



## Memorandum

**DATE:** December 28, 2010

**TO:** Shoreline Planning Commission

**FROM:** Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP, Planning and Development Services Director  
*JWT* Steven Cohn, Senior Planner

**RE:** January 6 Study Session on Countywide Planning Policies

---

### Background

As part of the Comprehensive Plan Major update, cities need to ensure that the revised plan is consistent with the planning policies of the County. King County's policies are established in the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), which have been in place for more than a decade. The CPPs are currently undergoing revision to bring them up-to-date with the PSRC's VISION 2040 and other policies that have been adopted over the last several years.

To provide the Commission with a more complete understanding of the context for the City's update, staff will provide background on the County's update and discuss some of the ideas that are presented in the proposed Housing section of the CPPs.

If you have questions prior to the meeting, please contact Steve Cohn at 801-2511 or [scohn@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:scohn@shorelinewa.gov).

### Attachments

1. Report on Policy Issues Related to the Update of the CPPs
2. Agenda item related to Update of the Countywide Planning Policies, December 8, 2010

This page intentionally blank

---

---

**GMPC Executive Committee Staff Report**  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**RE:** Policy Issues Related to the Update of the Countywide Planning Policies

**PRESENTED BY:** Interjurisdictional Staff Team

**SUMMARY**

The GMPC and staff have been engaged in the revision of the Countywide Planning Policies for nearly two years, establishing first the housing and employment targets for King County's jurisdictions. Since then, staff has dedicated its effort to scoping the revision of policy language, content and structure of the CPPs with direction from GMPC.

At the June, 2010 GMPC meeting, staff presented members with a discussion of policy areas in which the existing CPPs: a) are silent on particular tenets of the MPPs, b) do not adequately address specific issues, or c) that use outdated terminology. Staff received appropriate direction to continue work on policy revisions for most of these issues. However, GMPC directed staff to prepare a more robust presentation on several issues before providing further direction to staff.

In order to facilitate this work, Chair Constantine proposed that the Executive Committee convene over the summer months to follow staff progress prior to the September 2010 GMPC meeting. This staff report responds to that charge, and lists the seven policy issues for which staff requests guidance from the Executive Committee. The discussion of each issue is organized into three parts:

- VISION 2040 Direction: highlights specific direction that is provided by VISION 2040/ MPPs on each policy area or question.
- Existing Countywide Planning Policies: identifies how each policy area is currently handled in the CPPs.
- Options for Consideration: where possible, staff included several approaches for Executive Committee consideration in moving forward. In other cases, staff is not prepared to present the committee with specific options for consideration but is presenting an update of staff progress.

In addition, Attachment A to this report includes a detailed table of contents for the revised CPP document. Staff recognizes that this draft structure will need to be revised as necessary to reflect the policy vision and strategy approved by the GMPC.

## **KEY POLICY ISSUES**

This staff report presents updates, options and recommendations on the following policy areas: climate change; Transfer of Development Rights; housing; the Regional Economic Strategy; economic activities in the Rural Cities and resource lands; healthy communities; and regional coordination and finance. Staff requests direction from the Executive Committee on the various options. With that direction, staff will continue drafting policy language for GMPC presentation in September, 2010. Discussion of each of these policy areas is below.

### ***Issue 1. Climate Change***

**VISION 2040 Direction.** VISION 2040 promotes a sustainable environment and calls on countywide planning policies to provide direction for programs and strategies to address reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, adaptation to the effects from climate change, and recognition of interjurisdictional issues related to greenhouse gas emissions. (*MPP-En-20 through 25*)

**Existing Countywide Planning Policies.** The CPPs do not address climate change at all.

**Options for Consideration.** Staff presents three possible alternatives for addressing climate change in the CPPs:

- **Option 1:** Provide overall goal statements regarding the importance of addressing climate change as well as specific, interrelated policies in each of the relevant chapters. New policies in the CPPs would address each of the following points by indicating responsibility (e.g. county, city or other) and a *quality* of outcome while providing the greatest latitude to each jurisdiction to determine specific standards and approaches for implementing the policies:
  - Commit to comply with state greenhouse gas emission targets (as per RCW 80.80.020) as a minimum;
  - Require an analysis of climate change impacts as part of the environmental (SEPA) review of proposed actions;
  - Reduce the rate of energy use per capita;
  - Pursue development of energy management technology;
  - Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through conservation, alternative energy sources, and reduction of vehicle miles travelled (VMT);
  - Take positive actions to reduce carbons (e.g. increase urban tree canopy); and
  - Anticipate and address impacts of climate change on public health, safety and habitat (e.g. health effects of higher temperatures, flooding, habitat distribution and stream flows).

- Option 2: Incorporate the same goal statements as Option 1 above with more guidance on implementation, *without* mandating specific standards or approaches. For example:
  - Countywide policies should provide guidelines for incorporating climate change analysis in SEPA review (e.g. project thresholds, standards for measures or benchmarks, levels of analysis); and
  - Countywide policies should provide guidelines for setting community targets to reduce energy use, carbons and GHG.
  
- Option 3: Incorporate the same goal statements and policies as Option 1 above *with* specific standards and quantifiable targets. For example:
  - Countywide policies should establish minimum thresholds for projects and analysis related to climate change to be incorporated into SEPA review requirements by each jurisdiction; and
  - Countywide policies should establish targets (consistent with state goals above) for King County and/or individual communities to reduce energy use, carbons and GHG emissions. As an alternative the CPPs could establish a process for setting the targets and require each community to comply by a specified date.

***Issue 2. Transfer of Development Rights***

VISION 2040 Direction. In VISION 2040, *MPP DP-48* encourages the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), Purchase of Development Rights (PDRs), and conservation incentives. The use of these tools is intended to preserve rural and resource lands while focusing additional growth within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and especially cities.

VISION 2040 *DP-Action-12* also calls for collaboration in the development of a regional strategy for TDRs, PDRs, and other techniques for protecting rural and resource lands from overdevelopment. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has partnered with the Department of Commerce and the Cascade Land Conservancy to develop a regional approach to TDR and to foster its wider use in the region.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. Current *CPP LU-14* directs TDRs, stating the following: “King County may allow transfer of density from Rural Area properties to other Rural or Urban Area properties in order to 1) secure a substantial dedication of significant land to the King County Open Space System; 2) provide permanent protection which is greater than that available through existing regulation to a significant natural resource; or 3) encourage retention of resource-based uses in the Rural Area. The County shall develop a mechanism to accomplish these objectives and provide that:

- a. Lands dedicated are first determined to be suitable for inclusion in the King County Open Space System;

- b. The protected natural resource is first determined to be of significance to King County citizens and the protection afforded is materially superior to that provided by existing regulations;
- c. The resulting development is located in proximity to the lands to be dedicated to public ownership or where it can be otherwise shown that the residents of this development will share in an overriding public benefit to be derived from the preservation of the dedicated lands or the protection of the natural resource;
- d. The resulting development in the Rural Area maintains rural character; and
- e. There shall be no net increase in density within the Rural Area as a result of this density transfer.”

