

January 22, 2009

TO: All Interested Parties

RE: *Addendum to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* for the Pierce County Development Regulations Title 18-General Provisions, Title 18A-Zoning, Title 18B-Signs, Title 18E-Critical Areas, Title 18F-Land Divisions and Boundary Changes, Title 18H-Forest Practices and Tree Conservation, and Title 18J-Design Standards and Guidelines

Pierce County has issued an Addendum to the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS), Development Regulations, June 1995*. The June 1995 Final SEIS addressed the impacts of the Development Regulations which were adopted in July 1995 to implement the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the Growth Management Act.

These amendments are proposed as part of a yearly review of Development Regulations to make both technical and substantive changes. Those amendments which are substantive or may have a perceived impact are discussed in further detail in this document. Additionally, there are changes that respond to County Council Resolutions R2008-23, R2008-71s, and R2007-149.

In accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements, an Addendum may be used to add new information about a proposal provided that it does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing environmental document (WAC 197-11-600). Pierce County has determined that the proposed amendments to the Development Regulations do not substantially change the analysis of impacts previously discussed in the Final SEIS or any of the environmental documents included through the phased environmental review process.

The Addendum includes a fact sheet, background material, the discussion of the proposed amendments to the regulations, and necessary environmental documentation. The Addendum has been prepared in accordance with WAC 197-11-600 and 197-11-625 and has been distributed to the Department of Ecology and agencies with jurisdiction.

If you have questions concerning this Addendum to Final SEIS, please contact Sean Gaffney at (253)798-2724 or (253)798-3736.

Sincerely,

CHUCK KLEEBERG
Director/Environmental Official

CK:sg:pm

F:\WPFILES\LONG\Code Update\2008 SEPA\SEPA addend-code update 08.DOC

ADDENDUM
TO
FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(June, 1995)
FOR
AMENDMENTS TO THE
PIERCE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Prepared in compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act

January 22, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FACT SHEET..... i

INTRODUCTION1

BACKGROUND1

 A. DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS1

 B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS1

PROPOSED ACTION2

 A. SUMMARY DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED REVISIONS2

 SUMMARY DISCUSSION OF SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS2

 SUMMARY DISCUSSION OF TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS2

 B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND DOCUMENTATION11

FACT SHEET**Title and Description of Proposed Action**

The proposed amendments are to the Pierce County Development Regulations Title 18-General Provisions, Title 18A-Zoning, Title 18B-Signs, Title 18E-Critical Areas, Title 18F-Land Divisions and Boundary Changes, Title 18H-Forest Practices and Tree Conservation, and Title 18J-Design Standards and Guidelines. The amendments consist of substantive amendments, technical clarifications to the regulations necessary for code administration, and amendments necessary to recently adopted County Council resolutions.

This Addendum adds analyses and information to the June, 1995 *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) for Development Regulations*.

Proponent

Pierce County
Planning and Land Services Department

Tentative Adoption Date

The Planning Commission hearings were held on November 25 and December 9, 2008, and January 13, 2009. County Council hearings are scheduled for Winter 2009, with final adoption scheduled for Winter 2009.

Lead Agency

Pierce County
Planning and Land Services Department
2401 South 35th Street
Tacoma, WA 98409

Responsible Official:
Chuck Kleeberg, Director
Planning and Land Services Department
(253) 798-7210

Contact Person:
Sean Gaffney, Senior Planner
Planning and Land Services Department
(253) 798-2724 or 798-3736
(253) 798-3680 Facsimile

Authors and Principal Contributors

Pierce County
Planning and Land Services Department

Date of Issue:	January 22, 2009
Environmental Review Process	Pierce County has used a phased review process for the non-project actions required by Washington State's Growth Management Act, including the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations. Pierce County intends to continue to use this phased review for adoption of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations that implement the Plan.
Location of Background Material and Documents Incorporated by Reference	Background material and documents used to support development of this Addendum are available for review at the Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department, 2401 South 35th Street, Tacoma, WA 98409, (253) 798-2785.
Relation to Other Documents	A series of environmental documents have been prepared by Pierce County to evaluate the impacts of the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and amendments to the plan. These documents, noted in the Background section of this Addendum to the Final SEIS, are incorporated by reference. Pierce County intends to continue to use a phased environmental review approach for analyzing Comprehensive Plan amendments or other GMA documents related to the Comprehensive Plan or Development Regulations. Additional environmental documentation, in the form of supplemental EISs, addenda, or other State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) determinations may be made as the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan is further implemented. This document is not intended to satisfy individual project SEPA requirements.

