

**UDC UPDATE PROJECT**  
**UDC PUBLIC FORUM**  
**FACILITATED DISCUSSION WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC**  
**RE: ZONING AND USE MATRICES SUBPROJECT**

AS DISCUSSED ON DEC 6, 2007 AT 9:00 A.M. AND 6:00 P.M.

**Comments related to Zoning and Use Matrices – 9:00 a.m.**

*\*Staff comments are denoted in italics.*

Have we looked at the format of some of the city codes in terms of future impact and annexation?  
How are we using input from cities?

*David Killingstad (DK) – Our consultant is beginning to take a look at other formats in the region and will be getting back to us on the models that exist.*

*Jean Shaffer (JS) – We have been meeting with cities and will attend Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) meetings to solicit their concerns.*

How does the county evaluate the current performance of the code? Are development review staff evaluating how current development practices apply the existing code and are deficiencies being identified? What is the process?

*DK – Identifying deficiencies in the existing code is a general goal that applies to all Unified Development Code (UDC) Update projects. The experiences of our past drive the need to update the UDC. County staff typically identify deficiencies in the code and we take that to the public for review. As it relates to this project, it's been determined that a particular use may not be appropriate for a certain zone. For example, we are looking at what appropriate uses in Urban Centers might be.*

Is there a post-development evaluation process?

*DK – Some sections of code have an embedded feedback loop and our intent is to build in a better monitoring system to assist with implementation in the future.*

In the second paragraph of the Zoning and Use Matrices Subproject handout, it says that “zoning is used to implement the vision of the Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan (CP) which determines where types of development should and should not happen. Under the GMA, a comprehensive plan should be consistent with zoning.” The diagram and the General Policy Plan (GPP) say the opposite: that zoning regulations have to be consistent with it, not the other way around. We should be talking about changing the zoning plans to implement the vision of the GPP. We should be hesitant to change the GPP to change regulations.

*DK – It's a two-way street and consistency goes both ways. Over the last 12 years, our development regulations have changed to reflect the GPP and the GPP has also changed to reflect the development regulations. I don't disagree with you, but generally there is always a back and forth tweaking to make sure that the policies and regulations match.*

In the handout there could be areawide rezones. Are rezones related to fixes in existing code now or also zoning that is inconsistent with the CP?

*DK – Our primary focus of the areawide rezones will be related to fixes in the existing code. For example, if we decide we don't want the FS zoning classification and we rezone those to CB, then we have to go through and rezone all properties that are zoned FS. The ten-year update to the CP has already occurred. We can deal with updating the CP at the seven-year compliance or at the next ten-year update.*

<p>Are we looking at bulk matrix changes to density or height at the same time?  <i>DK – The Urban Residential Design Standards subproject (URDS) will address height. Density issues will be captured by the CP, so it is unlikely we will look at that issue in this project.</i></p>
<p>Will this project look solely at what type of uses are appropriate in particular zones or will the county also be addressing the issue of some CP designations (MR zone) not allowing property owners to achieve densities allowed for by the zone? This is a glaring inconsistency that needs to be fixed.</p>
<p>During the NPDES presentation, there were various inconsistencies across county departments. How compartmentalized is this subproject of the UDC and is the county working closely with those who are modifying the Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS)?  <i>DK – Most UDC project teams include employees from various divisions and departments that are also part of other project teams. Communication is at a high and project managers meet to discuss similarities between projects.</i></p>
<p>As part of streamlining uses, will performance standards be developed that separate urban from rural uses, such as livestock in the Urban Growth Area (UGA)?  <i>DK – Case-by-case issues warrant the use of performance standards. For example, woodwaste and recycling standards do not provide guidance on how to deal with regulating uses; we may want to look at that. For uses where no problems have arisen, then performance standards do not make sense.</i></p>
<p>Since performance standards are a key element of zoning provisions, is the county confident that it will get the cooperation needed internally to integrate zone uses and Urban Residential Design Standards (URDS) or will these projects go separately? Reformatting of zones might not fit in with the concept of how we choose to deal with URDS.  <i>DK – This is a challenge with updating the code and breaking projects out individually. Our goal is to ensure that we know how to create a placeholder for whatever is coming in before or after. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) project has the potential to impact zoning and may be ahead or behind this project, but coordination is a high priority for us.</i></p>