Options for Consideration. Staff presents the following alternatives regarding TDRs to more fully implement guidance set forth in VISION 2040 (further staff work and interagency collaboration will be necessary to address each of these points in a final proposed policy or policies for consideration by the GMPC):

- Revise current policy *LU-14* and consider moving to different subsection of Development Pattern chapter.
- Amend CPPs to prioritize TDRs from resource and rural lands to urban lands, explicitly within cities.
- Provide encouragement and guidance to cities on 1) identifying receiving areas within their borders, 2) interlocal agreements such as with the county, and 3) tie-ins with other planning objectives and incentives for participation in TDR from county to city lands. Consider the following two general approaches:
  - Encourage cities to partner with King County to use TDR, including identifying receiving areas within cities, to implement TDR through interlocal agreements, and to coordinate with other agencies to identify and secure opportunities to fund infrastructure within city receiving areas.
  - Provide incentives for cities to partner with King County or other agencies to participate in a countywide or regional TDR program.
- Delete reference to rural to rural transfers in the CPPs entirely and specifically add a prohibition on resource to rural transfers. Or, at a minimum, significantly qualify the option of the Rural Area as a receiving site with strict limitations, as currently practiced under King County’s TDR program.
- Address use of TDR where appropriate in the CPPs on the UGA expansion process and criteria.
- Clarify criteria for identifying sending areas and reference cities as participants in identifying areas of importance to them.
- Address and encourage use of PDRs (Purchase of Development Rights) and/ or other conservation techniques in separate policy.

### ***Issue 3. Housing***

VISION 2040 Direction. In VISION 2040, *MPP-H-2* calls for counties and cities to “achieve and sustain—through preservation, rehabilitation, and new development—a sufficient supply of

housing to meet the needs of low income, moderate income, and special needs individuals and households that is equitably and rationally distributed throughout the region.”

In order to implement the housing policies, *H-Action-1* and *H-Action-2* call for a regionally coordinated housing strategy and program of technical assistance, including guidance for developing affordable housing targets.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. Current *CPP AH-2* states: “All jurisdictions shall share the responsibility for achieving a rational and equitable distribution of affordable housing...Each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes between 50 and 80 percent of the median County household income that is equal to 17 percent of its projected net household growth. In addition, each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes below 50 percent of the median County household income that is either 20 or 24 percent of its projected net household growth.” Additional policy language elaborates on the expectations for the county and cities in working toward achievement of the affordable housing targets.

Options for Consideration. Staff is not prepared at this time to present the Executive Committee with policy options for consideration. However, the following discussion provides an update on the work to date regarding housing CPPs.

A technical committee, comprised of housing staff from multiple jurisdictions and organizations, is meeting to discuss a range of housing issues, starting with the affordable housing targets. The subcommittee’s goal is to provide recommendations to the GMPC at the September meeting.

Issues likely to be addressed by the technical committee include:

- Do the current policies result in opportunities for affordable housing throughout the county? If not, what alternative approaches should be considered?
- Affordable housing targets as currently defined have presented difficulties in our ability to monitor progress over time. What changes to the monitoring process could rectify this problem?
- Are there any changes to the affordable housing targets themselves which are recommended to address the issues above?
- Should the CPPs be revised to clarify expectations for local government implementation of the affordable housing targets and policies, including the comprehensive plan and other measures?

***Issue 4. Regional Economic Strategy***

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION supports the Prosperity Partnership’s Regional Economic Strategy, which takes a two-pronged approach:

- Support fundamental economic foundations, such as education, technology, infrastructure and quality of life.

- Promote specific economic clusters: aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The CPPs call for working with Snohomish and Pierce counties to develop a joint regional economic strategy and for the local adoption of economic development policies. Since the inception of the CPPs, regional efforts have led to the Prosperity Partnership.

Existing CPPs do encourage the creation and sustenance of economic vitality in the region. *CPP ED-7* calls for jurisdictions to establish economic diversification and development goals for the multi-County region. *CPP ED-9* states that jurisdictions shall “recognize businesses, facilities, and institutions within their boundaries that provide opportunities to maintain economic stability and realize economic growth for the entire region. These include major educational facilities, research institutions, health care facilities, high value added manufacturing facilities and port facilities among others.” However, the CPPs do not speak specifically to the Regional Economic Strategy adopted by VISION 2040.

Options for Consideration. Staff presents two options for revising the Economic chapter of the CPPs regarding the Regional Economic Strategy:

- Option 1: Reference and reinforce the Regional Economic Strategy, supporting the region’s identified economic clusters as identified in the regional strategy. New policies should reflect VISION’s organizational emphasis of business, people and places as the means to frame the county’s economic policies. The CPPs that called for development of local and regional plans have now been satisfied and should be removed.
- Option 2: Reinforce and apply a finer grain to the Regional Economic Strategy. This should provide the county with the opportunity to put greater emphasis on economic elements specific to King County and provide policy direction at a greater level of detail. For example, the CPPs could identify specific geographic areas in the county as target areas for specific economic clusters or additional “micro-clusters” unique to King County.

***Issue 5. Economic Activities in Rural Cities and Resource Lands***

VISION 2040 Direction. *MPPs EC-21 and EC-22* call for focus of appropriate employment growth into local centers, and ensuring that employment in and adjacent to resource lands is compatible with resource functions and character and do not conflict with rural character and resource-based land uses.

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. Existing CPPs are largely silent on these issues.

Options for Consideration. Staff recommends the following policy direction:

- Acknowledge that Rural Cities are recognized as the economic and cultural centers of the Rural Area and also the Natural Resource Lands, while stating that development in rural cities

must be of a size and scale that will ensure compatibility with the surrounding rural and resource lands and does not lead to a need to extend urban services outside city boundaries.

### *Issue 6. Healthy Communities*

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION 2040 addresses the connection between health and land use within the Development Patterns chapter by acknowledging that health and well-being are linked with how we live and how we get around. VISION 2040 presents innovative approaches to maintaining a wide variety of healthy, accessible, and well-designed communities.

Specifically, VISION 2040 specifically calls on countywide planning policies to:

- Incorporate health considerations into countywide decision-making (*MPP-DP-44*).
- Provide guidance for planning that addresses the three major themes of (1) healthy environment, (2) physical activity and well-being, and (3) safety. (*MPP-DP-43 through 47*).
- Promote local food production within the region. (*MPP-DP-47*).

Further, VISION calls for:

- The maintenance of a healthy natural environment for all residents of the region, regardless of social or economic status (*MPP-En-3, 4*).
- The development of a transportation system that minimizes negative impacts to human health (*MPP-T-7*).
- The protection of the environment and public health and safety when providing services and facilities (*MPP-PS-1*).
- The encouragement of health and human services facilities near centers and transit (*MPP-PS-16*).

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The existing Countywide Planning Policies do not address the linkage between health and land use.

Options for Consideration. GMPC directed staff to address public health in the CPPs. IJT is working with Seattle & King County Public Health staff to analyze the scope of the health policies to be included in the CPPs. Further, the Board of Health is developing standards that are intended to assist land use and transportation planners working at regional, county and city levels with identifying actions and strategies that will improve the health of residents and communities throughout King County. This information will be useful when drafting policies that link land use and transportation and health.

Presently, staff presents two approaches to incorporate public health in the CPPs:

- Option 1. Fully integrate Healthy Community policies throughout the proposed chapter structure (Attachment A) to strengthen the concept that health is not only a product of the health care system, but also a product of our agricultural, transportation, land use, housing, environmental, educational, energy, and economic policies. In addition, call out the health policy focus by providing an overall health framework and community healthy standards in

the Executive Summary and in the introduction to each chapter. This would emphasize the health connections to that policy area.