INTRODUCTION

In June 1995, a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS) was released which, in conjunction with the April 1995 Draft SEIS, addressed the probable significant adverse impacts of adoption of the Development Regulations. The Development Regulations implement the policies and objectives of the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and were adopted by the Pierce County Council in July 1995. The Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations are in compliance with and implement the Washington State Growth Management Act.

This Addendum addresses amendments proposed by Planning and Land Services to the Pierce County Development Regulations which are both substantive and technical. These amendments are as a result of a yearly review of Development Regulations often resulting in technical and occasionally substantive amendments. The Pierce County Council requested evaluation and resolution of some of the substantive amendments in Resolutions R2007-149, R2008-23, and R2008-71s.

BACKGROUND

A. DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

In 1990 the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) which required certain local jurisdictions to prepare and adopt comprehensive land use plans to direct growth and development for a 20-year period. The GMA also required that regulations be prepared and adopted to implement the policies set forth in local comprehensive plans. Pierce County adopted the Comprehensive Plan in November, 1994 which became effective in January, 1995. To implement the Comprehensive Plan, Pierce County adopted the Development Regulations, in July of 1995. Amendments, additions, and updates to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations have been ongoing since 1995.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Pierce County has used a phased environmental review process to analyze the environmental impacts of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations. A table that lists environmental documents prepared to date can be viewed at www.piercecountywa.org/pals on the environmental page or at the Planning and Land Services Department. The information and analyses contained in the environmental documents described in the table identify the environmental impacts associated with the Comprehensive Plan and implementing regulations. For complete information and disclosure of impacts these documents should also be referenced.

This Addendum addresses the impacts of the proposed amendments to Development Regulations and supplements information in the April 1994 Draft SEIS and June 1994 Final SEIS for the Comprehensive Plan, and April 1995 Draft SEIS and June 1995 Final SEIS for the implementing regulations to the Comprehensive Plan.

PROPOSED ACTION

A. SUMMARY DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED REVISION

Since the County Council adopted the Development Regulations, staff has compiled a list of clarification amendments each year for inclusion into the amendment process annually. Many of these changes are technical and necessary for clear and predictable implementation of the regulations, whereas some are more substantive. This Addendum discusses those changes that are substantive in nature.

Summary of Substantive Amendments

Revisions to Title 18 – General Provisions

18.25.030 - Definitions

“Outdoor Event Facility” This is a new definition. This definition corresponds to proposed new Section 18A.35.170, Outdoor Event Facilities. This group of amendments was in response to Resolution R2007-149 requesting PALS evaluate the impacts of indoor and outdoor wedding facilities. Staff is recommending that new development regulations for outdoor wedding facilities be included in Title 18A; this is the corresponding definition.

“Wildland” The definition of wildland is being added in conjunction with new regulations which allow for some clearing of defensible space for fire safety.

18.140.040 - General Enforcement Provisions

Removal of the ability of Planning and Land Services to issue a Class I Civil

Infraction. This Section is being removed only as it would result from failure to comply with a notice and order to correct, work order, or other written order, as filing of criminal misdemeanor charges is the preferred method of gaining compliance with violations. Class I Civil Infractions will continue to be issued by the department as a penalty for failure to comply with any permit or decision, in accordance with Section 18.140.050.

18.140.050 - Penalties

Removal of reference to a written order. The removal of reference to other written orders will help to define the line as to when civil infractions may be issued or criminal charges filed. Written orders often contain appeal language allowing that decision to be forwarded to the Hearing Examiner for resolution. This language would allow criminal misdemeanor charges to be filed as a result of non-compliance with a Stop Work Order or Notice and Order to Correct.

