INTERNAL DISCUSSION DRAFT - 3
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW

POLICY PAPER #3
Five Year Plan Review

DATE: July 17, 2000

BACKGROUND

There are two separate types of five year requirements currently contained in county documents. County Code under 18.610.010(1)(d) limits UGA boundary changes to *no more than* once every five years.–Clark County added this Code language in 1996 in response to a Hearings Board Remand. Its effect is to preclude UGA expansion between major updates.

Countywide Planning Policy 1.1.f, found in the Community Framework Plan, requires that densities in UGAs be reviewed at least once every five years, and plans be revised to accommodate the next 20 years of growth. This last part of the policy may or may not effectively require that UGAs be expanded, depending on how much growth is forecast to occur.

A third five year rule was incorporated into GMA at the state level in 1997, but has not been formally integrated into local plans or codes. SB 6094 requires larger counties and cities to monitor the density of development that has occurred, and determine if existing available land supplies are sufficient to accommodate existing adopted growth forecasts.

In response to that law, the GM Steering Committee recommended, and the County Planning Commission Recommended approval of amendments to Countywide Planning Policies 1.1.f. That language is included at the end of this paper. That language, if adopted by the Board, would require local density monitoring every 5 years as required by GMA, and would allow but no longer require that new 20-year growth forecasts be adopted every 5 years. This would be consistent with the GMA language that new 20-year growth forecasts can be adopted as frequently every 5 years, but must be adopted at least every 10.

POLICY: Five Year Plan Review

A comprehensive review will be initiated and considered by the county and applicable cities a maximum of once every five years." (Plan Chapter 12, page 12-1).

CCC 18.610.030(1)(d) limits consideration of UGB boundary changes to "*intervals of not less than 5 years.*"

CPP 1.1.f *requires that counties and cities review at least every 5 years, designated UGAs, and densities permitted within the boundaries, and that comprehensive plans be revised to accommodate urban growth projected to occur for the succeeding 20-year period.*

ORIGINAL INTENT

The intent was to create a predictable time period to review plan polices and a predictable time period in which the community could expect changes in urban growth boundaries. Review of the plan policies and the UGB's are kept on the same schedule because of the inter-relationship of the plan policies as a whole. A change in policies of the plan might influence the UGB'S. Conversely, changing UGB's without a look at the plan as a whole might create inconsistent density expectations, population allocations, etc. Over the life span of a 20-year plan, four reviews would take place.

Review on a periodic basis allows the plan to respond to changing economic conditions and to changing community values and priorities. A five-year interval allows some-development to occur to monitor the success of the plan policies and to point to places where refinements might be beneficial. A moderate time interval also allows government and community interests time to budget the resources necessary for a plan review process. Some have expressed concern that undergoing substantial revisions (by adopting new long term forecasts) to 20-year plans every five years does not allow for sufficient maturation of those plans, and places undue time and budget constraints on local governments. This is particularly the case since planning for a five year update (if the update involves adopted of new long term growth forecasts) is, at minimum, a 2 year process.

What issues have come up in discussion of this subject?

Several issues seem to be in play. First, is the fact that the county has three distinct 5 year rules. The first calls for review of the plan every five years; the second limits consideration of UGA boundary changes to intervals of not less

than once every five years and; third is SB 6094 which requires the review of plan assumptions and plan performance *at least every five (5) years* and finding reasonably alternatives to make the plan work before considering moving boundaries.

Options for Change:

Adoption of the language to implement SB 6094 should result in the County having only one five year review rule.

Repeal CCC 18.610.030(1d) because of the 75%/50% rule. In addition, we have the SB 6094 mandated policy that the TAC and County Planning Commission have recommended and the Board of Commissioners is now considering, which has the following language:

"Policy 1.1 (f) reads:

The county and cities shall review, at least every five (5) years their designated urban growth areas or areas in compliance with RCW 36.70A.215. The purpose of the review and evaluation program shall be to determine whether Clark County and its cities are achieving urban densities within Urban Growth Areas. This shall be accomplished by comparing the growth and development assumptions, targets and objectives contained in these policies (and in county and city comprehensive plans) with actual growth and development that has occurred.

(1) Each municipality within Clark County shall annually provide to the County parcel information on land developed or permitted for building and development in three categories: residential, commercial, and industrial. The county and municipalities shall follow the guidelines specified in the Plan Monitoring Procedures Report for the collection, monitoring, and analysis of development activity and potential residential/employment capacity.

(2) Clark County in cooperation with the municipalities, shall prepare a Buildable Lands Capacity Report every five years, with the first report completed by 2002. The report will detail growth , development, capacity, needs, and consistency between comprehensive plan goals and actual densities for Clark County and the municipalities within it.

(3) *The county and municipalities shall use the results of the Buildable Lands Capacity Report to determine the most appropriate means to address inconsistencies between land capacity and needs. In addressing the inconsistencies, the County and municipalities shall identify reasonable measures, other than adjusting urban growth areas, that will be taken to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.215.*

Steering Committee Discussion –

Action Taken –

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\project management\5yrreviewpolicy-3.doc