- Option 2. Create a new chapter of the Countywide Planning Policies entitled “Healthy Communities” to highlight the importance of health in overall land use planning. A stand-alone chapter discussing the linkages between health and various planning elements can bring special prominence and visibility to community health-related goals. In addition, a separate chapter could fit the various health elements more naturally together in the same section. Careful attention would be needed to ensure that policies in other chapters are not in conflict with health chapter policies so that the overall healthy communities’ goal is achieved.

### ***Issue 7. Regional Coordination and Finance***

VISION 2040 Direction. VISION 2040 implies that there must be regional coordination for many actions inclusive of financing, but it includes little explicit policy to that effect, except that *MPP-G-1* calls for the coordination of planning efforts among jurisdictions where there are common borders or related regional issues to facilitate a common vision. In addition, *MPP-D-7* states that priority for regional transportation funding should be given to projects in regional growth centers [referred to as Urban Centers in the CPPs].

Existing Countywide Planning Policies. The basis for the CPPs was coordination among jurisdictions to make the CPPs function. While clearly not alone, Chapter X focuses on Regional Finance and Governance (RF&G), calling for explicit regional plans for governance and finance. Such efforts were undertaken in the late 1990’s and were not successful. Since then many of the RF&G objectives have been or are nearly accomplished such as defining and identifying providers of urban services. Likewise, much of the unincorporated urban area has been annexed.

In the past 20 years, many needs for the funding for regional infrastructure have been centered at PSRC, Prosperity Partnership, Sound Transit and the Cascade Water Alliance, of which only PSRC existed at the adoption of the CPPs. Additionally, since the adoption of the CPPs major changes have occurred within King County government through charter amendments and financial constraints.

Many of the CPP policies were intended to provide direction to local jurisdictions in the preparation of their first comprehensive plan under GMA; with those plans completed, many of those policies can be deleted as the agreements are memorialized elsewhere or are no longer needed.

Options for Consideration. Staff presents two approaches to incorporate regional coordination and finance into the CPPs:

- Option 1. Integrate policies about regional coordination and finance throughout the CPPs in the appropriate topical chapters (Attachment A). For example, policies addressing regional coordination of transportation services and financing would be placed in the Transportation chapter. This option also places key regional coordination and finance policies in the Vision

and Framework chapter as a means to ground these concepts and strategies throughout the CPPs.

- Option 2. Create a chapter in the Countywide Planning Policies entitled “Regional Coordination and Finance.” This chapter would include policies that address:
  - Prioritization of regional investments to achieve implementation of the regional growth strategy;
  - Identification of potential regional investment strategies; and
  - Coordination and communication between jurisdictions on levels of service standards.

This option should pull policies (amended as necessary) from other chapters of the existing CPPs, including Land Use, Transportation and Community Character among others:

- *LU-47* and *LU-60 [Incentives for Centers]* which call for regional financial strategies and funding sources for urban infrastructure and services and consider appropriate amendments;
- *FW-21 & 22, T-15, 18 & 19*, regarding regional funding of transportation improvements;
- *CC-7, 9 & 13* regarding Countywide funding of parks and open space and coordinated park level of service standards;
- *FW-29* regarding funding and prioritization of Countywide facilities;
- *S-1* regarding a Countywide process for siting facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature; and
- *ED-18* regarding regional funding of infrastructure in support of economic development in light of the work of the Prosperity Partnership.

In both Options 1 and 2, *FW-1* will be deleted and replaced by:

- Moving all but *steps 8a and 9* to an introduction detailing the history and accomplishments of the CPPs to date;
- Developing a new policy from *step 8a* describing the current process and criteria for GMPC evaluation of changes to the Urban Growth Boundary; and
- From *step 9* prepare a new policy to describe the current process for amending the CPPs. Revise *FW-1* for currency and applicability.

### **NEXT STEPS**

With direction provided by the Executive Committee on the policy issues presented here, staff will continue work on drafting CPP policy language and policy options for consideration by the full council in September, 2010. Staff will also present GMPC with draft language and progress on affordable housing target methodology.

This page intentionally blank

Council Meeting Date: December 8, 2010

Agenda Item: II

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**AGENDA TITLE:** Update of the Countywide Planning Policies

**PRESENTED BY:** Interjurisdictional Staff Team

**SUMMARY**

The focus of the December GMPC meeting is to present staff progress on Countywide Planning Policies (CPP) updates. This report provides a short narrative for the Development Patterns, Housing, and Economy chapters as well as draft policies in the following attachments:

- **Attachment A:** draft policy language for the Development Patterns chapter
- **Attachment B:** draft policy language for the Housing chapter
- **Attachment C:** draft policy language for the Economy chapter

This staff report also includes a response to questions from GMPC members regarding the King County Transfer of Development Rights Program. Attachment D shows historical transfers through the TDR program. Further, this staff report recognizes the King County Board of Health “Planning for Healthy Communities Guidelines.” The guidelines, as in Attachment E, will inform revisions to the CPPs.

The proposed policies presented to GMPC today represent a first draft for policy maker and public review. Based on input from the GMPC, stakeholders, the public, and staff representing jurisdictions from throughout the county and the PSRC, the Interjurisdictional Team (IJT) will revise this draft for GMPC review and consideration for adoption in 2011. In the coming months, the staff teams will work on supporting text, appendices, and continued work on proposed policies.

**BACKGROUND**

At the September GMPC meeting, staff presented draft policy language for the Environment chapter and an update of progress of the remaining chapters of the CPPs as well as a public outreach strategy for the CPP update process. Following GMPC direction, staff is presenting draft language for Development Patterns, Housing, and Economy chapters. Staff will present policy language for the Transportation, Public Services, and Vision & Framework chapters in early 2011.

**DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS**

Attachment A contains draft updates for policies in a new Development Patterns chapter of the CPPs. The Development Patterns chapter consolidates elements of several chapters in the current CPPs, including Land Use Pattern, Community Character and Open Space, and Contiguous and Orderly Development, as well as provisions of several Framework Policies. This new chapter responds to the policy direction in VISION 2040 and updates the policies to reflect current conditions. Subsections of the new chapter include Urban Growth Area, Centers, Urban Design and Historic Preservation, and Rural and Resource Lands.

Specifically, the proposed policies address the following:

- Characteristics of Urban lands, such as compact development and coordination with provision of infrastructure, amenities, and open space
- Methods and criteria for allocating housing and employment growth targets, summarized in text that has been abbreviated from the CPP amendments adopted in 2009
- Clarification of the process and criteria for amending the UGA that shifts emphasis from initial designation to ongoing maintenance of the UGA and recognizes current statute and the approach used by the GMPC in evaluating past UGA boundary change proposals
- Joint Planning and Annexation policies that support the ongoing transition of governance over Urban lands from the county to cities
- Policies for Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers that provide more focused guidance on actions that support the success of centers locally and regionally as a strategy for focusing growth and as a framework for providing regional transit systems
- Expanded guidance on use of Transfer of Development Rights as a growth management tool
- Land uses and infrastructure that foster healthy communities by providing opportunities for daily exercise, healthy eating, protection from toxins and hazards, and increased social connectivity
- Climate change, both in terms of land use patterns that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and in terms of development approaches that adapt to the changing climate and its effects

In the coming months, staff will work on supporting text, appendices, and continued work on proposed policies that, in particular, may include refinements to the guidance related to new policy themes of healthy communities and climate change.