<p><b><u>Comments related to Zoning and Use Matrices – 6:00 p.m.</u></b></p> <p><i>*Staff comments are denoted in italics.</i></p>
<p>How does Low Impact Development (LID) interface with this project?  <i>David Killingstad (DK) – We are considering some center zones.</i></p>
<p>Critical questions will arise as changes are put on the map. What is the estimated time that these zones will be placed on a map?  <i>DK – When we come out of the code updating process, we will be developing options for both the public and our elected officials. At that time, people can see the reality of it and how it will play out later in 2008 when ordinances are formalized. Options may include re-formatting or a recommendation for which classifications can be eliminated.</i></p>
<p>I have been devastated by rezones that allowed clusters/cottage homes and the resulting increase in traffic on roads that were never designed to carry such high levels of traffic. It seems there was no plan for gradients moving outward from the urban core. It all happened so suddenly where everything got the same density all at once and contributed to an overall decrease in quality of life. There needed to be some type of consideration there even in the urban core. The infrastructure was never put in place prior to allowing development, so roads like 164<sup>th</sup> bear the brunt of these issues. Even the local neighborhood roads are practically gridlocked from my front door to my workplace.</p>

<p>There isn't an option for transit.  <i>DK – That goes back to the vision set forth in the Comprehensive Plan (CP).</i></p>
<p>What is the county's strategy to reduce the number of zones? Will we be more inclusive or exclusive?  <i>DK – We may be a little of both. We have five commercial zones and the variation is just a handful of uses, so, is it relevant to have that much detail?</i></p>
<p>The next most intense zone should include everything that was below it. There should be the ability to add more stuff to a project, but can't because you aren't in an "intense" enough zone.  <i>DK – We have a consultant team helping us with these inconsistencies. The consultant is doing background work looking at other jurisdictions, exploring options, and finding models. We may be looking at creating less specificity and collapsing specific shops into a use just called retail or on the industrial side, we have some similar examples.</i></p>
<p>When was the rule made that requires a minimum of four dwelling units per acre (du/ac) within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGA)?  <i>DK - 1995 with the Comprehensive Plan (CP).</i></p>
<p>The goal should be to have the most flexible code possible. R-7200 and R-9600 are vague zones. What is being proposed in those zones? What is going to happen to the residential categories?  <i>DK – We haven't arrived at a decision regarding those categories. We have other subdivision techniques that would allow a developer to cluster lots (lot size averaging or Planned Residential Development). This project isn't going to revisit what the appropriate density is for a particular area, it is going to look at whether there is a better way to look at uses within the zones.</i>  <i>Jean Shaffer (JS) –It's not all set in concrete. Your interest and recommendations help us shape how we are going to proceed. We don't have a proposal yet. This is a ripe time to shape this project.</i></p>
<p>It took over an hour to commute here from Kirkland tonight. Eleven years ago this month the county downzoned all the area outside the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) to R-5. There was a lot of stuff out there Rural Cluster (RC) zoning, sprawling zone and then we (Snohomish County) took the bold step to implement first the Growth Management Act (GMA), then the Comprehensive Plan (CP). Everything upzoned and we took a staunch position on four du/ac. The train left the station in 1990 with the GMA. I've been away for six years and saw a map of Rural Cluster Subdivisions (RCS) and was seeing that the market was overspilling. I think there needs to be more incentives to do growth in the UGAs but then we need to think about water quality and Low Impact Development (LID).  LID techniques cost more money to do, but provide the applicant with a density bonus. But it's not a total solution because if infiltration fails then we have urban flooding. We have to pursue LID, we have to, more than ever, work at changing code to provide incentives to urban centers.</p>
<p><i>Craig Young (CY) – The average citizen thinks steep slopes are fully protected by the Critical Areas Regulations (CAR) because of their intrinsic landscape value, but with steep slopes CAR is primarily concerned with human safety, and requires increased engineering for those areas to be developed safely. Our codes are often compartmentalized and we need to create more opportunities for reviewers to communicate in a timely fashion. We would love to see LID be the main driver in all projects – even if it means changing GMA. GMA can be improved – if there is a better way to get density and preserve the livability of our neighborhoods, then let's do it.</i>  <i>DK – We may need to look at some specialized zones.</i></p>