# REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

**- MINUTES -**

**MEETING DATE:** December 19, 1997

**TO:** Building Services Division Staff
Lynn Baugh
Chris Ricketts
Pam Dhanapal
Terry Brunner
Ken Dinsmore
Priscilla Kaufmann

Land Use Services Division Staff
Mark Carey
Lisa Pringle
Marilyn Cox
Lanny Henoch
Gordon Thomson

Greg Kipp, Deputy Director
Michael Sinsky, Prosecuting Attorney's Office

**FM:** Sophia Byrd, Code Development Coordinator

Present: Connie Blumen, Sophia Byrd, Tom Fitzpatrick, Kamuron Gurol,
Lanny Henoch, Priscilla Kaufmann, Betty Salvati, Gordon Thomson,
(Susan Marlin, recorder)

Issue:

1. **Is an interpretation necessary to clarify the sending site criteria for Transfer of Development Credits in K.C.C. 21A.36.030(B)? Many of the features listed in B.1-9 are not defined in the Zoning Code or Comp Plan.**

Discussion:
The group discussed how Chapter 21A.36.030(B) lists sending site features which are very broad in definition and that specific criteria are needed to determine how an area qualifies as a sending site.

It was agreed that a review of what qualifies as sending-site criteria needs to take a commonsense approach. A written interpretation is not necessary, but rather the RRC believes the code provides sufficient direction to look to the King County Comprehensive Plan policies and other particular plans as stated in 21A.36.030(B). **" Sending sites must contain one or more of the following features, as defined in the Comprehensive Plan, Open Space Plan, other functional plan or a community plan:**

1. **Open spaces**
2. **Wildlife habitat**
3. **Woodlands**
4. **Shoreline access**
5. **Community separator**
6. **Regional trail/natural linkage**
7. **Historic landmark designation**
8. **Agricultural land not encumbered through the county's farmlands preservation development rights purchase; or**
9. **Park site that meets adopted size, distance and other standards for serving the receiving sites to which the density credits are being transferred.**

The group discussed each of the nine features and agreed that there are definitions and policies identifying criteria for each, e.g. in the Comp. Plan, community plans, the Shoreline Master Program, Parks and Open Space Plan, zoning designations, and specific area mapping. It was also agreed upon that " community separator" is synonomous with " urban separator."

Conclusion:
It was decided that an Administrative Interpretation is not necessary at this time. An amendment to this section of the code is being drafted as part of the broader TDR program. In the meantime, the RRC agreed that DDES should evaluate whether a site qualifies as a TDR sending site under 21A.36.030(B) by examining applicable policies, definitions, maps, etc., that exist in the various plans.

SB:sm