***Transfer of Development Rights.*** At the September GMPC meeting members raised questions about the King County Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program to better understand how the program has been operating. Staff has prepared a response to these questions as well as an illustration of historical TDR transactions as shown in Attachment D.

Since the program's inception 1998, 141,500 acres of Rural, Resource, and Urban Separator lands have been permanently preserved using TDR. Of this amount, 89,000 acres are attributed to the preservation of the Snoqualmie Tree Farm. Capacity for a total of 2,284 potential dwelling units has been removed from the preserved lands including 374 dwelling units from the Rural Area. The vast majority of TDR transfers have relocated development rights to the Urban Growth Area. There have only been two rural-to-rural transfers. The capacity increase in the Urban Growth Area from TDR has been 367 dwelling units. Of this, one-third went into cities

(Seattle and Issaquah) while roughly two-thirds of the capacity was transferred to urban unincorporated King County. The total amount of money exchanged between private landowners and developers is \$6.75 million.

***Healthy Communities.*** At the September GMPC meeting members brought adopted guidelines of the King County Board of Health to the attention of staff. “Planning for Healthy Communities Guidelines” (Attachment E) provides guidance to planners, local governments, and other organizations on key elements of the built environment and community design that hold the potential to improve and promote public health. The guidelines cover nine areas including: physical activity, nutrition, harmful environmental exposures, injury (transportation-related as well as land use- and design-related), tobacco use, alcohol use, mental health and well-being, and access to health care.

Staff is utilizing the guidelines to develop healthy community CPPs for all chapters. While the guidelines are most directly related to the Development Patterns chapter, they will be used to enhance other CPPs that affect aspects of the physical, social, and mental health of all King County populations.

## **HOUSING**

Attachment B contains draft updates for policies in a new Housing chapter of the CPPs. The Housing chapter proposal makes policy and technical amendments to the current Affordable Housing chapter of the CPPs. The chapter responds to the policy direction in VISION 2040 and updates the policies to reflect current conditions.

Specifically, the proposed policies address the following:

- Policy direction for local comprehensive plan housing needs assessments, with detailed guidance on scope, data, and methods to be covered in a technical appendix to the CPPs
- Affordable housing targets that are calculated similarly to the current affordable housing targets, with technical updates to reflect current data and a refined approach to jobs-housing balance
- Strategies to meet housing needs that include provision of adequate land capacity and local and regional adoption of a range of tools to further housing production, diversity, and affordability, with detailed guidance on housing tools and resources to be covered in a technical appendix to the CPPs
- New policy language covering housing and affordable housing in mixed-use centers
- Policy direction on monitoring housing activity and markets as a basis for improving outcomes for all economic and demographic segments of the county’s population, with further detail on monitoring and evaluation provided in a technical appendix

The policies were prepared by the IJT in partnership with multijurisdictional workgroup of housing staff. In the coming months, the staff teams will work on supporting text, appendices, and continued work on proposed policies that, in particular, will address further refinement of the affordable housing targets and guidance on the relationship between the targets, the housing needs assessment, and local plans and regulations.

## **ECONOMY**

At the September GMPC meeting staff presented members with a proposed outline of the CPPs. This outline organizes the Economy policies consistent with the VISION 2040 framework. The staff also reviewed with the GMPC Executive Committee the concept of relying heavily on the adopted Regional Economic Strategy (RES) so as to avoid creating separate independent economic guidance.

The RES is the region's federally required comprehensive economic development strategy as well as VISION 2040's economic functional plan. VISION 2040 integrates the RES with growth management, transportation, and environmental objectives to:

- support fundamental economic foundations, such as education, technology, infrastructure, and quality of life; and
- promote the region's specific economic clusters: aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism.

Attachment C contains draft updates for policies in a new Economy chapter of the CPPs. As with other chapters of the CPPs, the update of the Economy section seeks to remove or update outdated language, address specific issue areas not currently covered, and better align the policy framework with that of the VISION 2040. The style of the policies is updated similar to the updated Environment policies that were previously presented, seeking to make the policies more clear and direct.

### **Economy Chapter Structure**

Overarching Economy policies call for aligning local economic policies and strategies with VISION 2040 and the Regional Economic Strategy, supporting the adopted 20-year employment targets, and identifying and supporting the region's industry clusters within King County.

***Businesses.*** The Businesses section continues to support business retention and development, including local government actions, such as predictability of local regulations, and public-private partnerships. A new policy, ED-10, recommended to be added to the CPPs is one that would integrate the healthy communities concept into the Economy section. It calls for support of the regional food economy, including production, processing, wholesaling and distribution of the region's agricultural food and food products.

***People.*** The People section supports education and workforce training, celebrating the economic advantage of cultural diversity, and addressing disparity in income and employment for those that are economically disadvantaged.

***Places.*** The Places section reinforces the centers-oriented approach of the region's growth strategy and supports infrastructure investments that are aligned with the region's economic strategy. A new policy concept, ED-16, encourages economic development that supports neighborhood and community vibrancy. The Places policies also address industrial lands and

Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, and cleanup of contaminated sites to encourage redevelopment.

A new policy, ED-22, addresses economic activity in Rural Cities. Within VISION 2040, *MPPs EC-21 and EC-22*, call for focus of appropriate employment growth outside the Urban Area into local centers. VISION further calls for employment in and adjacent to resource lands to be compatible with resource functions and character and to not conflict with rural character and resource-based land uses. The draft policy addresses this by acknowledging Rural Cities in the CPPs as the economic and cultural centers of the Rural Area and of Natural Resource Lands.

Several policies related to utilities that are currently included in the Economy section of the CPPs are proposed to be relocated to a Public Services section and are not included in the attached draft. They will be presented to the GMPC at an upcoming meeting.

In addition to using VISION and the RES for guidance, IJT staff developed the updated Economy policies by working collaboratively with a number of Economic Development managers from various jurisdictions. The draft Economy policies were also reviewed with the King County Economic Development Managers group. As with the Development Patterns and Housing sections, the policies will be reviewed at an upcoming stakeholders meeting and staff will continue to seek comments.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Staff will continue drafting CPP policy language for GMPC consideration in February, 2011. Staff will also continue public outreach as recommended by GMPC.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

While no formal action by GMPC is requested at this time, staff seeks feedback from GMPC regarding the direction expressed by the draft policies included herein.

Attachment A

## **King County Countywide Planning Policies**

### **Draft Policies:**

### **Development Patterns Chapter**

**Goal for Development Patterns Chapter:** (To be inserted.)

#### Urban, Rural, and Resource Lands

DP-1: Designate all land within King County as either:

- a) Urban land contained within the Urban Growth Area (UGA), within which growth is focused and accommodated through an urban pattern and density of development that is or easily can be provided with urban services;
- b) Rural land, located outside the UGA, which protects farming, forestry, and other resource uses, along with long-term very low-density residential uses, and small-scale non-residential uses; or
- c) Resource land, characterized as permanent regionally significant agricultural, forestry, and mining lands.

Map DP-1 shows the UGA boundary and Urban, Rural, and Resource lands within King County.

#### Urban Growth Area

**Goal Statement:** (To be inserted.)

#### *Urban Lands*

DP-2: Promote a pattern of compact development within the UGA that includes housing at a range of urban densities, commercial and industrial development, and other urban facilities, including medical, governmental, institutional, and educational uses and parks and open space. The UGA will include a mix of uses that are convenient to public transportation in order to reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles for most daily activities.

