



2006 Docket Report

King County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations

Background

The King County docket was established in 1998 in accordance with K.C.C. 20.18.140 to provide an opportunity for citizens of the County to register comments on the King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) 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 all County-sponsored public meetings where land use and development issues are being discussed. The docket is open continuously, and each September 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.

2006 Issues

King County received thirty-five items on the docket that closed on September 30, 2006. Many of these docket items involve proposed substantive amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan, which may only be addressed in the next major update of the KCCP which will occur in 2008. Following is a summary of these docket requests.

- Thirteen of the requests seek a land use redesignation from Rural to Urban, which may only be considered during the next major update of the King County Comprehensive Plan in 2008.
- Six of the requests seek amendments to the King County Code.
- Three request to expand Rural Towns or Rural Neighborhoods.
- Two cities request adjustments to the Urban Growth Area and their corresponding potential annexation area.
- Two of the requests seek to redesignate Urban Separators to allow higher residential density.

Organization of Report

Included below is an alphabetical list of the docketed items. Following the alphabetical index is a chart of the docketed items including a brief summary of the request, the 2006 Council District where the property is located, and the corresponding Executive recommendation. The dockets are also organized in numeric order based on when the docket was entered into the system. Copies of the Executive response letters are also attached as part of this report.

The summary table is also available on the King County Website at <http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/compplan/docket/index.htm>.

2006 Docket Alphabetical Index

Last Name	First Name, Middle Initial	Council District	Docket #
Anderson-(BranBar, LLC)	Barry	9	9
Bonewits (#1)	Richard E.	9	33
Buttar	Baljinder	9	8
Donahue	Mike	7	29
Durkin Jr.	Martin	9	16
Erikson (Puget Western Inc.)	Gust	3	23
Falkenberg	Douglas & Kathy	3	4
Feuerborn	Glenn	5	7
Griffin	Michael	3	22
Guck-(Interwest Development)	Larry	9	6
Gurol (City of Sammamish)	Kameron	9	28
Harris	Eric	9	24
Iverson Family Trust	RW Thorpe & Assoc	9	15
Keesling	Maxine	3	30
Kern (Lake Joy Comm. Club)	David	3	32
King	Steven	7	19
Kohlmann (Black Diamond Lawson Partners, LP Kombol/Palmer Coking Coal Co.)	Ryan	9	21
Martin, Marsha	(Earl R. & Nellie walker Trust)	3	12
Moorhead-(Buckles)	George	3	13
Norse (Kent School District)	Hal	5	26
Orni (Yarrow Bay)	Katherine	6	27
Peck	Steven L. & Anne G.	8	11
Poppie (Frontier Construction)	Bill	7	17
Potter	Jon	3	35
Powell	Roger	3	18
R&R Development, LLC		5	10
Scott (City of Carnation)	Linda	3	5
Slay	David	8	20
Snure	Brian	5	25
Soushek	Earl M.	7	3
Stark	Heather	3	1

Last Name	First Name, Middle Initial	Council District	Docket #
Thompson	Bob	3	14
Traub	Patricia A.	9	31
Uveric	Eileen E. & Alexander	3	2
Woehler (WSDOT)	Kerri	3	34

2006 Docket Summary

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
1	A request to redesignate land from Rural to Urban. <i>(Heather Stark)</i>	3	This proposal is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-103, which states King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to Urban until reviewed pursuant to GMA and the Countywide Planning Policy FW-1. A proposal to amend the UGA may be considered during a major or four-year review of the King County Comprehensive Plan, as specified in King County Code Chapter 20.18.030. The next four year review will take place in 2008. No change is recommended for the subject property.
2	A request to redesignate land from Rural to Urban. <i>(Eileen E. & Alexander Uveric)</i>	3	This proposal is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-103, which states King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to Urban until reviewed pursuant to GMA and the Countywide Planning Policy FW-1. A proposal to amend the UGA may be considered during a major or four-year review of the King County Comprehensive Plan, as specified in King County Code Chapter 20.18.030. The next four year review will take place in 2008. No change is recommended for the subject property.
3	A request to redesignate land from Rural to Urban. <i>(Earl M. Soushek)</i>	7	This proposal is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-103, which states King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to Urban until reviewed pursuant to GMA and the Countywide Planning Policy FW-1. A proposal to amend the UGA may be considered during a major or four-year review of the King County Comprehensive Plan, as specified in King County Code Chapter 20.18.030. The next four year review will take place in 2008. No change is recommended for the subject property.

