

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**2009 AMENDMENTS TO THE PIERCE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

T-2 Unused County Rights-of-way Terminating at Navigable Waters ..... 2

T-3 Water Treatment and Water Purification Facilities..... 3

T-4 Solid Waste Management Plan Update..... 3

T-5 Housing Affordability..... 3

T-6 UGA Expansion Criteria ..... 4

T-8 Adopt the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area Stewardship Plan..... 4

M-1 Pierce County Parks and Recreation - PARK..... 5

M-2 PALS Technical Amendment – ARL to R10 ..... 5

M-3 Crescent Valley Alliance – R10 and Rsv5 to RSR, Gig Harbor ..... 5

M-4 Business Association of Midland – MSF to MUD, Midland ..... 6

M-5 Business Association of Midland – MSF to NC, Midland ..... 6

M-6 Business Association of Midland – MSF to EC, Midland ..... 7

M-10 Merit Company – HRD to EC, Parkland ..... 7

M-11 Smith / Damrau – AC to MUD, Spanaway ..... 7

M-12 Les Schwab Profit Sharing Retirement Trust – MSF to MUD, Spanaway ..... 8

M-13 Solis – MSF to MUD, Spanaway ..... 8

M-15 Warmoth – MSF to EC, Mid-County ..... 8

M-16 Pierce – MSF to EC, Frederickson ..... 8

M-17 Gustafson – RSR to RF, Graham ..... 9

M-18 Pro-Fusion – HSF to HRD, South Hill..... 9

M-21 McVean – MSF to MUD, North Puyallup ..... 9



1 M-23 Monarch Custom Homes – ARL to R10, McKenna ..... 9  
2  
3 U-1 PALS Technical Amendment – Recognize Annexations ..... 10  
4  
5 U-2 County Council – East Sumner UGA Reduction..... 10  
6  
7 U-3 City of Sumner – East Sumner UGA Modification ..... 10  
8  
9 U-4 City of Puyallup – UGA Modification ..... 10  
10  
11 U-5 Town of Eatonville – UGA Expansion for EC..... 11  
12  
13 U-6 Watters – Eatonville UGA Reduction ..... 11  
14  
15 U-7 Knox – UGA Adjustment, Mid-County ..... 11  
16  
17 U-8a Merriman – UGA Expansion, Mid-County..... 12  
18  
19 C-3 Bethel School District – Electronic Readerboard Signs in Graham ..... 12  
20  
21 C-4 Business Association of Midland – Auto Repair in CE and  
22 Residential in NC, Parkland Spanaway Midland..... 12  
23  
24 C-5 Affinity Investments – Density Consistent with Height in AC,  
25 Parkland Spanaway Midland ..... 12  
26  
27 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement..... 13  
28  
29  
30

31 **T-2, Unused County Rights-of-way Terminating at Navigable Waters**

32 The County Council finds that Text Amendment T-2, to create management policies for  
33 the use of unused rights-of-way which terminate at navigable waters, is appropriate  
34 because:

- 35 • It is consistent with recreation goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan to  
36 increase access to the shorelines of the County;
- 37 • It is consistent with Objective 54 of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive  
38 Plan which provides that non-athletic recreational uses should be easily  
39 accessible and located at sites that off unique saltwater features, freshwater  
40 bodies, and rivers and streams; and
- 41 • It is consistent with Goal 9 of the Growth Management Act which encourages the  
42 enhancement of recreational opportunities and the increase of access to  
43 shorelines.

1 **T-3, Water Treatment and Water Purification Facilities**

2 The County Council finds that proposed Text Amendment T-3, to add policies for  
3 locational criteria, siting standards, and design standards for water treatment and water  
4 purification facilities, is appropriate because:

- 5 • It has been amended to replace the initial proposal with the text proposed in the  
6 staff recommendation in the Staff Report and Draft SEIS dated July 20, 2009;
- 7 • It recognizes public water facilities are not precluded from being sited, provided  
8 reasonable mitigation measure are included with development in order to  
9 improve compatibility with the surrounding area; and
- 10 • It recognizes the need to engage the public water system providers in any  
11 process to amend development regulations regarding public water systems and  
12 facilities.