DP-3: Develop land in the UGA efficiently to create healthy vibrant urban communities, reduce urban sprawl, use available urban services, and accommodate growth within existing urban areas thereby preserving the long-term viability of Rural and Resource lands. Promote the efficient use of Urban land by using methods such as:

- a) Directing concentrations of housing and employment growth to designated centers;

- b) Encouraging compact development with a mix of compatible residential, commercial, and community activities on the same site or in close proximity to each other;
- c) Using tools to maximize utilization of the existing capacity for housing and employment;
- d) Coordinating the growth expectations of land use, transportation, capital facility and utility plans.

DP-4: Concentrate housing and employment growth within the designated Urban Growth Area. Focus housing growth within designated Urban and Subregional Centers. Focus employment growth within designated Urban, Subregional, and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.

DP-5: Provide all residents with opportunities for safe and convenient daily physical activity, access to healthy food, social connectivity, and protection from exposure to harmful substances and environments through land use patterns, transportation systems, open space and other amenities that promote health.

DP-6: Designate Urban Separators as permanent low-density incorporated and unincorporated areas within the UGA. Urban Separators are intended to protect resource lands, Rural Areas, and environmentally sensitive areas, and create open space and wildlife corridors within and between communities while also providing public health, environmental, visual, and recreational benefits. The maintenance of the Urban Separators is a local as well as a regional concern. Changes to Urban Separators are made by amendment to the Countywide Planning Policies Designated Urban Separators within cities and unincorporated areas are shown in Map DP-2.

***Growth Targets***

DP-7: Allocate residential and employment growth to each city and unincorporated urban area in the county to meet the following objectives:

- a) To accommodate the most recent 20-year population projection from the state Office of Financial Management and the most recent 20-year regional employment forecast from the PSRC;
- b) To plan for a pattern of growth that is guided by the Regional Growth Strategy contained in VISION 2040 including concentrating growth in cities with designated Centers and other larger cities, limiting development in the Rural areas, and protecting designated Resource lands;
- c) To efficiently utilize existing and planned development capacity as well as the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure, including sewer and water systems;
- d) To promote a land use pattern that can be served by a connected network of public transportation services and facilities and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and amenities;
- e) To focus growth in locations with access to existing and planned transportation infrastructure and services, especially high-capacity and other frequent transit service;
- f) To improve the jobs/housing balance within the region and the county;
- g) To distribute growth equitably in order to promote sufficient opportunities for housing and employment development within all jurisdictions;
- h) To allocate growth to individual Potential Annexation Areas within the Urban unincorporated area as guided by the capacity for housing and employment growth within each PAA.

Adopt housing and employment growth targets in the CPPs subject to ratification by the county and cities. Targets may be adjusted administratively upon annexation of unincorporated PAAs by cities. Growth targets for the 2006-2031 planning period are shown in table DP-1.<sup>1</sup>

DP-8: Plan for and accommodate housing and employment targets in each jurisdiction. This includes:

- a) Providing adequate capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial uses through the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan and zoning regulations;
- b) Planning for and providing water, sewer, transportation and other infrastructure, in concert with investments by other agencies, including special purpose districts; and
- c) Accommodating increases in housing and employment targets as annexations occur.

The targets do not obligate a jurisdiction to guarantee that a given number of housing units will be built or jobs added during the planning period.

### ***Amendments to the Urban Growth Area***

DP-9: Allow expansion of the UGA only when the following steps have been satisfied:

- a) The proposed expansion of the UGA is brought to the GMPC by King County and it is under review by King County as part of the four-year cycle amendment process of the King County Comprehensive Plan;
- b) The GMPC recommends to the King County Council approval of the proposed amendment to the UGA;
- c) The King County Council approves the proposed amendment to the UGA; and
- d) The proposed amendment to the UGA is ratified by the county and cities following the procedures set forth in Policy FW-1.<sup>2</sup>

DP-10: Approve proposed expansions of the UGA only if at least one of the following criteria is met:

- a) The current UGA is insufficient in size and additional land is needed to accommodate the housing and employment growth targets, as demonstrated in the most recent UGA review, or institutional and other non-residential uses as provided in RCW 37.70A.110(2), and there are no other reasonable measures, such as increasing density or rezoning existing urban land, that would avoid the need to expand the UGA; or
- b) The proposed expansion of the UGA is accompanied by dedication of permanent open space to the King County Open Space System, where the acreage of the proposed open space is at least four times the acreage of the land added to the UGA; or
- c) The area is currently a King County park being transferred to a city for purpose as a park in perpetuity or is park land that has been owned by a city since 1994 and is less than thirty acres.

<sup>1</sup> Table DP-1 refers to existing table LU-1 without amendment

<sup>2</sup> As proposed in the 9/22/10 GMPC staff report, FW-1 outlines the CPP ratification process and formula.

DP-11: If expansion of the UGA is warranted based on the criteria in DP-10, add land to the UGA only if it meets all of the following criteria:

- a) Is adjacent to the existing UGA;
- b) Can be efficiently provided with urban services and does not require supportive facilities located in the Rural Area;
- c) Follows topographical features that form natural boundaries, such as rivers and ridge lines and does not extend beyond natural boundaries, such as watersheds, that impede the provision of urban services;
- d) Is not currently designated as Resource land;
- e) Is sufficiently free of environmental constraints to be able to support urban development without significant adverse environmental impacts, unless the area is designated as an urban separator by interlocal agreement between King County and the annexing city; and
- f) Is subject to an agreement between King County and the city or town adjacent to the area that the area will be added to the city's potential annexation area [PAA]. Upon ratification of the amendment, the CPPs will reflect both the UGA change and PAA change.

DP-12: Allow redesignation of land within the Urban Growth Area to Rural Area if it meets all of the following criteria:

- a) Is not needed to accommodate projected urban growth;
- b) Is not served or cannot be served easily by public sewers;
- c) Is currently developed at a low density lot pattern that cannot be realistically redeveloped at an urban density; and
- d) Is characterized by environmentally sensitive areas making it inappropriate for higher density development.

DP-13: Review the UGA at least every ten years. The review shall consider monitoring reports, including the most recent Buildable Lands Report, and other available data. As a result of this review, and based on the criteria established in DP-10 and DP-11, the GMPC may recommend amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan that make changes to the UGA boundary.

### ***Review and Evaluation Program***

DP-14: Conduct a Buildable Lands Program, in compliance with the review and evaluation requirements of the Growth Management Act in RCW 36.70A.215. The purposes of the Buildable Lands program are:

- a) To collect and analyze data on development activity and land supply and capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses; and
- b) To evaluate 1) the consistency of actual development densities with current comprehensive plans and 2) the sufficiency of land capacity to accommodate growth for the remainder of the planning period.

Further detail on the Buildable Lands Program is described in Appendix DP-1.

DP-15: Adopt reasonable measures, where necessary based on the findings of the Buildable Lands report, to increase the efficiency of the use of urban land consistent with current plans and targets in order to provide for sufficient land capacity for housing and employment growth. Expansion of the UGA may not be employed as a reasonable measure.

***Joint Planning and Annexation***

DP-16: Coordinate the preparation of comprehensive plans with adjacent and other affected jurisdictions, consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies.

DP-17: Transfer the responsibility to provide urban services within the Urban Area to cities as conditions warrant.

