1 ADOPTED: 10/06/21 2 EFFECTIVE: 10/22/21 3 4 5 6 SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL 7 SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON 8 9 ORDINANCE NO. 21-053 10 RELATING TO THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT, ADOPTING FUTURE LAND USE 11 12 MAP AMENDMENTS TO THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND AMENDING THE ZONING MAP TO IMPLEMENT 13 14 CHANGES TO THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP (SW5 – EDWARD TOKARZ) 15 WHEREAS, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.130 and .470 direct 16 counties planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA), chapter 36.70A RCW, to 17 18 adopt procedures for interested persons to propose amendments and revisions to the 19 Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan (GMACP) or development regulations; 20 and 21 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council ("County Council") adopted Chapter 22 23 30.74 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC), "Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing," to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.130 24 25 and .470; and 26 27 WHEREAS, the Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) 28 compiled a list of non-county initiated amendments and revisions received by the 29 October 31, 2019, deadline for Docket XX applications and evaluated these proposed amendments, including the SW5 – Edward Tokarz docket proposal, for consistency with 30 31 the initial docket review criteria in SCC 30.74.030(1) and 30.74.040; and 32 33 WHEREAS, on July 22, 2020, the County Council approved, by Amended Motion 34 No. 20-116, a list of proposed non-county initiated comprehensive plan amendments, 35 including SW5 - Edward Tokarz, to be included on Final Docket XX and authorized the 36 County Executive, through PDS, to further process the proposed minor docket 37 amendments consistent with Chapters 30.73 and 30.74 SCC, including environmental 38 review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), for final consideration in 2021; 39 and 40 41 WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Planning Commission ("Planning 42 Commission") was briefed on the SW5 – Edward Tokarz proposal on May 25, 2021; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 30.74 SCC, PDS completed a final review and evaluation of the SW5 – Edward Tokarz proposal and forwarded a recommendation to approve the proposal to the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on June 22, 2021, to receive public testimony on the SW5 – Edward Tokarz proposal, and recommended adoption of the amendments contained in this ordinance, as described in its recommendation letter of July 9, 2021; and

WHEREAS, on October 6, 2021, the County Council held a public hearing, after proper notice, to receive public testimony and consider the entire record related to the SW5 – Edward Tokarz proposed amendments contained in this ordinance; and

WHEREAS, following the public hearing, the County Council deliberated on the proposed amendments contained in this ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:

Section 1. The County Council adopts the following findings to support this ordinance:

A. The foregoing recitals are adopted as findings as if set forth in full herein.

B. The SW5 – Edward Tokarz proposal would amend the Future Land Use (FLU) Map of the General Policy Plan (GPP) by redesignating .72 acres in the Southwest Urban Growth Area (SWUGA) from Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR) to Urban High Density Residential (UHDR) with a concurrent rezone from R-8,400 to Multiple Residential (MR). The SW5 – Edward Tokarz proposal is located at 7826 228th St. SW, approximately 550 feet west of State Route 99 which is a designated transit emphasis corridor.

 C. The SW5 proposal is consistent with RCW 36.70A.110(3) requirements for the location of future urban population growth as the SW5 proposal would provide opportunities for increasing residential densities in a portion of the SWUGA that is already characterized by urban growth. The SW5 proposal site can accommodate additional residential capacity as it is served by public water and sanitary sewer, and nearby bus rapid transit facilities on State Route 99.

D. The SW5 proposal was analyzed for consistency with RCW 36.70A.130(1)(d), which requires that proposed comprehensive plan amendments be consistent with the GMA. The proposed amendments are consistent with the GMA requirements for accommodating additional residential capacity. The proposal is consistent with RCW 36.70A.130(2)(a), which requires that proposed comprehensive plan amendments

be considered no more frequently than once every year. The proposed non-county initiated amendments are scheduled for final consideration by the County Council according to the requirements in Chapter 30.74 SCC and are considered together with county-initiated comprehensive plan amendments for final action no more frequently than once per year. The proposal is consistent with RCW 36.70A.070, which requires internal consistency within a comprehensive plan because the proposed amendments maintain internal consistency between the GPP FLU map and the area-wide zoning map. The proposal is consistent with RCW 36.70A.210, which requires that a comprehensive plan be consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP). The proposed amendments are consistent with the CPPs as analyzed and described in the June 4, 2021, PDS staff report to the Planning Commission.

1 2

> E. The SW5 proposal was analyzed for consistency with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policies (MPP). The SW5 proposal maintains consistency with the MPP including Regional Growth Strategy Policy RGS-6 by amending the GPP FLU map and the area-wide zoning map to optimize the urban residential development potential of the site. The proposal will encourage more compact and efficient urban development which reduces demand for new public facilities and services.