Revisions to Title 18A – Development Regulations, Zoning

18A.17.030 B.3, 18A.18.030 B.3, 18A.22.030 B.3, 18A.23.030 B.3, 18A.24.030 B.3,

18A.26.030 B.3, 18A.27.030 B.3, 18A.28.030 B.3, 18A.29.030 B.3, and 18A.31.030 B.3 -

Footnote 9 – State Highways, Major Roads, and All Other Arterials. This footnote was revised at the request of the Public Works and Utilities Department to address developments

taking place on parcels adjacent to roads with inadequate right-of-way. This allows the County Engineer to identify the right-of-way need when development is taking place. The setback from roads will now be determined from the edge of needed right-of-way, instead of from property boundaries, to avoid instances in which the County redevelops a roadway and finds that buildings have been placed within the needed right-of-way.

18A.18.020, 18A.23.020, and 18A.26.020 - Levels 2-4 of Resource Use Category, Agricultural Supply Sales and Industrial Use Category, Food and Related Products were removed Countywide. Resource Use Category, Agricultural Supply Sales levels 2-4 and Industrial Use Category, Food and Related Products were removed from all levels within the Agricultural Resource Land (ARL) and Rural Farm (RF) zone classification Countywide. In ARL and Rural Farm (RF) zone classifications, where the soil resource is valuable, Agricultural Supply Sales equal to or more than 10,000 square feet in size and Food and Related Products use types are not appropriate. These uses are inappropriate for those agricultural parcels identified by the County as resources for soil types or existing farming activities through the ARL and RF zone classifications. This revision reduces the environmental impacts of development to prime agricultural soils.

18A.22.030 B.2 and 3, 18A.24.030 B.2 and 3, and 18A.27.030 B.2 and 3 – Addition of footnote 28 to the Frederickson, Graham, and Mid-County Community Plan areas. Resolution R2008-23, requested that Planning and Land Services evaluate whether garage setback requirements should be applied Countywide to allow for a reduction in road setbacks when the garage is placed an additional five feet behind the front of the primary structure. Staff evaluated this resolution and came to the conclusion that it was reasonable for Countywide development to follow this standard, as no specific policies within these community plans prohibit this provision. This provision was already implemented in all other areas, except in the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area. This provision is not recommended to be added to the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan, because specific policies within that plan call for urban regulations to be consistent with City of Gig Harbor regulations. This provision is not consistent with City of Gig Harbor regulations.

18A.26.030 B.3 - Revision to Footnote 46. This footnote allows a reduction in setbacks when it is found that critical areas and their buffers would leave the parcel undevelopable at the required setbacks. Staff has encountered several instances since the adoption of the Graham Community Plan in which this footnote has become confusing as to whether it can be applied to single-family residential construction on existing lots of record or is only applicable to lots being created through the subdivision process. The Graham Community Plan does not include policies specifically excluding development on lots of record from this footnote. This will make it clear that the footnote may be used for single-family residential building permits on lots of record and save those proposing to develop existing lots encumbered by critical areas from going through the setback variance process due to reduced usable lot area.

18A.31.020 B.2 - Tourist Commercial zone and Employee Housing use. The Upper Nisqually Valley Community Plan specifically addresses a need for employee housing as associated with the various recreational, resort, and other uses in the Upper Nisqually area, especially surrounding Mt. Rainier. It appears that allowing Employee Housing in the

Tourist Commercial zone was inadvertently omitted. The amendment would allow the Employee Housing use level within the Tourist Commercial zone classification. Employee housing is much less transient than other types of lodging, because of the length of stay, either seasonally or year-round. This use will not be allowed in Case 2 volcanic hazard areas to limit dense population clusters within this area.

18A.33.220 C - Civic Use category, Community and Cultural Services use level revision. Resolution R2007-149, requested that Planning and Land Services evaluate the impacts of indoor and outdoor wedding facilities and other uses described in the Civic Use Category under the Community and Cultural Services Use type. It appears that as written, the Community and Cultural Services use levels are somewhat ambiguous, especially as to evaluation of impacts of indoor versus outdoor facilities. Proposed revisions have been made to better evaluate uses based on indoor versus outdoor and total use area, instead of by specific uses. This will also address some of the confusion staff has experienced in placing uses within this category that are not specifically identified. To further eliminate future conflicts regarding facilities which include outdoor uses, staff recommends a new section entitled "Outdoor Event Facility."