DP-18: Designate potential annexation areas (PAAs), where applicable, in city comprehensive plans. PAAs shall be approved by the Growth Management Planning Council and mapped in the Countywide Planning Policies. PAAs should not overlap. Cities may agree to modify PAA boundaries. PAA designation shall ensure that unincorporated urban islands of King County are not created between cities and strive to eliminate existing islands between cities.

DP-19: Allow cities to annex territory only within their designated PAA as shown in Map DP-2. Phase annexations to coincide with the ability of the city to coordinate the provision of a full range of urban services to areas to be annexed.

DP-20: Apply the following policy only within the North Highline unincorporated area. Where PAAs overlapped prior to January 1, 2009, the cities with the PAA overlap and the county should attempt to establish alternative non-overlapping PAA boundaries through a process of negotiation. Absent a negotiated resolution, a city may file a Notice of Intent to Annex with the Boundary Review Board for King County for territory within its designated portion of a PAA overlap as shown on the Interim Potential Annexation Area Map and detailed in the city's comprehensive plan after the following steps have been taken:

- a) The city proposing annexation has, at least 30 days prior to filing a Notice of Intent to annex with the Boundary Review Board, contacted in writing the cities with the PAA overlap and the county to provide notification of the city's intent to annex and to request a meeting or formal mediation to discuss boundary alternatives, and;
- b) The cities with the PAA overlap and the county have either:
  - i. Agreed to meet but failed to develop a negotiated settlement to the overlap within 60 days of receipt of the notice, or;
  - ii. Declined to meet or failed to respond in writing within 30 days of receipt of the notice.

DP-21: Develop agreements between King County and cities with PAAs to apply city-compatible development standards that will guide land development prior to annexation. Affected cities, with support from King County, should reach out to affected unincorporated residents to explain the service delivery benefits of annexation and the reasons for the use of city standards.

DP-22: Facilitate the annexation of unincorporated Urban Areas that are already urbanized and are within a city’s PAA in order to receive urban services. Annexation is preferred over incorporation.

DP-23: Evaluate proposals to annex or incorporate unincorporated land based on the following criteria:

- a) Conformance with Countywide Planning Policies including the UGA boundary;
- b) The ability of the annexing or incorporating jurisdiction to provide urban services at standards equal to or better than the current service providers; and
- c) Annexation or incorporation in a manner that will avoid creating unincorporated islands of development.

## Centers

**Goal Statement:** (To be inserted.)

### *Urban Centers*

DP-24: Concentrate housing and employment growth within designated Urban Centers.

DP-25: Designate Urban Centers in the CPPs where city-nominated locations meet the criteria in DP-26 and DP-27 and where the city’s commitments will help ensure the success of the center. Each center’s proposed location will promote a countywide system of Urban Centers, and the total number of centers should represent a realistic growth strategy for the county. Map DP-3 displays the designated Urban Centers.

DP-26: Evaluate and approve each Urban Center proposal based on the following criteria:

- a) Meets the criteria for designation by the PSRC as a Regional Growth Center;
- b) May be up to one and a half square miles in area; and
- c) Zoning and infrastructure are adequate to accommodate:
  - i. A minimum of 15,000 jobs within one-half mile of a high-capacity transit station;
  - ii. At a minimum, an average of 50 employees per gross acre; and
  - iii. At a minimum, an average of 15 housing units per gross acre.

DP-27: Develop plans for each Urban Center that include goals, policies, and actions to promote and maintain quality of life in the Center through:

- a) Pedestrian and bicycle mobility, transit use, and linkages between these modes;
- b) Parking management strategies that minimize single-occupancy vehicle usage, especially during peak commute periods;
- c) A broad array and mix of land uses that foster both daytime and nighttime activities and opportunities for social interaction and community cohesion;
- d) A range of affordable and healthy housing choices;
- e) Historic preservation and adaptive reuse of historic places;

- f) Parks and public open spaces that are accessible and beneficial to all residents in the Urban Center;
- g) Facilities to meet human service needs; and
- h) Superior urban design which reflects the local community.

DP-28: Contribute to improving health for all residents and decrease greenhouse gas emissions through land use strategies that reduce vehicle miles traveled and provide alternatives to auto travel in Urban and Subregional Centers.

DP-29: Adopt in the comprehensive plan for each city containing an Urban Center a map of the Center showing its geographic boundaries, and targets for both housing and employment growth within the center for the comprehensive planning period.

DP-30: Form the land use foundation for a regional high-capacity transit system through the designation of a system of Urban Centers. Urban Centers should receive high priority for the location of transit stations, transit centers, as well as infrastructure providing pedestrians and bicyclists with safe and convenient access to transit.

DP-31: Direct concentrations of office activity to Urban Centers. Office building development outside of Urban Centers should occur within locally designated Subregional Centers.

***Manufacturing/Industrial Centers***

DP-32: Support concentrations of manufacturing and industrial employment within designated Manufacturing/Industrial Centers. Map DP-4 displays the designated Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.

DP-33: Adopt plans and regulations for each Manufacturing/Industrial Center to:

- a) Provide zoning and infrastructure adequate to accommodate a minimum of 10,000 jobs;
- b) Preserve and enhance sites that are appropriate for manufacturing or industrial uses;
- c) Prohibit residential uses and discourage land uses that are not compatible with manufacturing and industrial uses, such as by imposing limits on the size of offices and retail uses that are not accessory to an industrial use;
- d) Facilitate the mobility of employees by transit and the movement of goods by truck, rail, or waterway, as appropriate;
- e) Provide for capital facility improvement projects which support the movement of goods and manufacturing/industrial operations;
- f) Ensure that utilities are available to serve the center;
- g) Provide buffers around the center to reduce conflicts with adjacent land uses; and
- h) Attract the type of businesses that will ensure economic growth and stability.

DP-34: Adopt in the comprehensive plan of each city containing a Manufacturing/Industrial Center a map showing the geographic boundaries of the center and targets for employment growth within the center for the comprehensive planning period.

DP-35: Minimize or mitigate potential health impacts of the activities in Manufacturing/Industrial Centers on nearby residential communities, schools, open space, and other public facilities located in or adjacent to Centers as needed.

DP-36: Designate additional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers through the GMPC based on nominations from cities after determining that the nominated locations meet the criteria set forth in DP-33 and the criteria established by the PSRC for Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, and that the proposed center's location will promote a countywide system of Manufacturing/Industrial Centers with the total number of centers representing a realistic growth strategy for the county; and that the city's commitments will help ensure the success of the center.

### ***Subregional Centers***

DP-37: Allow and encourage, where appropriate, concentrations of housing and employment growth within locally designated Subregional Centers.

DP-38: Encourage local designation in city comprehensive plans of one or more Subregional Centers, such as city or town centers, neighborhood centers, transit station areas, or other activity nodes, that are characterized by the following:

- a) A diversity of land uses, including commercial, residential, public facilities, and open spaces;
- b) Housing and employment densities that, while lower than most Urban Centers, are sufficient to support frequent transit service;
- c) Pedestrian and bicycle facilities that connect residential areas to commercial districts, recreation, and transit facilities;
- d) Superior urban design which reflects the local community; and
- e) Disincentives for single-occupancy vehicle usage for commute purposes during peak hours.

## Urban Design and Historic Preservation

**Goal statement:** (To be inserted)

DP-39: Develop neighborhood planning and design processes that encourage infill development, redevelopment, and reuse of existing buildings and that enhance the existing community character and mix of uses.

