping designations which are not discussed in LU policy 2.C.1 although it is discussed in LU policy 2.E.1. There is also a proposed grammatical revision.
<p>Low Density Rural Residential (LDRR: 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres).</p> <p>This designation includes lands that have been zoned Forestry but are not designated as Commercial Forest Land in the ((GPP)) Comprehensive Plan. This designation is intended to be a partial basis for a future Rural Resource Transition designation which could provide for transition areas between rural residential lands and natural resource lands of long-term commercial significance. Future ((GPP)) Comprehensive Plan amendments will determine the feasibility of such a designation as well as its extent and future minimum lot size requirements. The existing Forestry zone will continue to remain in place until any ((GPP)) Comprehensive Plan amendments and implementing regulations for this designation are adopted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will no longer be a separate GPP in the Plan.
<p>Rural Residential-10 (Resource Transition) (RR-10-RT: 1 dwelling unit per 10 or more acres).</p> <p>This designation includes lands which were included in Forestry designations on pre-GMA subarea plans but not zoned Forestry and includes: (1) lands on the Tulalip Reservation adjacent to or in close proximity to lands designated for forestry or agriculture use by the ((GPP)) Comprehensive Plan and the Tulalip Tribes' Comprehensive Plan, and (2) lands adjacent to the estuary of Quilceda Creek. The implementing zone is the RRT-10 zone.</p> <p>Existing zones within this designation, except where located on the Tulalip Reservation, may remain, but zoning regulations shall limit the minimum lot size in new subdivisions within this designation to 10 acres with an option for using the rural cluster subdivision technique. On the Tulalip Reservation only, lands designated RR-10-RT are zoned RRT-10. The RRT-10 zone requires a minimum lot size of 10 acres for each house in a new subdivision. The rural cluster subdivision technique may be used in the RRT-10 zone.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will no longer be a separate GPP in the Plan.
<p>Rural Residential-10 (RR-10: 1 dwelling unit per 10 or more acres).</p> <p>This designation includes lands which have been previously designated agriculture in pre-GMA subarea comprehensive plans or zoned Agriculture-10 Acre. The existing Agricultural-10 Acre zone will continue to remain in place until the ((GPP)) Comprehensive Plan is amended in the future and implementing regulations for this designation are adopted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will no longer be a separate GPP in the Plan.

Attachment A: Policy Summary Table

Proposed Draft Policy: Proposed <u>new text</u> and proposed (removed text)	Findings
This category provides for an alternative rural lot size and possible set of uses which can accommodate a wider variety of rural uses and lots, be used where hazardous and critical areas require lower density and be applied as a transition category between resource lands/critical areas and rural residential/urban areas.	

DRAFT