13  
14 **T-4, Solid Waste Management Plan Update**

15 The County Council finds that proposed Text Amendment T-4, to update the Utilities  
16 Element of the History and Background portion of the Comprehensive Plan, Title 19; the  
17 Solid Waste Management section of the Utilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan,  
18 Title 19A; and Chapter 19D.90, Tacoma-Pierce County Solid Waste Management Plan  
19 in Other Comprehensive Planning Documents, Title 19D is appropriate because:

- 20 • It ensures that the Comprehensive Plan and Tacoma-Pierce County Solid Waste  
21 Management Plan are consistent;
- 22 • It promotes the minimization and avoidance of waste, which will lessen the  
23 impact of waste handling and recycling on the built environment;
- 24 • It provides for reliable and cost effective service to Pierce County residents;
- 25 • It is consistent with the goals of the Growth Management Act which seek to  
26 protect the environment as well as provide public facilities and services that  
27 serve development at the time it is available for occupancy; and

28  
29 **T-5, Housing Affordability**

30 The County Council finds that proposed Text Amendment T-5, to amend the Housing  
31 Element of the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate recommendation from the Pierce  
32 County Housing Affordability Task Force addressing the preservation of existing and  
33 development of new manufactured home communities and adopting incentives for new  
34 development of affordable housing is appropriate because:

- 35 • It implements an existing Comprehensive Plan policy, 19A.70.050 D, that  
36 addresses the preservation, conversion, and development of new manufactured  
37 home communities;
- 38 • It adopts bonus densities within the Land Use Element augmenting an existing  
39 policy that states that the County should adopt such regulations in conjunction  
40 with the development of affordable housing for low income households; and
- 41 • It is the result of an analysis of potential reasons for manufactured home  
42 community closures and conversions that have occurred recently in Pierce  
43 County; and
- 44 • It has been amended to delete proposed policy language regarding the  
45 promotion of education and information addressing manufactured home  
46 communities and a portion of proposed policy language regarding the  
47 preservation of existing manufactured home communities.



- It has been amended to remove proposed language that may be inconsistent with RCW 59.20, RCW 59.21, RCW 59.22 and Washington State Supreme Court Cases *Manufactured Housing Communities of Washington v. State of Washington* and *Guimont v. Clarke.*”

**T-6, UGA Expansion Criteria**

The County Council finds that proposed Text Amendment T-6 to amend the Urban Growth Area Expansion Criteria in Pierce County Code Title 19A, the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and in Pierce County Code, Title 19C, Procedures for Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan is appropriate because:

- The Text Amendment incorporates recommendations from the Pierce County UGA Ad Hoc Policy Review Committee;
- The Text Amendment incorporates recommendations from the Pierce County Growth Management Coordinating Committee;
- The Text Amendment incorporates recommendations from the Pierce County Regional Council and received a unanimous recommendation for approval from that body on September 17, 2009;
- The amendment requires that any expansion of the UGA comply with the requirements of Pierce County’s Transfer or Purchase of Development Rights program;
- The amendment requires implementation of joint planning agreements between Pierce County and its cities and towns;
- The amendment requires implementation of an expanded public participation process;
- The amendment requires additional information to determine if sufficient land capacity is available to accommodate the 20-year growth projections;
- The amendment requires that need for additional capacity is clearly demonstrated as required by RCW 36.70A.215; and
- The amendment allows consideration of future UGA expansions based on housing and employment needs of an individual jurisdiction rather than the countywide need.

**T-8, Adopt the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area Stewardship Plan**

The County Council finds that proposed Text Amendment T-8, to adopt the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area Stewardship Plan, dated November, 2008, as Other Comprehensive Planning Documents, Title 19D, is appropriate because:

- Crescent Valley is within the biodiversity network adopted by Pierce County known as the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area (CVBMA);
- It represents the implementation of strategic actions identified in Pierce County Biodiversity Network Assessment report; adopted November 9, 2004, as a supporting planning document to the Comprehensive Plan;
- It was developed by residents from the local community to retain the areas biodiversity with the assistance of the Pierce County Biodiversity Alliance;
- To conserve biodiversity the Stewardship Plan includes the policies and strategic actions such as property enrollment in county tax reduction incentive programs, permanent dedication or purchase of properties as open space, restoration of native vegetation in areas of degraded habitat and education; and



- Biodiversity Management Areas are not considered “Critical Areas” and additional environmental review standards or studies are not required or contemplated for development projects within Rural Sensitive Resource zones or based on designation of Biodiversity Management Areas.
- It is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan, and Growth Management Act.