DP-40: Promote a high quality of design and site planning in publicly-funded construction and in private development throughout the UGA.

DP-41: Preserve significant historic, archeological, cultural, architectural, artistic, and environmental features, especially in the UGA where the goal to accommodate most new growth could place these resources at risk. Where appropriate, designate individual features or areas for

protection or restoration. Encourage land use patterns and implement regulations that protect and enhance historic resources and sustain historic community character.

DP-42: Ensure that schools and public facilities are accessible by walking, biking or transit. Promote the joint use of facilities, where appropriate.

DP-43: Design urban buildings, development sites, and landscapes to create, protect, and manage systems of green infrastructure (i.e., urban forests, parks, green roofs, and natural drainage systems) as a means to both reduce climate altering pollution and increase resilience of communities to climate change impacts.

DP-44: Design communities, neighborhoods and individual development projects using techniques that reduce heat absorption.

DP-45: Increase access to healthy food in communities throughout the UGA by encouraging the location of healthy food purveyors, such as grocery stores and farmers markets, and community food gardens in proximity to residential uses and transit facilities.

DP-46: Adopt design standards or guidelines that make infill development more compatible with the existing or desired urban context.

## Rural and Resource Lands

**Goal Statement:** (To be inserted.)

### *Rural Lands*

DP-47: Limit growth in the Rural Area as guided by the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy to prevent sprawl and the overburdening of rural services, reduce the need for capital expenditures for rural roads, maintain rural character, and protect the environment.

DP-48: Limit residential development in the Rural Area to housing at low densities that are compatible with rural character and comply with the following density guidelines:

- a) One home per 20 acres where a pattern of large lots exists and to protect forest lands;
- b) One home per ten acres to protect lands for small-scale farming and forestry or on lands within a quarter mile of the Forest Production District or Agricultural Production District;  
or
- c) One home per five acres when the land does not meet the criteria for lower density designations and where the predominant lot size is less than ten acres.

DP-49: Extend utilities, roads, and other infrastructure improvements through Rural Areas only when necessary to serve Urban Areas and when there are no other feasible alignments. Such limited extensions may be considered only if land use controls are in place to restrict uses appropriate for the Rural Area and only if access management controls are in place to prohibit tie-ins to the extended facilities.

DP-50: Establish rural development standards to protect the natural environment by using seasonal and maximum clearing limits for vegetation, limits on the amount of impervious surface, surface water management standards that preserve natural drainage systems, water quality and groundwater recharge, and best management practices for resource-based activities.

DP-51: Use a range of tools, including land use designations, development regulations, level-of-service standards, purchase or transfer of development rights, and other incentives for preserving rural lands and focusing urban development within the UGA.

DP-52: Prevent or, if necessary, mitigate negative impacts of urban development on adjacent Rural Areas.

DP-53: Maintain rural roads at rural standards. Do not upgrade rural roads to accommodate urban traffic levels.

DP-54: Do not locate regional public facilities in the Rural Area if those facilities are likely to attract a large number of people from the Urban Area.

DP-55: Allow cities that own property in the rural area to enter into Interlocal Agreements with King County that would allow the cities to provide services to the property. The cities shall not be allowed to annex the property or serve it with sewers. The use of the property must be consistent with the rural land use policies of this document and the King County Comprehensive Plan.

### ***Resource Lands***

DP-56: Promote and support forestry, agriculture, mining and other resource-based industries outside of the UGA as part of a diverse, regional and sustainable economy.

DP-57: Protect commercial agricultural and forestry resource lands primarily for their long-term productive resource value and for the open space, scenic views, wildlife habitat, and critical area protection benefits they provide.

DP-58: Encourage best practices in agriculture and forestry operations for long-term protection of the natural resources.

DP-59: Prohibit annexation of lands within designated Agricultural Production Districts or within Forest Production Districts by cities.

DP-60: Retain the Lower Green River Agricultural Production District as a regionally designated resource that is to remain in unincorporated King County.

DP-61: Discourage incompatible land uses adjacent to designated Resource lands to minimize conflicts with resource uses.

DP-62: Preserve opportunities for mining in the Rural Area, in the Forest Production District, and on Mineral Resource Lands and ensure that extractive industries maintain environmental quality and minimize negative impacts on adjacent land uses.

DP-63: Support local production and processing of food within King County to reduce the need for long distance transport and to increase the reliability and security of local food.

DP-64: Coordinate among all King County jurisdictions to support local-area farmers and to ensure a continued supply of fresh produce and local food products, including at farmers markets throughout the county.

DP-65: Support institutional procurement policies that encourage purchases of locally grown food products.

DP-66: Use Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) as a growth management tool that protects Rural and Resource lands by shifting potential development from those lands into existing Urban areas, especially cities. Implement TDR within King County through a partnership between the county and cities that is designed to:

- a) Identify Rural and Resource sending sites that satisfy countywide conservation goals and are consistent with regionally coordinated TDR efforts;
- b) Preserve rural and resource lands of compelling interest to participating cities;
- c) Identify appropriate TDR receiving areas within cities;
- d) Identify incentives for city participation in regional TDR (i.e. county-to-city TDR);
- e) Develop interlocal agreements that allow rural and resource TDRs to be used in city receiving areas;
- f) Identify and secure opportunities to fund or finance infrastructure within city TDR receiving areas; and
- g) Recognize that cities may have their own citywide TDR programs.

## Attachment B

## King County Countywide Planning Policies

### Draft Policies:

### Housing Chapter

**Overarching Goal:** The housing needs of all economic and demographic groups of the population are met by all jurisdictions.

#### *Housing Supply and Needs Assessment*

H-1: Include in each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan an inventory and analysis of housing needs of all economic and demographic segments of the population, both existing and projected for the community over the planning period. The analysis should include, at a minimum, relevant characteristics of housing supply and housing need, especially the needs of very-low, low- and moderate-income households, and special needs populations in the county. The housing needs assessment shall reflect each jurisdiction's existing needs as well as its responsibility to accommodate a fair share of the projected future demand for affordable housing countywide. Further guidance on the elements of the housing needs assessment is provided in Appendix H-1.

#### *Affordable Housing Targets*

H-2: Adopt in each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan policies and strategies that accommodate at least the following affordable housing targets:

- a) Housing affordable to moderate income households, with incomes between 50 and 80 percent of the area median household income, which is equal to 16 percent of the jurisdiction's overall housing target.
- b) Housing affordable to low-income and very-low income households, with incomes below 50 percent of area median household income, which is equal to either 20 percent or 24 percent of the jurisdiction's overall housing target, as determined in the Jobs/Housing Index table in Appendix H-2.

Progress toward affordable housing targets may be accomplished through the addition of new affordable units or existing units newly preserved or acquired and rehabilitated with a regulatory agreement for long-term affordability.

#### *Strategies to Meet Housing Needs*

H-3: Provide residential capacity, including a range of housing types and densities, within each jurisdiction in the Urban Growth Area, that is sufficient to accommodate both its overall housing target and its affordable housing targets.

