



2016 Docket Report

King County Comprehensive Plan

December 2016

I. About the Docket Process

The King County Docket was established in 1998 in accordance with K.C.C. 20.18.140 to provide an opportunity for residents of the county to register comments on the *King County Comprehensive Plan* and associated development regulations. The county responds to each item registered on the Docket, providing a feedback loop, as required by RCW 36.70A.470. Docket forms are available on the King County website, at several county department offices, and at county-sponsored public meetings where land use and development issues are being discussed. The Docket is open continuously and, each June 30, the items registered in the previous twelve months are compiled into the Docket report for release on December 1 to the King County Council.

II. Summary of Submittal

King County received one item for the Docket that closed on June 30, 2016. The following requested change was submitted:

<i>Name of Requestor:</i>	Gary Remlinger
<i>Council District:</i>	District 3, Councilmember Lambert
<i>Summary Category:</i>	Four to One Proposal – Requires Land Use and Zoning Changes
<i>Submitted Request:</i>	Four to One to provide permanent open space/farmlands and provide urban lands for development. Parcel numbers 1525079049, 1525079005 and 1525079010. These are all zoned Rural Area 10.
<i>Submitted Information:</i>	No additional information was submitted.

III. Background Information on Submittal

A. Maps


i. Vicinity Map



ii. Site Map



iii. Zoning Map



B. Prior Analysis

The "concept" of a Four to One at this location was included in the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Scope of Work Motion 14531, and was the subject of Area Zoning and Land Use Study #12. The Study contains an analysis of the policy context, topic-specific mapping, parcel-level information, a brief summary of public comment, and an Executive Recommendation. The recommendation stated:

IV. Conclusion and Recommendation

According to the King County 2014 Buildable Lands Report, the existing Carnation Urban Growth Area has sufficient capacity to accommodate forecasted growth (approximately 470 unit surplus) through 2031. There are large parcels in the northwest corner of Carnation's UGA zoned for development at six units per acre upon annexation to the City. These properties are currently zoned Urban Reserve (one unit per five acres) but would be eligible for the higher density zoning upon annexation.

While these parcels are not needed for capacity reasons, there may be a public benefit in allowing some urban growth through a Four-to-One, which would result in the permanent conservation of rural and/or agricultural lands that would serve as a buffer to other agricultural properties recently acquired by King County. It would also allow the City to increase its residential base, which was noted as a reason for the City's support of this proposal.

Were this proposal to be submitted, King County has an interest in protecting the adjacent Agricultural Production District from development pressure through a permanent buffer, protecting views from the valley floor from incompatible hillside development, preferring that the dedicated open space be in a contiguous parcel, allowing access to the new urban development in a manner that does not compromise the adjacent agricultural district's access on the eastern edge, and ensuring that the new urban development uses the land efficiently.

Recommendation:

Do not expand the Urban Growth Area boundary at this time, but consider a Four-to-One proposal, consistent with the aforementioned interests, should the property owner apply.


Study #12 can be found on the Comprehensive Plan website at www.kingcounty.gov/compplan/; look at the 2016 Executive Recommended Plan "Area Zoning Study Attachment" for more information. The full set of public comments can also be found within the "Public Participation Report Attachment" on the same website.

C. New Information

While this concept was analyzed in the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan, the Docket Request provided more detail in the form of a map proposing the delineation of the proposed new urban land and the proposed new open space land. The map submitted with the Docket was subsequently modified by the property owner, and the revised map¹ is the subject of this report.

¹ The revised map is identical to the map included by the King County Council in their November 28, 2016 Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing Notice.

i. Proposed Boundary




ii. Zoning

The parcels are **currently classified as farm & agricultural** land per *Revised Code of Washington Chapter 84.34 - Open Space, Agricultural, Timberlands – Current Use – Conservation Futures*. If the property were to be developed, any portion no longer qualifying for a current use program would be subject to a compensating tax and be removed from the open space program. A compensating tax would not be imposed on the portion(s) transferred to County ownership, pursuant to RCW 84.34.108, primarily because the land will remain in agricultural or open space uses.