**M-1, Pierce County Parks and Recreation, PARK**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-1, to redesignate approximately 344 parcels making up 66 park properties and totaling approximately 5,700 acres owned or operated by Pierce County Parks and Recreation, Peninsula Metropolitan Park District, Metro Parks Tacoma and Washington State Parks located throughout the County from their current designation to the Park and Recreation (PARK) designation, is appropriate because:

- A change of land use is not proposed, but only redesignation to the PARK designation adopted per Ordinance 2007-75s;
- It is consistent with Growth Management Act, Comprehensive Plan, and County-wide Planning Policies encouraging preservation, dedication, and development of public open spaces for recreation and preservation;
- It removes barriers to park and recreation development on those parcels already identified by the Parks and Recreation Department as future parks, preserves, and recreation spaces;
- It limits uses not already existing to park and recreation uses, thus providing further protection to open spaces, critical areas, and areas of cultural and historic value; and
- It excludes property in the initial proposal owned by the Puyallup School District.

**M-2, Technical Amendments, ARL to R10**

The County Council finds that proposed Map Amendment M-2 to make technical changes to the Land Use Designations Map to redesignate two parcels from Agricultural Resource Land (ARL) to Rural 10 (R10) that do not meet the necessary criteria to be designated ARL, is appropriate because:

- Neither parcel contains the agricultural soils required to be designated ARL; and
- It corrects a technical error that occurred using the County’s GIS data layer that was applied to the two sites, resulting in an ARL designation being given to the sites that is not consistent with the criteria for classification of ARL in the Comprehensive Plan.

**M-3, Crescent Valley Alliance, R10 and Rsv5 to RSR, Gig Harbor**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-3, to redesignate 576 parcels on 1,850 acres within the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area on the Gig Harbor Peninsula from Rural 10 (R10) and Reserve 5 (Rsv5) to Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR) to expand the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area to better include more of the Crescent Valley watershed, is appropriate because:



- It is the result of extensive species verification surveys completed by local residents in conjunction with the Pierce County Biodiversity Alliance and Crescent Valley Alliance;
- It identifies additional land necessary to conserve the biodiversity and long term persistence of aquatic species, such as salmonid, as well as birds, mammals, amphibians and reptiles and promote conservation of these ecosystems;
- It will more precisely delineate on-the-ground conditions;
- It recognizes that lands within the Crescent Valley Biodiversity Management Area through redesignation to RSR will protect a resource of biologically rich and environmentally sensitive areas; and
- Rural Sensitive Resource zoning throughout the amendment area results in residential densities of one dwelling unit per ten acres with an option of two dwelling units per ten acres when 50 percent of a site is designated as open space.
- Low Impact Development techniques are required for new development in Rural Sensitive Resource areas to better manage storm water.
- It is consistent with the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan policies and objectives which recommend that environmentally rich and sensitive areas such as Biodiversity Management Areas (BMAs) and open space corridors be designated and zoned in the RSR classification.

**M-4, Business Association of Midland, MSF to MUD, Midland**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-wide Map Amendment M-4, to redesignate 3 parcels totaling 2.92 acres from Moderate Density Single-family (MSF) to Mixed Use District (MUD) designation with a Commercial Mixed Use District (CMUD) zone classification is appropriate, because:

- The proposed MUD expansion involves developed properties, and the change in designation will accommodate existing businesses;
- Within the existing MUD designation proposed to be expanded, totaling approximately 25 acres, three parcels totaling approximately 2.6 acres are currently vacant. Of those properties, two are covered by a flood plain and one is approximately 75 percent covered by a wetland; and
- The proposed change is consistent with existing development patterns in the area and the policies of the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan.