H-4: Adopt strategies, at the local and countywide levels, that promote housing supply, affordability and diversity. At a minimum, these strategies should address the following areas:

- a) New housing that increases the overall supply of housing and diversity of housing types;
- b) New housing that is affordable to very-low, low, and moderate income households;
- c) Provision of housing that is suitable and affordable for households with special needs;
- d) Preservation of existing housing units, especially affordable housing units;
- e) Acquisition and rehabilitation of housing units for long-term affordability;
- f) Universal design and sustainable residential development; and
- g) Housing supply, affordable housing, and special needs housing within Urban and Subregional Centers and in other areas planned for concentrations of mixed land uses.
- h) More detailed guidance on strategies for promoting housing supply and affordability are contained in Appendix H-1.

H-5: Plan for jobs and appropriately priced housing located within close proximity to each other so people of all incomes can live near their places of work. Encourage housing production at a level that improves the balance of housing to employment throughout the county.

H-6: Promote housing development, preservation, and affordability in coordination with transit, bicycle, and pedestrian plans and investments and in proximity to transit hubs and corridors, such as through transit oriented development and planning for mixed uses in transit station areas.

H-7: Incorporate healthy housing concepts into housing affordability strategies, policies, and programs.

H-8: Adopt comprehensive plan policies that promote fair housing and plan for communities that are diverse and inclusive of the abilities, ages, races, incomes, and other diverse characteristics of the population of the county.

### ***Regional Cooperation***

H-9: Collaborate in developing new countywide housing resources and programs, including funding, with a focus on meeting the affordable housing needs of very-low, low, and moderate income households. Jurisdictions are encouraged to support countywide affordable housing programs and contribute resources and other in-kind assistance to local affordable housing projects.

H-10: Work cooperatively among jurisdictions to meet housing and affordable housing targets.

H-11: Work cooperatively with the Puget Sound Regional Council and other agencies, to identify ways to expand technical assistance to local jurisdictions in developing, implementing and monitoring the success of affordable housing strategies. These efforts shall include collaboration in developing and implementing a housing strategy for the 4-county Puget Sound region.

### ***Measuring Results***

H-12: Monitor housing supply and affordability, including progress toward achieving affordable housing targets, both countywide and within each jurisdiction. Such monitoring should encompass:

- a) Number and type of new housing units, including accessory dwelling units;
- b) Number of units lost to demolition, redevelopment, or conversion to non-residential use;
- c) Number of new units that are affordable to very-low, low, and moderate income households;
- d) Number of affordable units newly preserved and units acquired and rehabilitated with a regulatory agreement for long-term affordability;
- e) Housing market trends including affordability of overall housing stock;
- f) Changes in zoned capacity for housing;
- g) The number and nature of fair housing complaints; and
- h) Housing development and market trends in Urban Centers.
- i) Report regularly on the results of the housing monitoring program. Further detail on the procedures and content of the housing monitoring are contained in Appendix H-1.

H-13: Consider the results of local and countywide monitoring in developing and updating county and city housing policies and strategies.

H-14: The Growth Management Planning Council shall on a regular basis, evaluate achievement of countywide goals for housing for all economic and demographic segments of the population. If the Growth Management Planning Council determines that housing planned for any segment falls short of the need for affordable housing, it may recommend additional policies or actions.

Attachment C

## **King County Countywide Planning Policies**

### **Draft Policies:**

### **Economy Chapter**

**Overarching Goal:** The people of King County prosper through economic growth and job creation.

#### ***Regional Economic Strategy***

ED-1: Align local economic policies and strategies with VISION 2040 and the Regional Economic Strategy.

#### ***Connections to Targets***

ED-2: Support economic growth that accommodates adopted twenty-year employment targets through local land use plans, infrastructure development, and implementation of economic development strategies.

#### ***Clusters***

ED-3: Identify and support existing and emerging industry clusters and subclusters within King County that are components of the Regional Economic Strategy.

#### ***Performance and Metrics***

ED-4: Evaluate the performance of economic development policies and strategies in business development and job creation. King County and its cities should identify and track key economic metrics to help jurisdictions evaluate the effectiveness of their individual and the region's economic strategies.

### **Businesses**

#### ***Local Regulations and Relationships***

ED-5: Help businesses to thrive and support business retention by:

- a) Assuring transparency, efficiency, and predictability of local regulations and policies;
- b) Encouraging communication and partnerships between businesses, government, schools, and research institutions; and
- c) Encouraging government contracts with local businesses.

***Business Retention and Development***

ED-6: Foster the retention and development of those businesses and industries that export their goods and services outside the region.

ED-7: Promote an economic climate that is supportive of business formation, expansion, and retention and emphasizes the importance of small businesses in creating jobs.

***Public-Private Partnerships***

ED-8: Foster a broad range of public-private partnerships to implement economic development policies, programs and projects.

***Local Assets***

ED-9: Identify and support the retention of key regional and local assets to the economy, such as major educational facilities, research institutions, health care facilities, manufacturing facilities, and port facilities.

***Healthy Communities***

ED-10: Support the regional food economy including the production, processing, wholesaling, and distribution of the region's agricultural food and food products to all King County communities. Emphasize increasing access to those communities with limited presence of healthy food options.

**People**

***Education***

ED-11: Work with schools and other institutions to sustain a highly educated and skilled workforce, including aligning job training and education offerings with the region's industry clusters. Identify partnership and funding opportunities where appropriate.

***Diversity***

ED-12: Celebrate the cultural diversity of local communities as a means to enhance our global relationships.

***Disadvantaged Populations***

ED-13: Address the historic disparity in income and employment opportunities for minorities, women, and economically disadvantaged populations by committing resources in human services, community development, housing, economic development, and public infrastructure to address these inequalities.

## Places

### *Centers*

ED-14: Foster economic and employment growth in designated Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers through local investments, planning, and financial policies. Retain sufficient land for basic industries to remain and locate in the UGA, especially in the Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, even as the UGA becomes denser and demand to site other activities increases.

### *Infrastructure*

ED-15: Make local investments in infrastructure, transportation, and public services that support local and regional economic development strategies. Focus investments where it encourages growth in designated centers and helps achieved employment targets.

### *Community supportive development*

ED-16: Encourage economic development that adds to the vibrancy and sustainability of our communities and the health and well-being of all people through providing safe and convenient access to local services, neighborhood-oriented retail, purveyors of healthy food (e.g. grocery stores and farmers markets), and transportation choices.

### *Environment*

ED-17: Promote the natural environment as a key economic asset. Work cooperatively with local businesses to help protect and restore the natural environment in a manner that is efficient and predictable, and minimizes impacts on businesses.

### *Land Supply*

ED-18: Maintain an adequate supply of land to support economic development. Inventory, plan for, and monitor the land supply and development capacity for commercial, manufacturing, and other employment uses that can accommodate the amount and types of economic activity anticipated during the planning period.

### *Industrial Siting*

ED-19: Foster a climate supportive of Manufacturing/Industrial Centers by adopting industrial siting policies, consistent with the Regional Economic Strategy. Prohibit or strictly limit non-supporting or incompatible activities that can interfere with the retention or operation of industrial businesses, especially in M/ICs.

### *Industrial Lands*

ED-20: Limit the loss of industrial lands, particularly in M/ICs, in order to maintain the region's economic diversity and the family-wage jobs that business in these areas provide.

***Brownfields***

ED-21: Facilitate redevelopment of contaminated sites through local, county and state financing and other strategies that assist with funding environmental clean-up.

***Rural Cities***

ED-22: Encourage limited economic activity within Rural Cities and their associated Potential Annexation Areas that does not create adverse impacts to surrounding Rural Area and Resource Lands and will not create the need to provide urban services and facilities to those areas.