



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON

COMMUNITY PLANNING

Planning Commission Recommendation

TO: County Council

FROM: Planning Commission Chair or Vice Chair, Steve Morasch or Ron Barca

PREPARED BY: Colete Anderson, Planner III

DATE: October 4, 2017

SUBJECT: CPZ2017-00006 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 policy change and corresponding CCC 40.560.010(1)(2)(a) correction.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Planning Commission voted 5 to 1 to forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to county council. The recommendation is to re-adopt the Comprehensive plan text and associated Clark County Code that established the type IV process for the establishment of a new rural center and the expansion of an existing rural center. The type IV process would shift from the annual review process to a county initiated docket process.

Planning Commission deliberated the merits of whether or not this proposal should apply to both new rural center applications and the expansion of existing rural centers. Commissioner Barca noted that the county, in the past, was denying numerous applications to expand rural centers. In some cases, it was the same property owner repeatedly utilizing county resources only to be denied. The county changed the type IV process from a docket to annual review in response. Planning Commissioners Bender, Swindell, Johnson, Grimwade and Wright responded that as the county is requesting to return to the type IV docket process, the county must be confident in managing resources. Commissioner Morasch was not in attendance.

Background

The Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2015-2035 text document was adopted on June 28, 2016. Since that update, a policy amendment and associated Clark County Code change for the formulation of a rural center has been identified. Prior to 2005, a request to expand a rural center or create a new rural center followed the county initiated docket type IV process rather than the property owner annual review type IV process. The proposal below is to re-adopt the Comprehensive plan text and associated Clark County Code that was in existence prior to 2005. The feasibility analysis associated with the formulation of a rural center under WAC 365-196-

425 is extensive and highly technical in nature. As such, the county is better equipped to complete the analysis for establishing a new rural center.

Summary of Proposed Actions

- Chapter 3 – Rural and Natural Resources:
 - a. Policy 3.6.7 replace “annual review” with “docket”.
- CCC 40.560.010(1)(2)(a):
 - a. In CCC 40.560.010(1)(2)(a) replace “annual review” with “docket”.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA, EVALUATION AND FINDINGS

CRITERIA FOR ALL MAP CHANGES

1. ***The proponent shall demonstrate that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) and requirements, the countywide planning policies, the Community Framework Plan, Clark County 20-Year Comprehensive Plan, and other related plans.***

No map changes are proposed.

CRITERIA FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY OR TEXT CHANGES

The amendment shall meet all the requirements of and be consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) and other requirements, the countywide planning policies, the community framework plan, the comprehensive plan, local comprehensive plans, applicable capital facilities plans and official population growth forecasts.

The proposed policy amendment is consistent with the GMA Goals, community framework plan, comprehensive plan and applicable capital facilities plans.

- Staff is proposing to readopt Comprehensive plan text and associated Clark County Code that was in existence prior to 2005.
- The feasibility analysis associated with the formulation of a rural center under WAC 365-196-425 is extensive and highly technical in nature. The county is better equipped to complete the analysis.

The corrections make no significant changes in plan policies.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The following table lists the applicable criteria and summarizes the findings of the staff report by the Planning Commission for CPZ2017-00006.

COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA	Criteria Met?	
	Staff Report	Planning Commission Findings
Criteria for All Map Changes		
A. Consistency with GMA & Countywide Policies	Yes	Yes
B. Conformance with Location Criteria	N/A	N/A
C. Site Suitability and Lack of Appropriately Designated Alternative Sites	N/A	N/A
D. Amendment Responds to Substantial Change in Conditions, Better Implements Policy, or Corrects Mapping Error	N/A	N/A
E. Adequacy/Timeliness of Public Facilities and Services	N/A	N/A
Recommendation:	Approval	Approval

Based upon the information and the findings presented in this report and in the supporting documents, Planning Commission voted 5 to 1 to forward a recommendation of **APPROVAL** to County Council.

Chapter 3 – Rural and Natural Resources

Rural Centers

Goal: Maintain the character of the designated Rural Centers within the surrounding rural area.

3.3 Policies

3.3.6 Rural Center designation criteria are as follows:

- an area proposed as a Rural Center had to have existed as of July 1, 1990, identifiable by pre-existing small lot development patterns, natural features as boundaries and access to arterials;
- proponents of a new Rural Center shall submit to the county a petition signed by at least 60 percent of the property owners of the land within the boundaries of the proposed new Rural Center;
- a new Rural Center or a boundary expansion of an existing Rural Center shall be considered and evaluated by the county through the ~~annual review~~ docket under CCC40.560 and pursuant to RCW36.70A.070(5)(d).

Title 40 Code Amendment CCC 40.560.010(1)(2)(a)

I. Additional Criteria for Rural Map Changes.

2.

- a. The creation of, expansion of, or change of land use within a rural center shall be considered and evaluated by the county through the ~~annual review~~ docket process under Chapter 40.560.