**M-5, Business Association of Midland, MSF to NC, Midland**

The County Council finds that Area-wide Map Amendment M-5, to redesignate two parcels totaling 1.37 acres from the Moderate Density Single-family (MSF) designation and Single Family (SF) zone to the Neighborhood Center (NC) designation and Neighborhood Center (NC) zone, is appropriate for two parcels on 1.37 acres because:

- The NC expansion involves developed properties, and the change in designation will accommodate existing businesses;
- The change is consistent with existing development patterns in the area and the policies of the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan; and
- For six parcels the change in designation is not appropriate due to critical area constraints, a “boxing-in” effect, residential character of existing development that



1 is consistent with the SF zone, and a conflict with amendment M-1 to redesignate  
2 Dawson Playfield to Park and Recreation, .  
3

4 **M-6, Business Association of Midland, MSF to EC, Midland**

5 The County Council finds that Area-wide Map Amendment M-6, to redesignate 9  
6 parcels on 2.3 acres from Moderate Density Single-family (MSF) to Employment Center  
7 (EC) designation with a Community Employment (CE) zone classification, is appropriate  
8 because:

- 9 • The existing development within the proposal area is consistent with the policies  
10 of the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan;
- 11 • This minor expansion of the EC designation would bring several well-established  
12 nonconforming businesses into compliance; and
- 13 • Removing these businesses from nonconforming status would allow future  
14 expansions of their uses which are currently limited, thus boosting economic  
15 development in the community.

16  
17 **M-10, Merit Company, HRD to EC, Parkland**

18 The County Council finds that proposed Area-wide Map Amendment M-10, to redesignate  
19 2 parcels totaling 4.28 acres from High Density Residential District (HRD) designation  
20 Moderate/High Density Residential (MHR) zone classification to Employment Center (EC)  
21 designation Community Employment (CE) zone classification, is appropriate because:

- 22 • The site is located in an area that can be served economically and adequately by  
23 services, including sewers, stormwater management, water, public safety  
24 services, and major road networks;
- 25 • Small scale development of this site could be achieved with minimum impact on  
26 residential areas to the east through compliance with design standards;
- 27 • Although the site is smaller than an Employment Center is encouraged to be, the  
28 site is in a transitional area adjacent to Interstate 5 and within the McChord AFB  
29 APZ I area of influence. The current densities allowed in the HRD designation  
30 are discouraged within the APZ I area; and
- 31 • The proposal is within the City of Tacoma Urban Service Area and the proposal  
32 is consistent with the City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan which designates the  
33 site for small to medium size employment centers to accommodate moderately  
34 scaled manufacturing and similar uses.

35  
36 **M-11, Smith / Damrau, AC to EC, Spanaway**

37 The County Council finds that the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding  
38 proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-11, to redesignate 2 parcels totaling 2.8 acres  
39 from Activity Center (AC) to Employment Center (EC) (rather than MUD) with an  
40 implementing Community Employment (CE) zone classification is appropriate because:

- 41 • Expansion of and support of existing industries providing employment  
42 opportunities to the community are goals of both the Comprehensive Plan and  
43 Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan;
- 44 • The proposal area has been used for employment purposes as the site of  
45 multiple small businesses since the mid-1960s; and
- 46 • The site is not appropriate for residential development and is consistent with  
47 surrounding commercial and light industrial uses.



1 **M-12, Les Schwab Profit Sharing Retirement Trust, MSF to MUD, Spanaway**

2 The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-12, to  
3 redesignate 8 parcels on 2 acres from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) to Mixed  
4 Use District (MUD) designation, is appropriate because:

- 5 • This proposal would expand the existing MUD designation to include existing  
6 uses that are well established, and unlikely to redevelop to residential uses;
- 7 • The proposal will have no impact on surrounding residential properties, as the  
8 land uses are already established; and
- 9 • The change is consistent with the policies of the Parkland Spanaway Midland  
10 Communities Plan.

