

KC GMPC 4:1 Program Review / UGA Expansion Policies
— Proposed Member Amendments —

Joint Rural Area Organizations Team Comments / Rationale

Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	Effect	Joint Team Comments / Rationale
<p>GMPC Chair Constantine, King County</p>	<p>Amend the underlying proposal to consistently refer to the original Urban Growth Area line adopted in the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>The amendment is to continue to require adjacency to the original 1994 UGA for proposal eligibility, with corrections to the CPPs for consistency.</p> <p>This preserves the long- standing foundation of the program which has functioned successfully for the past two and half decades. This option would allow but also limit the amount of urban development at the edge of the urban area. This would avoid land use pressures, infrastructure requirements, habitat impacts, climate change emissions, and other impacts.</p>	<p><u>Agree.</u> However, adding the JPA UGA, but excluding all 4:1 projects and those projects based on 4:1 principles (i.e., Black Diamond, Issaquah Highlands, & Grand Ridge) such that there are no cascading 4:1s, would allow the JPA cities (i.e., Snoqualmie, North Bend, & portions of Black Diamond) more opportunity for the 4:1 Program to buffer and define their UGA. These cities use a combination of the 1994 & JPA UGA.</p>
<p>Mayor McFarland, City of North Bend</p>	<p>Amend the underlying proposal to consistently refer to the current Urban Growth Area line.</p>	<p>The amendment would use the current UGA proposal eligibility. This means proposals would not be restricted to either the 1994 UGA or the JPA UGA.</p>	<p><u>Disagree</u> (see rationale above).</p>
<p>Councilmember Perry, King County</p>	<p>Amend the underlying proposal to allow mixed-used development in Four-to-One proposals.</p>	<p>This set of amendments would allow for mixed-use development to be considered as part of a Four-to-One proposal. Mixed-use development would only be allowed if adjacent to an existing mixed-use or commercial development.</p>	<p><u>Disagree.</u> This could set an unwanted precedent by “opening the door” to nonresidential uses in 4:1 proposals. If a new project is located near mixed use, it is already served by that urban feature. Further if mixed-use is allowed, other commercial could seek to use the same exemption and might have a legally sound argument to pursue.</p>
<p>GMPC Chair Constantine, King County, at the request of staff</p>	<p>Amend the underlying proposal to clarify onsite open space requirements.</p>	<p>The staff proposed set of amendments clarify the intent of the GMPC Recommended Amendment to ensure significant public benefit at the location of the Four- to-One project by requiring that half of the site be in open space, rather than “a portion.” This language continues the allowance for offsite open space for the remainder of the required acreage based on the four to one ratio.</p>	<p><u>Agree.</u> Defining that “half of the site” should be placed in dedicated open space adds much clarity and benefit to the current “a portion of the site” language.</p>