18A.33.270 N – Commercial Use category, Personal Services use level revision. Concerns regarding the Community and Cultural Services use level were brought to staff specifically in response to controversy over a wedding facility permitted for indoor use, which was holding outdoor events without permission in the Reserve 5 zone classification. Staff evaluated the specific impacts associated with this type of facility, and determined that it did not fit within the parameters of the Civic Use Category, rather that a more appropriate category was commercial, as most civic use types are non-profit or community-owned. Those facilities specifically for special events which are for-profit fit more closely into a commercial use category. Staff revised the existing Commercial Use Category, Personal Services Levels to include event facilities. Staff utilized the Comprehensive Plan and community plans to evaluate those levels of uses recommended within each zone classification.

18A.35.060 D.5 – Home Occupations and Cottage Industries revision to allow Event Facilities with restrictions. Pierce County has recently seen an expansion in the use of private residences for event locations, especially weddings. Many residents of Pierce County, while continuing to use their residence as the primary use, rent out their home, outbuildings, yards, etc. for events. To capture some of those facilities which remain primarily a single-family use, but utilize their properties a few times a year for events, staff has included additional standards and restrictions in the Cottage Industry 2 Category. The addition of this use type in the Cottage Industry 2 will allow for these facilities on a limited basis in the rural area while requiring a Conditional Use Permit to be approved by the Hearing Examiner. This will provide additional control to assure sites proposed for events are appropriate. Event facilities as a primary use are addressed elsewhere in this Addendum.

New Section – 18A.35.170 - Outdoor Event Facilities. In coordination with other proposed amendments, the addition of development regulations providing specific standards for the development of outdoor event facilities will provide an additional layer of protection

for properties located adjacent to outdoor event facilities. Staff has recommended provisions for hours of operation, lighting, noise, buffers and screening, setbacks, occupancy, parking areas, and location criteria to provide specific standards for developments not required to obtain a discretionary land use permit, and guidelines for those developments required to obtain a discretionary land use permit.

18A.33.230 C - Utilities Use category, Electrical Generation Facility Use level addition of wind powered electrical generation facilities and 18A.33.300 E – Accessory Use List addition of Wind Power Electrical Generation uses. There is a need for regulations to address both small and large wind power systems, whether as an accessory to an existing use or as a primary use. Proposed regulations provide specific design standards for small wind power systems accessory to existing uses in any zone classification. Proposed regulations require Conditional Use Permit approval for wind power generation facilities as a primary use allowed only in the rural area. The requirement of a Conditional Use Permit allows some flexibility of design, especially as technologies change, and the ability for Pierce County to make determinations on a site specific manner as to the appropriateness of the facility.

18A.33.270 O through R – Commercial Use category, Storage use level revision. The storage use level was revised to be entitled Storage and Moving to incorporate moving, which was previously related to Distribution in the Industrial Use Category Warehousing, Distribution and Freight Movement level. The revision, in addition to existing storage levels, includes transportation of items between locations, and additional levels which would allow larger buildings associated with the use type in some zones. Additionally, Level 4 was removed, as it does not appear to provide any additional restrictions over those stated in Level 3, rather the reference to the South Hill Community Plan design standards was moved to the description of the category. Staff has included this new level only in those zone classifications where the Industrial Use Category, Warehousing, Distribution and Freight Movement level was previously allowed to prevent conflicts in non-industrial zone classifications.

18A.22.280 K and L – Industrial Use category, Warehousing, Distribution, and Freight Movement use level revisions. The Warehousing, Distribution, and Freight Movement use level has been revised to create two separate use levels – Warehousing and Distribution and Transportation and Logistics. The Transportation and Logistics use level will replace Freight Movement, which is focused on dispatch and servicing of a truck fleet and has on average the highest employment density (jobs per acre or jobs per square foot) of any industrial use. The Warehousing and Distribution use level will be reduced from the current levels associated with Warehousing, Distribution and Freight Movement level through a reduction in the maximum parcel size allowed to be used for these operations to five acres. This reduction is to accommodate less land intensive warehousing uses, which will not use up limited industrial land so rapidly. Transportation and Logistics level will be allowed in all of the same categories that currently allow Warehousing, Distribution and Freight Movement, whereas warehousing uses will be allowed in the same zone classifications, but limited to a maximum parcel size of five acres.