The parcels are also in King County's **Lake Joy Rural Forest Focus Area**. Rural Forest Focus Areas are large contiguous blocks of forest land in the rural area and a suite of policies² in the Comprehensive Plan provide guidance to the types of development preferred on these lands. These lands are shown on the Agricultural and Forest Lands map in the Comprehensive Plan, as shown below.

² King County Comprehensive Plan R-207, R-208, R-309, P-116. Transfer of Development Rights policies: R-316 and R-318.

Figure: Excerpt from Agricultural and Forest Lands Map, 2016 Comprehensive Plan




Rural Forest Focus Area lands are encouraged for small-scale forestry, maintenance of forest cover and the practice of sustainable forestry in large, contiguous blocks, and should be maintained in parcels of 20 acres through regulations and/or incentives.³ Consideration of this designation is discussed in Section 5 – Analysis of Proposal, in concert with the evaluation of the proposed Four to One related to the Four to One program criteria.

³ King County Code, 21A.04.060 Rural area zone and 21A.06.1014 Rural forest focus areas. Incentives for preserving these lands are embedded in the County's Transfer of Development Rights program. To be able to develop a Rural Area-2.5 zoned parcel, in most circumstances, a property owner needs to purchase development rights from Rural Forest Focus Areas. Through the Transfer of Development Rights program, rights can be sold from these parcels; the County has used this tool to protect about 2,000 acres of these lands through the purchase of about 375 development rights.

iii. Updated Landslide Hazard maps

In 2016, King County published updated Potential Landslide Hazard maps. Shown below is the change in extent between the 2016 and 1990 Landslide Hazard maps for the subject parcels.



The 2016 Potential Landslide Hazard polygon much more closely mirrors the topography and covers a more significant portion of the site. Importantly, nearly all of the new urban area proposed by the property owner (shown previously on page 4) is within the 2016 Landslide Hazard Zone. While the maps do not purport to identify actual landslide hazards or existing landslide risks for specific properties, depending upon the nature of any proposed development, they inform the potential need for, or requirement for, further evaluation of the landslide hazard by a licensed geological engineer or engineering geologist. See *Required Studies and Potential Approval Conditions* below.

D. Chronology of 2016 Docket Request

City of Carnation Resolution of Support. One component of the Four to One Program is that the City adjacent to the newly created urban area agrees to add it to their Potential Annexation Area. On June 7, 2016, the Carnation City Council adopted a resolution expressing support for adding these three parcels into the urban growth area. The City's resolution was silent on adding these parcels to their Potential Annexation Area. Per the King County Code, this would be a condition if this Four to One were approved.

Proponent Submittal of Docket. Following submittal of this Docket on June 28, 2016, the request was reviewed for eligibility and policy considerations by the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget. Given that an Area Zoning and Land use Study had been completed (as noted previously) and the site was already deemed eligible, it was referred to the Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER) on July 1, 2016 for site-specific analysis, review and processing as a potential discretionary land use amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

County Request to Schedule a Pre-Application Meeting. DPER contacted the property owner on July 7, 2016 and provided them with information on the process and notifying them of the need to schedule a Pre-Application Meeting. The purpose of this meeting, in the context of the Four to One program, is to inform applicants of the information they need to provide to allow King County to

determine site suitability and feasibility, and identify which portions of the site are best suited for urban development and identify which portions are best suited for open space dedication through a conservation easement. Receiving this information allows the Executive to make an informed recommendation to the County Council on whether to support the proposal.

County Site Visit. In late September, permission for a site visit was granted from the property owner and a site visit occurred on September 28, 2016. The site visit was intended to be general in nature and not include the typical technical level of evaluation associated with a formal plat application. County staff visited the site; however, because permission to access the site via a private road from the north was not provided by the applicant, County staff conducted a "visual" site visit, looking at the site over the fence separating the subject parcels from the Estates at Snoqualmie Valley (Carnation plat).

Pre-Application Meeting. In mid-October, the property owner scheduled the Pre-Application Meeting and the meeting occurred on November 2, 2016. At the meeting, County staff provided information gathered at the visual site visit (discussed below). Attendees at the meeting included the property owner and their consultants, King County staff,⁴ and staff from the City of Carnation. As noted above, the purpose of a Pre-Application Meeting is to discuss the project, share information, and identify information that the applicant needs to submit to allow the County to review and process the proposed Four to One Project.

