



JEFFERSON COUNTY

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

621 Sheridan Street • Port Townsend • Washington 98368
360/379-4450 • 360/379-4451 Fax
<http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment>

MEMORANDUM

To: Board of County Commissioners
Fr: Department of Community Development
Date: March 30, 2005
Re: Planning Commission Recommendation and Staff Recommendation for Establishment of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Final Docket

Pursuant to Unified Development Code (UDC) Section 9.6.3, the Planning Commission is required to hold a public hearing and transmit a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) identifying the suggested amendments that the Planning Commission believes should be included on the Final Docket for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle based on perceived need, urgency and appropriateness.¹ Pursuant to UDC Section 9.9.4.a, the BOCC must consider the Planning Commission recommendation on the Final Docket by the second regular BOCC meeting in April.

The Preliminary Docket is managed by the Director of Community Development.² The Preliminary Docket included the following “placeholder” proposals at the request of individual County Commissioners and direction from the County Administrator. Policy topics were identified through a BOCC workshop on February 28.

1. File Number **MLA05-66** proposed for the purpose of developing potential Comprehensive Plan narrative and policy amendments in relation to discretionary amendments adopted in 2004 under file number MLA04-28. The 2004 amendments substantially updated and streamlined the Comprehensive Plan. This file number will involve elements of document housekeeping as well as policy review. The policy topics identified by County Commissioners include Housing, Open Space, Economic Development, and Environment. Under this file number, tables deleted in 2004 that appeared at the beginning of each Comprehensive Plan chapter relating the chapter to other elements of the Plan may be re-inserted.
2. File Number **MLA05-67** proposed for the purpose of developing potential Comprehensive Plan amendments related to the Irondale and Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA), including the UGA future land use map. Goals, policies, maps and development regulations were adopted in 2004. This file number will involve the consideration of adjustments to what was adopted in 2004. The review will include analysis of the distinction between the UGA future land use map and the UGA zoning map that is part of the Unified Development Code (UDC) and review of the designation of select areas on one or both maps.

¹ The Planning Commission recommendation involves suggested amendments. Site-specific amendments are automatically included on the Final Docket. There are nine (9) site-specific amendments on the 2005 Docket.

² UDC 9.4.1.b and 9.5.2.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Preliminary Docket on March 2. Deliberations and the completion of the recommendation occurred on March 16. After conducting a duly noticed public hearing and based on perceived need, urgency and appropriateness, the Planning Commission unanimously recommends that the Final Docket include *no* suggested amendments (i.e., to *not docket* either of the suggested amendments on the Preliminary Docket). The meeting minutes of the meetings cited above summarize the discussion before the Planning Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the following with regard to the Preliminary Docket:

1. **MLA05-66** be docketed for the 2005 amendment cycle, but only for the purpose of “housekeeping,” involving map anomalies and text and table corrections only, and not for the purpose of amending policy or narrative description.
2. **MLA05-67** *not* be docketed for the 2005 amendment cycle.

There are nine site-specific amendments that are automatically part of the Final Docket. In conjunction with other work plan elements—such as the UDC Omnibus amendment package and work required in response to GMA petitions—these nine site-specific applications represent a substantial workload for DCD Long-Range Planning (LRP). Additionally, any proposals that the BOCC, individual County Commissioners, the County Administrator, the DCD Director, and/or other departments may want to be included on the 2006 Preliminary Docket should be researched and developed so that they are completed prior to the February 1, 2006 deadline for receipt of applications for inclusion on the 2006 Docket. Accordingly, limiting the breadth of the suggested amendments on this year’s Final Docket would allow LRP capacity to be applied to other priorities.

With regard to “housekeeping,” staff presents the following illustrations:

LAND USE MAP

- Issues with parcels that were recently re-zoned Local Agriculture:
 - A unit of land that had only one parcel number now appears to have two, and so it is unclear what the intention of the landowner was at the time and what action the County effectively took in re-zoning the parcel(s) last year. The numbers involved are 901 252 002 east of Beaver Valley Road and 901 251 004 across the street (which was RR 1:10). The first impression of staff is that 901 252 002 should stay AP (Prime Agriculture) as it was originally designated and that 901 251 004 be AL (Local Agriculture). The landowner should be contacted to confirm intention, but essentially it was never meant to re-zone any property that was already designated AP (because of soils, etc.). Effectively, there is no regulatory difference between AP and AL. This is a technicality.
 - The UGA boundary intersects a large parcel, 901 034 003, “Sunfield Farm.” The small portion of that parcel that lies inside the UGA boundary got inadvertently re-zoned AL. It was never the intention to re-zone anything inside the UGA. This needs to be corrected, though the portion in question of the large parcel is very small. Basically, this is also a technicality, but it should be corrected.
- Parcels with no zoning:
 - Two large parcels in south portion of county, easily seen in white on CP map: 603143001 and 503360001 (two pieces).

- An island off the tip of Indian Island consisting of portions of these parcels: 921000000 and 021180000.
- "Small" zones:
 - There are 21 zones in east Jefferson County smaller than one acre. We have an Excel spreadsheet showing about 50 parcels that intersect these 21 zones. We are hoping to use that list to find the 21 small zones and review them together with GIS staff. In looking over a few examples, some appear legitimate (spot zones or small chunks separated from main zone by water, etc.), but some others look like candidates for review and may be mapped so in error.
 - Another way to tackle this would be to look for parcels of a certain size and zoning. For instance, there are 73 parcels in east Jefferson County that are smaller than 5 acres but are not zoned RR1:5. Most are probably fine, but there as an example of one area that could warrant review, there is a 4-acre piece sandwiched between a large RR 1:5 area and a large RR 1:20 area. It is zoned 1:10. Not sure why this is zoned this way - could be "map error" or could be intentional. This could be a candidate for 1:5, especially since it wholly encloses two small parcels.

PLAN TABLES AND TEXT

- Error in the population projection table.
 - Table 3-1 on page 3-3 of the Comp Plan contains an error. The 2000 population figure for Unincorporated Rural & Resource Areas, as pulled from BOCC Resolution 55-03, should read 13,972 instead of 18,972. When arranging for a mass printing of the 2005 Comp Plan, as revised in 2004, we plan to include the correct figure. However, the figure should be correctly through the formal amendment process, also.
- References/clarifications:
 - Urban Growth Area Element (p. 2-7) – Replace references to the UDC with the Jefferson County Code (JCC).
 - Land Use and Rural Element (p. 3-70 / #6) – Correct the reference to designating two Industrial Land Banks (ILBs) to "...a bank with two master planned locations."

Each of these examples would be presented in more detail once we have the opportunity to develop a proposal and corresponding analysis. Some are more important to correct or adjust than others. The priority can be examined in the review process.

BOCC ACTION

Should the BOCC elect to establish the Final Docket pursuant to the Planning Commission recommendation, such a motion could be made without first holding a duly-noticed public hearing. Should the BOCC wish to establish a Final Docket incongruent with the Planning Commission recommendation, whether following the staff recommendation in this matter or an alternative, it shall first notice and hold a public hearing.

The Final Docket shall be represented in writing on DCD letterhead and on a webpage dedicated to the 2005 Comp Plan amendment cycle. If any of the two suggested amendments on the Preliminary Docket are placed on the Final Docket, the purpose and scope of the proposals can be refined by the BOCC and such description shall be made clear on teh document representing the Final Docket.

[END]