11  
12 **M-13, Solis, MSF to MUD, Spanaway**

13 The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-13, to  
14 redesignate 4 parcels on 6.65 acres from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) to  
15 Mixed Use District (MUD) designation, is appropriate for 2 parcels on 4.33 acres  
16 because:

- 17 • The proposal would expand the existing MUD designation to include existing  
18 uses that are well established and unlikely to redevelop to residential uses;
- 19 • The existing mini-storage use continues into the existing MUD designation, thus  
20 the entire business would be in one designation, rather than a portion being  
21 nonconforming; and
- 22 • The change is consistent with the policies of the Parkland Spanaway Midland  
23 Communities Plan.
- 24 • For two parcels on 2.32 acres the change in designation is not appropriate due to  
25 critical area constraints that are more compatible with uses allowed in the current  
26 MSF zone than with commercial and high density uses allowed in the MUD zone.

27  
28 **M-15, Warmoth, MSF to EC, Mid-County**

29 The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-15, to  
30 redesignate 5 parcels from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) designation Single  
31 Family (SF) and Residential Resource (RR) zone classifications to Employment Center  
32 (EC) designation Community Employment (CE) zone classification, is appropriate  
33 because:

- 34 • The EC/CE designation is consistent with the designation directly to the west and  
35 the existing commercial / light industrial uses on 2 of the 5 parcels; and
- 36 • The proposal is consistent with the Mid-County Community Plan and  
37 Comprehensive Plan goals to support existing employment within the community  
38 allowing Warmoth Guitar Products an opportunity to expand their operation and  
39 provide additional job opportunities to the community.

40  
41 **M-16, Pierce, MSF to EC, Frederickson**

42 The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-16, to  
43 redesignate 7 parcels from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) to Employment  
44 Center (EC) designation, is appropriate because:

- 45 • The amendment area is surrounded by 3 sides by EC designation and is not a  
46 desirable area for residential development;



- The proposal provides additional opportunities for employment and economic development contiguous with the existing EC designation; and
- The proposal is consistent with the Frederickson Community Plan and Comprehensive Plan goals to support employment growth and economic development at the Frederickson Industrial site.

**M-17, Gustafson, RSR to RF, Graham**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-17, to redesignate 2 parcels from Rural Sensitive Resource (RSR) to Rural Farm (RF) designation, is appropriate because:

- The two parcels within the amendment area are part of an existing working farm enrolled in the Agricultural Current Use Program and within the RF designation; and
- The proposal is consistent with the Graham Community Plan and Comprehensive Plan policies regarding the RF designation.

**M-18, Pro-Fusion, HSF to HRD, South Hill**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-18, to redesignate 2 parcels on 8.55 acres from High Density Single-Family (HSF) designation to High Density Residential District (HRD) designation, is appropriate with the stipulation that the resulting zone classification should be Moderate/High Density Residential (MHR) because:

- The proposal will extend the existing MHR zone located on 2 sides of the proposal area; and
- The proposal is consistent with locational criteria for residential development in the South Hill Community Plan and Comprehensive Plan.

**M-21, McVean, MSF to MUD, North Puyallup**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-21, to redesignate 3 parcels from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) to Mixed Use District (MUD) designation, is appropriate because:

- The proposed changes are consistent with Section 19A.30.040 of the Comprehensive Plan policies for the expansion of a MUD designation; and
- The proposal is consistent with surrounding development patterns and would expand the MUD designation located on 2 sides of the proposal area.

**M-23, Monarch Custom Homes, ARL to R10, McKenna**

The County Council finds that proposed Area-Wide Map Amendment M-23, to redesignate a 20 acre parcel from Agricultural Resource Land (ARL) to Rural 10 (R10) designation, is appropriate because:

- The soils on the property are listed as Prime Agricultural Soils when drained, however more than half of the property is covered by a Type 3 Wetland, which is not allowed to be drained, thus the property does not meet the ARL designation criteria and should be redesignated.