IV. Analysis of Proposal

Four to One Projects have typically developed in unincorporated King County and, while the King County Code requires that the area be added to a City's Potential Annexation, it does not require that the site develop within the City, nor does it require annexation. Given this, the Pre-Application Meeting focused on plat requirements under King County regulations.

A. Plat Requirements

The discussion focused on typical requirements related to Roadway Mitigation Payment System fees, fire protection codes, access to neighborhood schools or school bus stops, transportation concurrency (this area passes), set-asides for recreation tracts (e.g., playgrounds or structures), school impact fees, and requirements for certificates of water and sewer availability.

B. Required Studies and Potential Approval Conditions

As part of the Plat requirements, and County review and recommendation, the meeting and meeting materials also focused on areas where additional information will be required and potential approval conditions. This includes the information noted below.

⁴ Participating departments included the Department of Permitting and Environmental Review, the Department of Natural Resources and Parks, and the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget.

i. Critical Areas

- Submission of **Critical Area Studies** which evaluate wetland(s), streams, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes, landslide hazard areas and provide buffer and setback recommendations. A conceptual mitigation plan will be required for any ecologic critical area and/or buffer impacts.
- **Geotechnical engineering report** recommendations will be required to address any alterations to landslide or steep slope hazard areas. Based upon the County's GIS layers, it appears there are wetland(s) and potential stream located within the proposed urban area. Protection of these features and associated buffers could limit the development area and potential number of lots. Critical areas and associated buffers are required to be placed in separate critical area tract(s) and owned in undivided interest by the lot owners or Homeowner's Association and/or within the open space/resource tract as applicable. A 15 foot Building Set-Back Line is required from the edge of critical area tract(s). Larger setback lines may be required for slope area(s) not required to be place in tract(s).
- A **State Environmental Policy Act threshold determination** is required for the proposal, including the County's greenhouse gas emission worksheet.

ii. Engineering

- 2016 Surface Water Design Manual Studies – **Level 1 Drainage Analysis**, Technical Information Report, etc., and **Conceptual Drainage Plan(s)** required to make an assessment of the feasibility of complying with the 2016 SWDM requirements. One issue, given the potential for this development to occur under City regulations following annexation, is how to ensure that stormwater be sufficiently managed to not affect the potential to use the western-portion open space tract for farming after the development occurs. This could be added to the *Pre-Annexation Conditions* noted below.
- 2007 King County **Road Design & Construction Standards Plan**, addressing cul-de-sac lengths and sight distance.

iii. Access

- Access would be through the City of Carnation, and the Estates at Snoqualmie Valley (Carnation plat) subdivision (i.e., 328th Ave NE and NE 52nd Street). 328th Ave NE has 46 ft. of Right of Way which splits the property line of the parcel to the north (23 ft. each side). The minimum for a subaccess road (17-50 lots) per the 2007 KCRD & CS is 40 ft. of Right of Way with 36 or 38 ft. of improvements (including sidewalks). These improvements cannot be accommodated in 23 ft. of Right of Way available on the parcel to the north. **Additional Right of Way** is necessary from adjacent private properties for suitable access.
- A **Traffic Impact Analysis** may be required, based upon the ultimate number of lots proposed.
- Given that access is through the City of Carnation, **City Right of Way and Access standards**, as well as **City Traffic Impact Analysis** requirements will apply on any City portion of the project.

iv. Parks and Open Space

- To address the potential impact from the adjacent uses (urban development, farming, public open space), "**Right to Farm**" language is encouraged to be a condition of approval of this land use amendment. This would part of the development condition, with the language added to the **Home Owner Agreement and Covenants** to ensure that farming activities on the approximately 10 acres dedicated through the Four to One can continue.
- To restrict access to the open space land from the urban development, **six foot fencing** along the boundary of the proposed development will be constructed by the developer and maintained by either the developer or future owners of the residential parcels upon which the fence is located.