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
4	<i>A request to redesignate land from Rural to Urban adjacent to the Rural City Urban Growth Area for the City of Carnation.</i> <i>(Douglas & Kathy Falkenberg)</i>	3	This proposal is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-103, which states King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to Urban until reviewed pursuant to GMA and the Countywide Planning Policy FW-1. A proposal to amend the UGA may be considered during a major or four-year review of the King County Comprehensive Plan, as specified in King County Code Chapter 20.18.030. The next four year review will take place in 2008. It should be noted that King County staff will be working with the City of Carnation to determine whether an adjustment to the Carnation Rural City UGA is warranted.
5	A request to evaluate the need to modify the Rural City UGA for the City of Carnation. <i>(Linda Scott, City of Carnation)</i>	3	King County staff will be working with the City of Carnation to determine whether an adjustment to the Carnation Rural City UGA is warranted.
6	A request for a Mining land use designation and Mineral zoning. <i>(Larry Guck, Interwest Development)</i>	9	King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-557 requires approval of a site-specific rezone prior to amendment of the King County land use map.
7	A request for increased residential density within an Urban Separator. <i>(Glenn Feuerborn)</i>	5	This request is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan policy U-179 which states that designated Urban Separators should be maintained at a residential density of one unit per acre (R-1 zoning). No changes are recommended for the subject property.
8	<i>A request to redesignate a parcel designated rural Residential and three parcels designated Rural Neighborhood to Urban.</i> <i>(Baljinder Buttar)</i>	9	This proposal is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-103, which states King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to Urban until reviewed pursuant to GMA and the Countywide Planning Policy FW-1. A proposal to amend the UGA may be considered during a major or four-year review of the King County Comprehensive Plan, as specified in King County Code Chapter 20.18.030. The next four year review will take place in 2008. No change is recommended for the subject properties.

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
9	A proposal to redesignate several parcels from Rural to Urban. <i>(Barry Anderson Jr., BranBar, LLC)</i>	9	This proposal is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan Policy R-103, which states King County's Rural Area is considered to be permanent and shall not be redesignated to Urban until reviewed pursuant to GMA and the Countywide Planning Policy FW-1. A proposal to amend the UGA may be considered during a major or four-year review of the King County Comprehensive Plan, as specified in King County Code Chapter 20.18.030. The next four year review will take place in 2008. No change is recommended for the subject properties.
10	A request for increased residential density within an Urban Separator. <i>(R&R Development, LLC)</i>	5	This request is inconsistent with King County Comprehensive Plan policy U-179 which states that designated Urban Separators should be maintained at a residential density of one unit per acre (R-1 zoning). No changes are recommended for the subject property.
11	A request to redesignate property adjacent to the Town of Vashon from Rural to Office. <i>(Steven L. & Anne G. Peck)</i>	8	King County Comprehensive Plan policy R-403 requires a subarea plan to modify the Vashon Rural Town boundaries and consider whether the Office designation is appropriate for the subject property. Without a subarea plan, this request is not consistent with the KCCP.
12	A request to eliminate the Rural "island" within the City of Sammamish. <i>(Marsha Martin/Earl R. & Nellie Wallace Trust & Mystic Lake)</i>	3	Executive staff will address this issue during the development of the 2008 update of the KCCP.
13	A request to expand the Rural Neighborhood at the intersection of SR-202 and 236 th Ave NE. This parcel is designated Rural and requested a Rural Neighborhood designation and commercial zoning. <i>(George Moorhead/Bruce Buckles)</i>	3	This request was addressed by a subarea plan. The subarea plan, which was approved by the King County Council in 2006, found that no expansion of the existing Rural Neighborhood was warranted.

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
14	A request to expand the Rural Neighborhood at the intersection of SR-202 and 236 th Ave NE. This parcel is designated Rural and requested a Rural Neighborhood designation and commercial zoning. <i>(Bob Thompson)</i>	3	This request was addressed by a subarea plan. The subarea plan, which was approved by the King County Council in 2006, found that no expansion of the existing Rural Neighborhood was warranted.
15	A request for a Rural Neighborhood designation and NB zoning on property adjacent to the Hobart Rural Neighborhood. <i>(Iverson Family Trust/RW Thorpe & Assoc)</i>	9	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
16	A request to redesignate 23 acres from Rural to Industrial. <i>(Martin Durkin Jr.)</i>	9	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. An Industrial designation for property not within a Rural Town or the industrial area adjacent to Preston is inconsistent with policy R-412, however an amendment to the King County Code to allow materials processing as a permitted use in the RA zone will be considered.
17	A request to redesignate 7.9 acres from Rural to Industrial <i>(Bill Poppie, Frontier Construction)</i>	7	An Industrial designation for property not within a Rural Town or the industrial area adjacent to Preston is inconsistent with policy R-412. No change is recommended for the subject property.
18	A request to remove 13 acres of land from the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District. A Rural designation is requested for the purpose of developing a golf driving range. <i>(Roger Powell)</i>	3	This proposal is not consistent with policy R-547, which requires a demonstration that removal of the land from the APD will not diminish the productivity of prime agricultural soils or the effectiveness of farming within the APD and that the land is no longer suited for agriculture. This policy also requires the following mitigation for removal of land from an APD: Land must be added to the same APD that is of equal size and has equal or greater soils and agricultural value. No change is recommended for the subject property.