18A.33.300 E – Accessory Use List addition of Cargo Containers. Cargo containers of different shapes and sizes have been used and placed without permits throughout Pierce County for long term and short term storage associated with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Proposed amendments would allow cargo containers with certain restrictions as a permanent use accessory to industrial uses only. Commercial, Civic and Residential uses are required to adhere to stricter design standards, which cargo containers can not meet. Proposed regulations allow cargo containers to be located for no more than 180 days in Employment Center, MUD, and CC land use designations, and are prohibited in all other land use designations.

18A.35.020 D.10 – Addition of alley setback standards. Standards are proposed to provide setback requirements for attached structures on alleys. Detached structures are allowed within three feet of a rear property boundary; however, as a common development concept, alleys could be developed with attached garages as well. Proposed amendments include specific development standards for attached structures accessing an alley, and a limitation on other driveways to limit vehicle access to the house to the alley.

18A.35.060 D – Home Occupations and Cottage Industries revision to allow vehicles up to 18,000 GVW. Proposed amendment allows Home Occupation and Cottage Industry development standards to increase the Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) allowance from 10,000 GVW to 18,000 GVW to allow for late model trucks which are heavier or for truck and trailer combinations associated which may be accessory to these occupations. This amendment does not allow an increase in the number of vehicles allowed, only in the weight of each vehicle.

Revisions to Title 18B – Development Regulations, Signs

18B.10.040 - Variance revisions to streamline process Countywide. The proposed revision is to clarify the sign variance process. This process was not updated as community plans created separate chapters of the sign regulations and created confusion for staff and applicants upon implementation.

18B.140.050 – Amendment to non-conforming sign requirements in South Hill Community Plan. Resolution R2008-23, included reference to problems with nonconforming signs in South Hill. South Hill Community Plan goals are clear in their goal that a process should be in place to slowly remove nonconforming signs as parcels in the community plan redevelop. The proposed amendment includes an additional standard for nonconforming signs that when a new building sign is permitted, the non-conforming building sign should be removed; and that when a new freestanding sign is permitted, the non-conforming freestanding sign should be removed. This will achieve the goals of the South Hill Community Plan, rather than furthering the life of existing nonconforming signs despite redevelopment of sites and placement of new signs.

Revisions to Title 18E – Development Regulations, Critical Areas

18E.20.030, 18E.30.040, and 18E.40.040 – Addition of defensible space provisions for fire safety. The proposed revisions to Sections 18E.30.040 (Wetland Standards) and

18E.40.040 (Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area Standards) are made at the urging of the Washington Department of Natural Resources and Pierce County Fire Commissioners. Both entities desire the County to facilitate a landowner's ability to create a 30 foot perimeter of defensible space against wildfire, regardless of existing critical areas. In addition to specific standards added to allow defensible space activities, the revisions include a new definition ("wildland" - a term used numerous times in DNR literature) within Section 18.25.030 and new Appendix "E". The Appendix provides guidance on how a landowner should thin vegetation within the 30-foot perimeter area.

18E.40.040 B.15 – Limitation of disturbance area within fish and wildlife habitat areas. The changes to 18E.40.040 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area Standards (B) 15 (*Structures and Landscaped Areas*) dealing with allowable clearing limits are technical and will make the implementation of disturbance area regulations more uniform.

18E.40.040 B.17 - Clarification to obtaining standards for Other Critical Habitat Areas. The changes to 18E.40.040 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area Standards (D) (*Standards for Other Critical Habitat Areas*) are made to emphasize: 1) the coordination that is to occur between County staff and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; 2) the responsibility of County staff to develop, and make available, habitat-specific standards; and 3) the right of the applicant to request consultation with WDFW staff prior to issuance of County approval. This code change was done at the request of Council staff.

Revisions to Title 18F – Land Divisions and Boundary Line Adjustments

18F.10.060 - Addition of an exemption for land divisions where all resulting tracts and lots are 100 acres or more. This revision would eliminate survey and critical area review requirements for subdivision resulting in parcels of 100 acres or greater. These subdivisions are undertaken almost solely by timber companies exchanging lands. Critical area and other review takes place with forest practice approvals or building permit reviews if not undertaken at subdivision stage. These parcels are often not able to provide adequate access or meet other requirements stipulated by subdivision code, as they are not proposed for dwellings.

Revisions to Title 18H – Development Regulations, Forest Practices and Tree Conservation.