C. Pre-Annexation Conditions

The property owner and the City of Carnation both expressed interest in having the new urban portion annex into the City. This is a factor in how the County adopts the Four to One land use amendment. Meaning, if the County seeks to include conditions on the urban development that will have standing *after* the annexation, the Four to One will need to require an Interlocal Agreement or Tri-Party Agreement that binds the conditions to the property. This could include issues such as stormwater management to ensure that drainage from the development site does not impact the adjacent agricultural open space land, minimum urban densities, screening and/or landscaping requirements to protect views from the valley floor from incompatible hillside development, or other issues.

D. Comparison of Project to Four to One Criteria

Four-to-One projects are approved at the discretion of the County as a land use amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, and these decisions are guided by policies and criteria in the King County Code. Shown below is an comparison of the Project to the Four to One Criterial in the King County Code.

Adopted Code	Evaluation
20.18.170 The Four to One program – process for amending the urban growth area to achieve open space.	
A. The total area added to the urban growth area as a result of this program shall not exceed four thousand acres. The department shall keep a cumulative total for all parcels added under this section. The total shall be updated annually through the plan amendment process.	Pass. The total acreage added to the urban growth area under Four to Ones since the inception of the program in 1994 is just over 1,300 acres. This project would add approximately 5 new urban acres.
B. Proposals shall be processed as land use amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and may be considered in either the annual or four-year cycle.	Pass. Under consideration as a land use amendment in the 2016 cycle. Also under consideration as a Docket Request in 2017 cycle, if additional time is allowed for the necessary studies.

Adopted Code	Evaluation
<p>Site suitability and development conditions for both the urban and rural portions of the proposal shall be established through the preliminary formal plat approval process.</p> <p><i>Note: The Preliminary Formal Plat Approval Process applies if the project is developed in King County. If the project occurs in the City, then the focus is on identifying any whether to attach any development conditions to the site through the appropriate mechanism, such as an Interlocal Agreement or Tri-Party Agreement, when the land use amendment is adopted by the County Council.</i></p>	<p>Additional information needed. Initial review is underway based on the Pre-Application Meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to inform applicants of the information they need to provide to allow King County to determine site suitability and feasibility, and make a recommendation.</p> <p>As noted in the section on <i>Required Studies and Potential Approval Conditions</i>, additional studies are needed to determine the exact configuration of the site. In addition to ensuring the best substantive outcomes, this ensures that the procedural steps to define the new urban boundary, bring it into the urban growth area, create new taxable lots, create a conservation easement for the open space (both for farming and open space), etc., are based on a boundary that will likely not change.</p>
<p>C. A term conservation easement shall be placed on the open space at the time the Four to One proposal is approved by the Council. Upon final plat approval, the open space shall be permanently dedicated in fee simple to King County.</p>	<p>Future work. This will occur at the time, or shortly after (typically 21 days), that the Council acts on the project.</p> <p>Note: the aforementioned Critical Area and Engineering studies will be needed for King County to develop an appropriate Boundary and Terms for the conservation easement.</p>
<p>D. Proposals adjacent to incorporated area or potential annexation areas shall be referred to the affected city and special purpose districts for recommendations.</p>	<p>Pass. The project concept has been public since May 2016, was the subject of public meetings, and discussed at multiple County Council meetings. As noted previously, the City has adopted a resolution supporting the project. There have been no comments from special purpose districts on this proposal.</p>
<p>20.18.180 The Four to One program – criteria for amending the urban growth area to achieve open space. Rural area land may be added to the urban growth area in accordance with the following criteria:</p>	
<p>A. A proposal to add land to the urban growth area under this program shall meet the following criteria:</p>	<p>--</p>
<p>1. A permanent dedication to the King County open space system of four acres of open space is required for every one acre of land added to the urban growth area;</p>	<p>Pass. The proposal contains four acres of new open space for each acre of new urban land.</p>