F. The SW5 proposal was analyzed for consistency with the CPP. The SW5 proposal maintains consistency with the CPP, including CPP Development Patterns Policy DP-11, because it amends the GPP FLU Map and the area-wide zoning map to allow higher residential densities in an urban growth area which is the appropriate location for such higher residential density.

G. The SW5 proposal was analyzed for consistency with the GPP. The SW5 proposal maintains constancy with the GPP, including Land Use LU Policy 2.A.3 because it amends the GPP FLU map and the official zoning maps to provide the opportunity for additional higher density residential development on a site that is not impacted by critical areas.

H. The SW5 proposal is also consistent with GPP LU Policy 2.C.1 because it amends the GPP FLU map and the official zoning maps to provide opportunities for increased residential densities that can support public transit service and facilities located within the nearby State Route 99 corridor, a designated transit emphasis corridor.

I. Procedural requirements.

1. This proposal is a Type 3 legislative action pursuant to SCC 30.73.010.

2. The environmental impacts of this proposal are within the range of impacts 1 2 analyzed by the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) and final 3 environmental impact statement (FEIS) during the update to the GMACP in 4 2015. No new probable significant adverse environmental impacts from this 5 proposal have been identified. Therefore, State Environmental Policy Act 6 (SEPA) requirements with respect to this non-project action have been met 7 through issuance on June 7, 2021, of Addendum No. 22 to the FEIS for the 8 2015 Update to the GMACP. 9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

2425

26

27

28

29 30

31 32

33

34

36 37

40

- 3. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106(1), a notice of intent to adopt this ordinance was transmitted to the Washington State Department of Commerce for distribution to state agencies on May 28, 2021.
- 4. The public participation process used in the adoption of this ordinance complied with all applicable requirements of the GMA and the SCC.
- 5. The Washington State Attorney General last issued an advisory memorandum, as required by RCW 36.70A.370, in September of 2018 entitled "Advisory Memorandum: Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property" to help local governments avoid the unconstitutional taking of private property. The process outlined in the State Attorney General's 2018 advisory memorandum was used by Snohomish County in objectively evaluating the amendments proposed by this ordinance.
- J. The ordinance is consistent with the record as set forth in the PDS staff reports to the Planning Commission dated May 7, 2021, and June 4, 2021. In its staff report dated June 4, 2021, PDS concluded the proposal met the criteria found in SCC 30.74.060 and, therefore, recommended the proposal be approved.
- Section 2. The County Council makes the following conclusions:
- A. This proposal complies with all requirements of Washington State law and county code.
- 35 B. This proposal is consistent with the MPP.

C. This proposal is consistent with the CPP.

- D. This proposal is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the GPP.
- 41 E. All SEPA requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied.

1 2 3	F. This proposal does not result in an unconstitutional taking of private property for a public purpose and does not violate substantive due process guarantees.		
4 5 6 7 8	Section 3. The County Council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire record of the Planning Commission and the County Council, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding which should be deemed a conclusion, and any conclusion which should be deemed a finding, is hereby adopted as such.		
9 10 11 12	Section 4. Map 1 (Future Land Use) of the GPP, last amended by Ordinance No. 21-055 on October 6, 2021, is amended as indicated in Exhibit A to this ordinance, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference into this ordinance.		
13 14 15 16 17	Section 5. The official zoning maps maintained pursuant to SCC 30.21.030 shall be revised to reflect the zoning change adopted by the County Council as indicated in Exhibit B to this ordinance, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference into this ordinance.		
18 19 20	ection 6. The County Council directs the code reviser to update SCC 30.10.060 ursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).		
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	Section 7. Severability and Savings. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance shall be held to be invalid by the Growth Management Hearings Board ("Board"), or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance. Provided, however, that if any section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by the Board or court of competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence, clause, or phrase in effect prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and effect for that individual section, sentence, clause, or phrase as if this ordinance had never been adopted.		
31 32	PASSED this 6 th day of October, 2021.		
33 34 35	SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL Snohomish County, Washington		
36 37 38 39 40 41	Council Chair		

1 2 3 4	ATTEST:	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(X) APPROVED () EMERGENCY () VETOED	DATE:
12		
13		County Executive
14	ATTEST:	
15 16	Melissa Geraghty	
17 18	Approved as to form only:	
19	Approved as to form only.	
20	/s/ Justin Kasting 08/04/21	
21	Deputy Prosecuting Attorney	_
22	- op any recomming remaining	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31 32		
33		
34		

Exhibit A Ordinance No. 21-053 Final Docket XX SW5 – Edward Tokarz Amendments to the FLU of the GPP




Exhibit B Ordinance No. 21-053 Final Docket XX SW5 – Edward Tokarz Amendments to the Area-Wide Zoning Map