18H.20 and 18H.30 – Clarifications to process for forest practice permits and moratoria. These revisions are clarifications to the required review and submittal process for forest practice permits. Revisions to planting requirements for reforestation have been included to guide replanting of disturbed areas.

18H.40.030 - Addition of an exemption for urban short plats of 4 lots or less and of one acre or less. This revision would provide an exemption from Tree Conservation requirements for urban short subdivisions with a total site area of one acre or less and which would result in less than 4 lots. This revision is necessary to encourage infill development in the urban area by reducing the regulatory burden.

18H.40.040 C - Addition that significant trees be reflective of the diversity of species and age within the stand, and addition of Legacy Trees as significant trees. This emphasizes the priority of significant tree conservation, especially in regard to preserving some of the largest, oldest trees on-site. This also preserves valuable established habitat on sites where a diversity of trees exist. Inclusion of the Legacy Tree also encourages preservation of old growth trees significant for habitat or local history. This addition does not increase the number of trees required for retention, except when a Legacy Tree of a species not identified as another type of significant tree is identified on-site.

18H.40.040 F – Addition of Legacy Trees. Legacy trees were added as a type of significant tree. Applicants conserving Legacy Trees will receive five tree credits for their retention.

18H.40.040 G – Clarification of building / use expansion standards. The proposed language is in addition to existing standards. This section previously referred only to re-planting or conservation for development expansions that were not subject to a previous tree conservation plan. The amendment provides a different standard for those projects already subject to a tree conservation plan, which would amend that plan rather than creating a new plan.

18H.40.045 A - Revision to applicability for land divisions utilizing rural standards. Those land divisions which result in lots which are 1/128th of a section and those where the density is 0.2 dwelling units per acre or less, but individual lots are less than five acres would be allowed to use rural standards in the proposed amendment. This standard was altered to address most rural subdivisions which were previously excluded, often due to smaller Section sizes which left lots unable to meet the minimum lot size of five acres. This also addresses many large pasture parcels, the owners of which were proposing to split off one smaller lot which would require them to replant large trees, which is extremely costly on large parcels. Tree planting density in rural areas is much higher than under the regular tree conservation standards, because a smaller tree size is allowed at a much higher density. Survivability of younger trees is better than the taller trees required in the previous section of this Chapter, thus cost of planting is less, but the likely result is a denser stands of trees.

18H.40.050 B – Clarification to planting standards. This amendment proposes separating planting standards between natural areas (i.e., open space, critical areas, native vegetation areas, etc.) and landscaped areas (i.e., street trees, landscape buffers, parks, etc.) by stipulating that native species are required to be planted in natural areas, but not necessarily landscape areas. This provides more clarity in design and coordination with other regulations which require planting.

18H.40.110 – Revision to deviation standards. This amendment revises the variance section to be entitled “Deviations”. Deviations will be reviewed under the Site Plan Review process detailed in Title 18J. The revision includes addition of on-site and off-site mitigation priorities. The section provides clarification of a process that was not previously included, to allow on-site mitigation for deviations, and to clarify the off-mitigation sites for

deviations. Off-site mitigation will not be used until a program is set up and administered to track sites used as mitigations areas.

18H.40.130, Appendix A - Revision and clarification to minimum requirements for a Tree Conservation Plan. This amendment was proposed to clarify items that have been brought up to staff over time, especially in regard to regular industry practices. Staff has included clarifications to the requirements and the ability to do sampling on large parcels where forested areas will be preserved and individual tree surveys are not practical, or in some cases feasible. Language was clarified to represent process and items currently being requested by staff.

Revisions to Title 18J – Development Standards, Design Standards and Guidelines

18J.15.020 – Clarification of Infill Development Standards. This revision clarifies the role of the Hearing Examiner versus Director of Planning and Land Services role in determining Infill Development buffering standards.

18J.15.030 - Urban and Rural Stormwater Management, Impervious Surfaces and Native Vegetation Retention Standards and Guidelines re-organization and revisions.

18J.15.030 A – This amendment accomplished consolidation of stormwater regulations which were repeated in each community plan specific chapter. Those community plans which required different storm drainage requirements have been left as such.