1 **U-1, Technical Amendment**

2 The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-1, to  
3 recognize annexations that have occurred subsequent to the review cycle for 2007  
4 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, is appropriate with the added inclusion of one  
5 parcel on 2.6 acres that was annexed to the Town of Eatonville in 2009 because:

- 6 • It includes annexations to the Town of Eatonville, City of Fife, City of Gig Harbor,  
7 and City of Puyallup; and
- 8 • It is consistent with the intent for cooperative planning between the County and  
9 cities and towns involved with changes to jurisdiction boundaries.

10  
11 **U-2, Council, City of Sumner UGA Reduction, East Sumner**

12 The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-2, to reduce  
13 the City of Sumner Urban Growth Area (UGA) by designating 6 parcels on 208.6 acres  
14 from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) to Rural 10 (R10) designation east of the  
15 City of Sumner and south of the City of Auburn, is inappropriate and that the change be  
16 limited to the 45.62-acre parcel west of Lakeland Hills Way with that parcel changing to  
17 the Public Institution designation and remaining inside the UGA because:

- 18 • A revision to the UGA in this case is not warranted, as a large portion of the area  
19 in question is used by Puget Sound Energy for utilities purposes;
- 20 • Uses on the parcel west of Lakeland Hills Way could be accommodated under  
21 the Public Institution (PI) designation while correcting data in the Buildable Land  
22 Analysis that would otherwise show these lands as developable; and
- 23 • Puget Sound Energy has expressed interest in residential development of  
24 parcels east of Lakeland Hills Way.

25  
26 **U-3, City of Sumner, City of Sumner UGA Modification, East Sumner**

27 The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-3, to modify  
28 the east boundary of the City of Sumner's UGA, affecting 40 parcels totaling 37.37  
29 acres with a net change of decreasing the UGA by 2.93 acres, is appropriate because:

- 30 • Should this area be proposed for annexation into the City of Sumner, the  
31 amendment will eliminate ambiguity as to whether specific parcels that are  
32 currently split by the UGA boundary would be eligible for annexation, as only  
33 properties inside the UGA can be annexed to a city; and
- 34 • The amendment will bring the County UGA shown in the Comprehensive Plan  
35 and the UGA shown in the City of Sumner Comprehensive Plan into alignment,  
36 should the same change be adopted by the City of Sumner.

37  
38 **U-4, City of Puyallup, City of Puyallup UGA Modification, Puyallup**

39 The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-4, to amend  
40 the City of Puyallup Urban Service Area (USA) boundary or City Urban Growth Area  
41 (UGA) boundary in several locations to follow parcel lines, modify the boundary abutting  
42 adjacent city USA or incorporated boundaries, or to exclude road right-of-way from the  
43 edge of the USA, is appropriate with the stipulation that the change to the USA be  
44 limited to that portion of site #1 along Pioneer Way but not along Woodland Avenue and  
45 that this site also be removed from the Comprehensive UGA (CUGA), and the USA map  
46 in the Comprehensive Plan be adjusted to reflect this change to Puyallup's USA  
47 because:



- The proposal for site #1 along Pioneer Way provides a reasonable adjustment to the USA boundary in that it removes any expectation that the City of Puyallup should plan for maintaining or funding improvements to a roadway that extends into a rural area and does not abut properties inside the CUGA;

**U-5, Town of Eatonville, Town of Eatonville UGA Expansion for EC, East Eatonville**

The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-5, to expand the Town of Eatonville UGA through the redesignation of 5 parcels totaling 80 acres from Rural 20 (R20) and Agricultural Resource Land (ARL) to Employment Center (EC) designation, is appropriate because:

- A similar amendment was proposed for the site in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle, which was denied by the County Council, because a larger portion was included that was constrained by numerous critical areas and the proposal area had not been included in the Town of Eatonville's Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plan;
- The Town of Eatonville has submitted documentation that since the previous denial, they have included the proposal area within the Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plan;
- The proposed location for the Employment Center is contiguous with an area to the west designated as Employment Center in the 2007 amendment cycle; and
- The proposed location is currently used as a gravel mine, which is scheduled for reclamation in the next few years, which will provide a site removed from most residential uses and appropriate for industrial development that could provide an employment base for the Town of Eatonville should an employer choose to locate there.