Adopted Code	Evaluation
2. The land shall not be zoned agriculture (A);	<p>Pass. The land is <u>not</u> zoned Agriculture.</p> <p>The land is, however, directly adjacent to the Agricultural Production District and properties enrolled in the Farmland Protection Program. It is proposed that a portion of the open space land (i.e., the "four") be used for farming. The County could choose to zone the land Agriculture.</p>
3. The land added to the urban growth area shall:	--
a. be physically contiguous to urban growth area as adopted in 1994, unless the director determines that the land directly adjacent to the urban growth area contains critical areas that would be substantially harmed by development directly adjacent to the urban growth area and that all other criteria can be met; and	<p>Pass. The land is physically contiguous to urban growth area as adopted in 1994.</p>
b. not be in an area where a contiguous band of public open space, parks or watersheds already exists along the urban growth area boundary;	<p>Pass. The land does not impinge on public open space.</p> <p>The land is, however, directly adjacent to the existing public open space (Ormes Hill Park Site). It is proposed that a portion of the open space land (i.e., the "four") be contiguous to this existing park. See the Attachments section for a map showing public parks and trails near the subject properties.</p>
4. The land added to the urban growth area shall be able to be served by sewers and other urban services;	<p>Pass. Based on the City's resolution supporting the project, it is assumed that services can be provided to the subject parcels from the city. The terms could vary if the project developed in the County (i.e., city services would be extended to the site in the County) versus if it was developed after the site was annexed into the City. Either way, services appear to be available.</p>
5. A road serving the land added to the urban area shall not be counted as part of the required open space;	<p>Additional information needed. As noted in the previous section, one issue identified at the Pre-Application meeting is roadway access to the site. At this point, there is no public access to the site and the property owner will need to purchase land to be able to access the site.</p>
6. All urban facilities shall be provided directly from the urban area and shall not cross the open space or rural area and be located in the urban area except as permitted in subsection E of this section;	<p>Pass, with the current uncertainty regarding roadway access. See #A5 above. A related issue is the adequacy of roadway access through the Estates at Snoqualmie Valley (Carnation plat) plat, and the impact of the additional development on the plat road.</p>

Adopted Code	Evaluation
7. Open space areas shall retain a rural designation;	Pass. Note: King County Comprehensive Plan policy U-188 defines the types of "open space" allowed, and this includes both passive open space as well as resource lands for farms and forestry.
8. The minimum depth of the open space buffer shall be one half of the property width, unless the director determines that a smaller buffer of no less than two hundred feet is warranted due to the topography and critical areas on the site, shall generally parallel the urban growth area boundary and shall be configured in such a way as to connect with open space on adjacent properties;	Pass. The proposed boundary shows the new urban development on about one-quarter of the site, and provides a buffer on all three non-urban sides. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the new urban is adjacent to the existing urban, and the proposed new urban is in one contiguous tract. • The open space allows for connection to the adjacent existing open space on one side, and creates a large contiguous buffer from the adjacent Agricultural Production District on the other side.
9. The minimum size of the property to be considered is twenty acres. Smaller parcels may be combined to meet the twenty-acre minimum;	Pass. Combined, the three parcels are just under 26 acres.
10. Urban development under this section shall be limited to residential development and shall be at a minimum density of four dwelling units per acre; and	Pass. The proposed use is residential. Densities have yet to be established. If annexed to the City, the County may choose to condition the site such that the use and minimum density be specified.
11. The land to be retained in open space is not needed for any facilities necessary to support the urban development; and	Passes. No proposal is currently made to use the open space land for facilities to support the urban development.
B. A proposal that adds two hundred acres or more to the urban growth area shall also meet the following criteria:	N/A.
1. The proposal shall include a mix of housing types including thirty percent below-market-rate units affordable to low, moderate and median income households;	N/A.
2. In a proposal in which the thirty-percent requirement in subsection B.1 of this section is exceeded, the required open space dedication shall be reduced to three and one-half acres of open space for every one acre added to the urban growth area;	N/A.