18J.15.030 B – Amendments to this Section include large areas of re-organization and clarification that do not create substantive changes to the regulation. An amendment was provided clarifying the calculation of native vegetation area to be based upon net acreage, as this was not specified in the previous regulation. The amendment now matches calculation methods for tree conservation and urban density. An amendment is proposed to allow an exemption from native vegetation requirements for short subdivisions resulting in four lots or less with a total area of one acre or less. This amendment is companion to the proposed exemption for the same type of developments in the Tree Conservation chapter.

The revision requires the dedication of native vegetation areas to be concentrated within tracts, rather than within individual residential lot design. This section continues to provide the flexibility of allowing some native vegetation area within individual lots, but recognizes that survivability and cohesiveness of native vegetation areas are generally better protected by tracts.

Staff currently uses a handout directing native vegetation planting and retention standards since March 1, 2005. This handout includes guidelines for planting, which were not previously codified. This amendment would serve to codify the planting standards included in the handout. This will reduce the need for the applicant to obtain a handout in addition to the regulations. Including both in one document is more user-friendly.

Impervious surface area restrictions were added to the ARL and RF zone classifications, as they appear to have been accidentally omitted. The proposed standard of 10 percent is the same as all other non-commercial rural classifications.

Deviation standards specific to the native vegetation standards were added. This language is place-holder language, similar to off-site mitigation language contained within the Tree Conservation section, which has not been implemented due to lack of a program or process for implementation. In the event that such a program is created, this is the standard that could be used to provide guidance as to the types of sites appropriate for off-site mitigation.

18J.17.030 B – Removal of figures within Small Lot Design Standards which present inaccurate representations of standards within the Section. Figures associated with design guidelines and pedestrian connections which misrepresented allowed design practices for Small Lot Design developments are proposed to be removed.

18J.30.060 A – Reference added to clarify when storm drainage systems could be credited toward open space. Resolution R2008-23, requested that staff evaluate the use of public stormwater ponds as recreational amenities. Staff found that while no language specifically forbade the use of public stormwater ponds for passive open space area credit, it was implied by language referencing the need for those ponds to be designed as site amenities. Design of a stormwater pond as an amenity and for public dedication is impossible, because public stormwater ponds are required to be rectangular, fenced, and free of vegetation. Staff is recommending an amendment which would include language clarifying that public stormwater ponds can not be used toward passive open space in each section including that reference.

18J.30.110 New Appendix C - Garfield Street Neighborhood Activity Center Design Guidelines. These new guidelines, adopted May 20, 2008, by Resolution R2008-71s, were included by reference in the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Design Standards and Guidelines.

18J.50.050 – Revision to landscaping standards along Meridian Avenue East between 120th Street East and 176th Street East. The requirement for a Level 3 Landscape Buffer was replaced with a lesser planting standard of the same width to meet the intent of the South Hill Community Plan. Staff analysis of community plan policies and land use advisory commissioner feedback led to a new planting standard for building setback areas from Meridian to provide “lush greenery”, per the community plan, but still provide some visibility of commercial uses. This will also create more incentive for commercial developments to maintain the plantings within the setback, because they will not block the visibility of the use.

18J.60.090 B and D – Removal of specific driveway width standards. These standards were removed, because they were not consistent with road construction guidelines in Title 17B. Rather than correcting the mistake, staff found it more appropriate to remove it from this regulation, as it is regulated elsewhere. Removing this will prevent future revisions to Title 17B requiring revisions to Title 18J.

Summary of Technical Amendments

Technical amendments resolving errors and providing clarification to existing regulations were also included in this amendment package. These amendments have not been discussed in this document, as they are technical, not substantive.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND DOCUMENTATION

Summary Analysis

The proposed amendments do not conflict with any policies or principles contained within the respective community plans. The changes do not pose any significant environmental impacts. Those changes that would possibly create impacts would be evaluated and mitigated at the time of construction.

This Addendum is used as part of a phased environmental review process utilized by Pierce County Planning and Land Services since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations in 1995. Pierce County has used a phased review process for the non-project actions required by Washington State's Growth Management Act, including the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations. Pierce County intends to continue to use this phased review for adoption of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations that implement the Plan and update the regulations accordingly.

The earlier environmental documentation prepared in conjunction with the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations, as referenced in this document, addressed a range of alternatives and impacts. The proposed amendments do not create any new significant adverse environmental impacts.