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
19	A request to change DDES policies and procedures related to code enforcement. <i>(Steven King)</i>	7	DDES policy regarding use of photographs and entering property that is posted “no trespassing” was clarified for Mr. King. No change in policy or procedure is necessary.
20	A request to allow auto repair and painting as a home occupation in the rural Area of King County. <i>(David Slay)</i>	8	This request was addressed by code amendments that were approved by the King County Council in 2006.
21	This docket was filed to alert King County that a minor amendment to the Urban Growth Area may be needed to implement the Black Diamond interlocal agreement. <i>(Ryan Kohlmann, Black Diamond Lawson Partners, LP/William Kombol, Palmer Coking Coal Co.)</i>	9	Executive staff will address this issue, should an amendment to the UGA become necessary.
22	A request to include property designated Rural within the Rural City Urban Growth Area of the City of Snoqualmie. <i>(Michael Griffin)</i>	3	Executive staff will work with the City of Snoqualmie and property owners to address this issue during the development of the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
23	A request to include property designated Rural within the Rural City Urban Growth Area of the City of Snoqualmie. <i>(Gust Erikson, (Puget Western Inc.)</i>	3	Executive staff will work with the City of Snoqualmie and property owners to address this issue during the development of the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
24	A request to amend the King County Code sign regulations to be more consistent with rural character. <i>(Eric Harris)</i>	5	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. If possible, this issue will be addressed in 2007 and transmitted to the Council prior to the 2008 update of KCCP.
25	A request to amend Technical Appendix A of the KCCP to reflect adoption of the Capital Facility Level of Service Plan of Fire District 37. <i>(Brian Snure)</i>	9	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
26	A request to amend the King County Code sign regulations related to electronic message boards for high schools. <i>(Hal Norse, Kent School District)</i>	5	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. If possible, this issue will be addressed in 2007 and transmitted to the Council prior to the 2008 update of KCCP.
27	A request to amend the King County Code to allow a public agency utility yard as a permitted use in the Mineral zone, and a request to allow transfer of density credits to Rural Areas so they may be developed at a density of up to 3 homes per acre. <i>(Katherine Orni, Yarrow Bay)</i>	6	A public agency utility yard is not consistent with the KCCP policy R-555, which supports conservation of mineral resources and compatibility of adjacent land uses with mining. The proposal to allow residential density of up to 3 homes per acre on RA 2.5 and RA 5 land by means of density transfer is not consistent with policy R-213 which supports density transfers only to Urban areas and RA2.5 properties. The proposed density of up to 3 homes per acre in the Rural area is inconsistent with policies R-206 through R-209, which establish densities of one home per 2.5, 5 and 10 acres in the Rural Area.
28	A request to amend the Urban Growth Area and the Potential Annexation Area for the City of Sammamish. <i>(Kameron Gurol, City of Sammamish)</i>	9	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
29	A request to allow property within an Urban Neighborhood Business Center to be developed at high residential density, not as part of a mixed use development. <i>(Mike Donahue)</i>	7	This request is not consistent with KCCP policy U-162, which requires residential development within an Urban Neighborhood Business Center to be part of a mixed use development. This policy also limits the residential density to 12 units per acre unless there is access to a principal arterial – then up to 18 units per acre is allowed. No change is recommended for the subject property.
30	A proposal to include a property designated Rural within the Cottage Lake Rural Neighborhood and rezoning the property from RA-5 to NB (Neighborhood Business). <i>(Maxine Keesling)</i>	3	This request is not consistent with policy R-409, which requires a subarea plan to consider whether or not to expand the boundaries of a Rural Neighborhood. Without a subarea plan, this request is not consistent with the KCCP.

Docket #	Docket Item (Last name)	Council District	Recommendation
31	A request to add 10 equestrian trails east of Enumclaw to the Equestrian Communities map in the KCCP. <i>(Patricia A. Traub)</i>	9	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan. It should be noted that policy R-112 calls for support of the equestrian communities in the Rural Area, and this proposal addresses trails in the Forest Production District.
32	A proposal to designate NE Lake Joy Road as a collector arterial. <i>(David Kern, Lake Joy Comm. Club)</i>	3	This proposal would require modification of the Arterial Classification Map in Technical Appendix C of the KCCP. Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
33	A proposal to revise the headings of the permitted use tables in the King County Code, and a proposal for an editorial review of the KCCP document to insure consistent use of upper and lower case letters when referring to the Rural Area. <i>(Richard E. Bonewits)</i>	9	Executive staff will address these issues during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
34	A proposal related to land use designations and regulation in the vicinity of Bandara and Skykomish airfields. <i>(Kerri Woehler, WSDOT)</i>	3	Executive staff will address this issue during the 2008 update of the King County Comprehensive Plan.
35	A proposal to use the Four to One Program for property adjacent to the City of Sammamish. <i>(Jon Potter)</i>	3	Consistent with King County Code Chapter 20.18.170(C), DDES will prepare a report for this proposal based on applicable codes and policies and transmit this report to the King County Council for consideration in the next update of the KCCP.