Adopted Code	Evaluation
C. A proposal that adds less than two hundred acres to the urban growth area and that meets the affordable housing criteria in subsection B.1. of this section shall be subject to a reduced open space dedication requirement of three and one-half acres of open space for every one acre added to the urban growth area;	Pass. Given the preliminary nature of the project, there have been no discussions regarding any affordable housing requirement. This could be recommended or proposed by either the property owner or the Council. However, given the size of the project, this might not be warranted or feasible.
D. Requests for redesignation shall be evaluated to determine those that are the highest quality, including, but not limited to, consideration of the following:	N/A. Not proposed.
1. Preservation of fish and wildlife habitat, including wildlife habitat networks, and habitat for endangered and threatened species;	N/A. None of these features appear to be present, based on existing GIS information.
2. Provision of regional open space connections;	Pass. The site is adjacent to an existing public park in the City. Part of the open space portion of the site could allow for a linear expansion of the park, or it could be left in passive open space. The open space would approximately double the size of the park and have attendant environmental benefits.
3. Protection of wetlands, stream corridors, ground water and water bodies;	More information needed. The aforementioned Critical Area and Engineering studies will be needed to address this criteria.
4. Preservation of unique natural, biological, cultural, historical or archeological resources;	<p>Mixed. As noted previously under <i>ii. Required Studies and Potential Approval Conditions</i> (page 8), there are concerns regarding the impact of this development on some of the surrounding resources (see B4, below), and some potential conditions to mitigate impacts are noted.</p> <p>The site is proximate to two unique resources – the Agricultural Production District, and the Rural Forest Focus Area. The project would allow for potential expansion of the Agricultural Production District (or, at least buffering the APD) through the open space portion of the development.</p> <p>Rural Forest Focus Area lands are encouraged for small-scale forestry, maintenance of forest cover and the practice of sustainable forestry in large, contiguous blocks of rural forest. Policies and Code state that Rural Forest Focus Areas should be maintained in parcels of 20 acres or more, and that regulations and/or incentives should seek to achieve a maximum density of one home per 20 acres. The parcels are currently zoned RA-10, or one unit per ten acres.</p> <p>Another issue is the rural character of the area and</p>

Adopted Code	Evaluation
	the impact that hillside development could have. As noted in the Comprehensive Plan's Area Zoning and Land Use #12, which addressed this Four to One, King County has an interest in protecting views from the valley floor from incompatible hillside development.
5. The size of open space dedication and connection to other open space dedications along the urban growth area boundary; and	Mixed. See #B2 above.
6. The ability to provide extensions of urban services to the redesignated urban areas; and	Pass, with the current uncertainty regarding roadway access. See #A5 above.
E. The open space acquired through this program shall be preserved primarily as natural areas, passive recreation sites or resource lands for farming and forestry. The following additional uses may be allowed only if located on a small portion of the open space and provided that these uses are found to be compatible with the site's natural open space values and functions:	Pass. The open space is proposed for park open space and farming.
1. Trails;	N/A. Not proposed by the applicant. King County might choose to create trail access at some point in the future to the Ormes Hill Park Site.
2. Compensatory mitigation of wetland losses on the urban designated portion of the project, consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan and K.C.C. chapter 21A.24; and	N/A. None of these features appear to be present, based on existing GIS information.
3. Active recreation uses not to exceed five percent of the total open space area. The support services and facilities for the active recreation uses may locate within the active recreation area only, and shall not exceed five percent of the total acreage of the active recreation area. The entire open space area, including any active recreation site, is a regional resource. It shall not be used to satisfy the on-site active recreation space requirements in K.C.C. 21A.14.180 for the urban portion of the Four to One property. (Ord. 17485 § 10, 2012; Ord. 16263 § 6, 2008; Ord. 15606 § 1, 2006; Ord. 14047 § 10, 2001).	N/A. Not proposed by the applicant.

E. Regional Context: City of Carnation Comprehensive Plan

In addition to the site-specific issues and King County Code requirements for the proposed project, another factor in this discretionary land use amendment is how it relates to the overall goals of the Comprehensive Plan and Countywide Planning Policies.

The City of Carnation adopted their Comprehensive Plan in August 2015 and submitted it to the Puget Sound Regional Council for review and certification.⁵ In December 2015, the Puget Sound Regional Council conditionally certified the plan. The issue that led to Conditional status is that the plan's anticipated population, housing and employment growth, along with commensurate estimates of demand for new infrastructure and transportation projects, are significantly higher than adopted regional growth targets.

The schedule for addressing the conditions is: Council adoption of a plan of work by April 30, 2016 that addresses the condition identified in the certification report; Submission of a draft amended comprehensive plan and supporting documents that address the condition to PSRC for review and comment in advance of adoption; and Once the condition is adequately addressed, submission of the adopted amended comprehensive plan and supporting documents by June 30, 2017 for review and certification by PSRC.