**U-6, Watters, Town of Eatonville UGA Reduction, West Eatonville**

The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-6, to reduce the Town of Eatonville UGA through redesignation of 2 parcels totaling 29.5 acres from Moderate Density Single-Family (MSF) to Rural 10 (R10), is appropriate because:

- The proposal is consistent with the rural character of development within the proposal area and of surrounding parcels;
- The 2007 Buildable Lands Report showed that the Town of Eatonville has excess residential lands capacity; and
- The proposal area is contiguous with the area designated R10 to the west.

**U-7, Knox, UGA Adjustment, Mid-County**

The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-7, to move the UGA in the Mid-County area to redesignate 2 parcels totaling 2.38 acres from Rural Separator (RSep) to Community Center (CC) designation and redesignate one parcel totaling 2.37 acres from CC to RSep designation, is appropriate because:

- The amendment is consistent with the Mid-County Community Plan policy for no net loss of Rural Separator lands;
- The amendment provides additional protection of critical areas by designative a parcel with approximately 50 percent wetland coverage to a rural designation;



- The parcel proposed for removal from the UGA is consistent with the density and size requirements of the RSEP designation; and
- The parcels proposed for inclusion into the UGA are contiguous with other commercial uses and CC designated properties to the north and east.

#### **U-8a, Merriman, UGA Expansion, Mid County**

The County Council finds that proposed Urban Growth Area Amendment U-8a, to move the UGA in the Mid County area to redesignate two parcels totaling 5.2 acres from Rural Separator (Rsep) to Moderate Density Single Family (MSF) with the Residential Resource (RR) zone is appropriate because:

- The amendment is consistent with the Mid-County Community Plan policy for establishment of Residential Resource zoning;
- The amendment is limited to 5.2 acres and has an insignificant effect on urban residential capacity;
- The amendment is consistent with the existing development pattern in the adjacent neighborhood.

#### **C-3, Bethel School District – Electronic Readerboard Signs in Graham**

The County Council finds that proposed Amendment C-3 to the Graham Community Plan, to allow electronic message signs associated with public safety, public park and recreation services, education facilities and religious assembly uses is appropriate because:

- It allows for an effective means of notifying the community of events, public health and safety alerts, and other information that could contribute to improving the quality of life for the community; and
- It was supported by the Graham Land Use Advisory Commission when presented by Bethel School District at their March 10, 2009, meeting.

#### **C-4, Business Association of Midland – Auto Repair in CE and Residential in NC, Parkland Spanaway Midland**

The County Council finds that proposed Amendment C-4 to the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan, to amend the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan to allow auto repair in the Community Employment zone and to allow residential development in the NC designation only when associated with commercial development, is appropriate because:

- It is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- It is based upon community preference as stated during the community planning process, which was not shown clearly in regulations implementing the community plan; and
- The Parkland Spanaway Midland Land Use Advisory Commission recommended approval of the proposal at their meeting on July 8, 2009.

#### **C-5, Affinity Investments – Density Consistent with Height in AC, Parkland Spanaway Midland**

The County Council finds that proposed Amendment C-5 to the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan, to amend the Parkland Spanaway Midland Communities Plan to allow for increased residential densities in the AC designation commensurate



1 with height allowances, is appropriate with the stipulation that the increased densities  
2 should not be limited to the Garfield Street AC but should apply to all AC designated  
3 lands in the Communities Plan area because:

- 4 • It is consistent with Section 19A.30.100 B.2 of the Comprehensive Plan which  
5 allows densities stipulated by the Plan to be exceeded by Community Plans “as a  
6 means to encourage increased private investment in public facilities or to  
7 accomplish other community plan goals”;
- 8 • It will allow increase residential densities within the same building footprint and  
9 height as would have previously been allowed, while responding to the market for  
10 more compact residential areas, especially to support Pacific Lutheran  
11 University; and
- 12 • The Parkland Spanaway Midland Land Use Advisory Commission recommended  
13 approval of the proposal at their July 8, 2009, meeting.

14  
15 **Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

16 The County Council finds that the proposed amendments as proposed and as approved  
17 have been considered cumulatively for impacts.

18  
19  
20