This Conditional certification, and the required review and update of the Comprehensive Plan, creates uncertainty in the planning process for the City regarding whether it would affect City support for urban development on these parcels. From a regional perspective, supporting expansion of an urban growth area boundary in a City that is Conditionally certified because of growth levels that are significantly higher than adopted targets could be an issue in other regional conversations currently underway.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendation

The Four to One Project comports with many of the program criteria in the King County Code, has the potential to add land to the County's Open Space System, and potential to serve the urban development directly from the City of Carnation. As noted in the table above, and the section on *Required Studies and Potential Approval Conditions*, some of the criteria will require additional information and analysis to assist the Executive to make a recommendation for County Council consideration. The Executive branch will continue to work with property owner as they complete the aforementioned studies. Following submittal, the Executive branch will make a recommendation to the County Council for inclusion in an upcoming Comprehensive Plan update.


VII. For More Information

For more information regarding this report, please contact Ivan Miller, Comprehensive Plan Manager, at 206-263-8297 or ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov.

⁵ The Puget Sound Regional Council has authority under state law, as guided by its Interlocal Agreement with its members, and procedures adopted in its Plan Review Manual, to review and certify that jurisdictions' comprehensive plans conform to Growth Management Act requirements and are consistent with regional plans. Certification is a requirement for jurisdictions and agencies that intend to apply for PSRC funding or proceed with projects submitted into the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Attachments

Figure: Public Parks and Trails Near Subject Properties





Summary of 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Docket Submittals

July 2016

I. BACKGROUND

The King County docket was established in 1998 in accordance with K.C.C. 20.18.140 to provide an opportunity for residents of the county to register comments on the *King County Comprehensive Plan* and associated development regulations. The county responds to each item registered on the docket, providing a feedback loop, as required by RCW 36.70A.470. Docket forms are available on the King County Website, at several county department offices, and at county-sponsored public meetings where land use and development issues are being discussed. The docket is open continuously and, each June 30, the items registered in the previous twelve months are compiled into the docket report for release on December 1 to the King County Council.

II. SUBMITTAL

King County received **one** item for the Docket period that closed on June 30, 2016.

Docket Request # 1

Name of Requestor(s): Gary Remlinger

Council District: 3

Summary Category: Four to One proposal - Land Use Change and Rezone

Submitted Request

Four to One to provide permanent open space/farmlands and provide urban lands for development. Parcel numbers 1525079049, 1525079005 and 1525079010. These are all zoned Rural Area 10.


Submitted Background Information

No additional information was submitted with Docket Request.

Prior to the submittal of the Docket Request, a conceptual map was provided with a potential delineation of the new urban and new open space/farmland portions of the parcels (see Attachment 1). The proponents indicated that the concept map is intended to comply with the "interests" defined in Study #12 (noted above). In recognition that Four to One Proposals are a discretionary action of the County and their review is based on a variety of provisions and criteria in the King County Code and King County Comprehensive Plan, the proponents have indicated that the concept map is a draft and expressed willingness to revise it based on County input.

Maps of Docket Area

Vicinity



Site



III. NOTES

1. This Docket was included in the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Scope of Work Motion 14531 and was the subject of Area Zoning and Land Use Study #12. Study #12 contains an analysis of the policy context, background information including subject-specific mapping and parcel-level information, a brief summary of public comment and an Executive Recommendation. Study #12 can be found on the County's Comprehensive Plan website, within the "Area Zoning Studies" Attachment and the full set of public comments can be found within the "Public Participation Report" Attachment.
2. Per Council Motion 14341, following submittal of a Docket Request and initial review for eligibility and policy considerations by the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (PSB), Four to One Proposals are referred to the Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER) for site-specific analysis, review and processing as a potential discretionary land use amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

IV. FOR MORE INFORMATION

The purpose of the Summary of Submittals Report is to provide notification regarding the proposals that have submitted. The Summary of Submittals is posted shortly after the Docket deadline of June 30, and is therefore released prior to conducting analysis of the request(s).

Contact Ivan Miller, Comprehensive Plan Manager, 206-263-8297 or ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov.

ATTACHMENT

Conceptual Map of Four to One Proposal

ATTACHMENT:

Conceptual Map of Four to One Proposal with urban and open space/farmland delineations

