



CO00014010

**SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

**AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 05-073**

**REVISING THE EXISTING URBAN GROWTH AREA  
FOR THE CITY OF ARLINGTON AND AMENDING  
ORDINANCE NO. 04-012**

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW 36.70A.110 requires Snohomish County to designate urban growth areas (UGA) within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature (RCW 36.70A.110(1)) and (WAC 365-195-335 (1)(a)); and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council designated a Final UGA for Arlington (Ordinance 94-120) on June 28, 1995, after holding public hearings from April 19, 1994, through January 18, 1995, in conformance with the requirements of the GMA; and

WHEREAS, on June 28, 1995, the county council approved Amended Ordinance 94-125 which adopted a GMA Comprehensive Plan including a General Policy Plan (GPP) and Future Land Use Map; and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council amended the Final UGA for Arlington on September 15, 1997 (Ordinance 97-076), September 9, 1998 (Ordinance 98-068), December 16, 1998 (Ordinance 98-114), July 26, 2000 (Ordinance 00-050), July 23, 2001 (Ordinance 01-047), January 27, 2002 (Ordinance 03-005), September 10, 2003 (Ordinance 03-063), March 10, 2004 (Ordinance 04-012) and on May 24, 2004 (Ordinance 04-057, note that the Growth Management Hearings Board found this Ordinance invalid in its June 24, 2004 Order) in conformance with the requirements of the GMA; and

WHEREAS, the planning goals of the GMA, which guide development of comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, state that development shall be encouraged "in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner" (RCW 36.70A.020(1)), and that "the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development" is to be reduced (RCW 36.70A.020(2)); and

WHEREAS, the GMA states that a UGA "may include territory that is situated outside of a city only if such territory already is characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth" (RCW 36.70A.110(1)); and

WHEREAS, the GMA states that "[u]rban growth should be situated first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, and second in areas already characterized by

AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 05-073  
REVISING THE EXISTING URBAN GROWTH AREA FOR THE  
CITY OF ARLINGTON AND AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 04-012

urban growth that will be served by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources" (RCW 36.70A.110(3)) and (WAC 365-195-335(1)(e)); and

WHEREAS, the GMA requires that, based upon the population projection made for the county by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM), the UGAs in the county "shall include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period" (RCW 36.70A.110(2)) and (WAC 365-195-335(1)(d)); and

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.110(2) requires that Snohomish County and its cities use the growth management population projection made for the county by the OFM as the basis for urban growth area determination; and

WHEREAS, OFM issued growth management population projections for Snohomish County in January 2002 that included a range for potential 2025 total county population that varied from a low of 795,725 to a high of 1,062,903; and

WHEREAS, Countywide Planning Policy UG-2 requires that the cities and the county engage in the cooperative planning process of Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) in order to establish a subcounty allocation of projected growth for coordination of growth management plans; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) of SCT conducted a technical review of the preliminary 2025 growth target preferences for cities, unincorporated urban growth areas, unincorporated municipal urban growth areas, and the rural/resource area of Snohomish County and recommended by consensus an initial population and employment growth target allocation for the year 2025 targets to update Appendix B of the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs); and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council amended Appendix B of the CPPs (Ordinance No. 04-006) to include the 2025 initial growth targets as recommended by the SCT Steering Committee; and

WHEREAS, the territory added to the Arlington UGA herein is consistent with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.110(1) being characterized by urban growth or adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth; and

WHEREAS, these Arlington UGA expansions provide an adequate amount of land to accommodate the twenty-year population and employment allocation (WAC 365-195-335(3)(e)(v)); and

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.130(3) directs counties planning under the GMA to take legislative action to review and, if needed, revise its comprehensive plan and development regulations to ensure that the plan is capable of accommodating forecasted population growth for the succeeding 20-year period; and

WHEREAS, Snohomish County has amended its comprehensive plan several times since its adoption, most recently in December 2004 as part of the "seven-year compliance review" required by RCW 36.70A.130(1); and

WHEREAS, the county must also review its plan every 10 years, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(3) to ensure that it is capable of accommodating projected population growth for the succeeding 20-year period; and

WHEREAS, in the spring of 2003 the county provided general notice it was, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130, undertaking a review of its comprehensive plan as part of the seven-year compliance review along with the separate 10-year update process, through its widely disseminated *Focus on Tomorrow Newsletter* and through updates to the county website; and

WHEREAS, public open houses concerning the seven-year compliance review and the 10-year update, were held in Everett on February 4, 2003, in Lynnwood on February 6, 2003, Monroe on February 10, 2003, and Arlington on February 19, 2003; and

WHEREAS, on July 22, 2003, the county council and planning commission conducted a joint public meeting in Everett concerning the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update; and

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2003, an all-day event referred to as "Planners in the Library" was held in Lynnwood, Marysville, and Monroe, for the purpose of discussing the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update with the public; and

WHEREAS, in April 2004, the county updated the public on the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update process through its widely disseminated *Focus on the Future Newsletter* and placed on the county website and through updates to the county website; and

WHEREAS, the county held public hearings concerning the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update in Arlington on June 1, 2004, and June 8, 2004, as well as in Everett on June 3, 2004; and

WHEREAS, on May 15, 2004, an all-day event known as "Planners in the Library" was held in Lynnwood, Marysville, and Monroe, for the purpose of discussing the seven-year compliance review update and 10-year update with the public; and

WHEREAS, Snohomish County Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS) staff hosted public workshops on the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update in Lynnwood on June 14, 2004, in Monroe on June 16, 2004, and in Arlington on June 17, 2004; and

WHEREAS, on June 29, 2004, the county council and planning commission conducted a joint public hearing in Everett concerning the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update; and

WHEREAS, on July 27, 2004, PDS presented overviews of the seven-year compliance review and 10-year update to the planning commission and the county council planning committee; and

WHEREAS, on October 12, 2004, PDS unveiled its "preferred alternative" future land use map at an advertised public meeting before the planning commission; and

WHEREAS, on October 14 and 20, 2004, PDS held public open houses to facilitate public knowledge of, and to receive public input concerning the "preferred alternative" future land use map; and

WHEREAS, on November 3, 4, 9 and 18, 2004, PDS held public workshops with city and county planning commissioners to discuss key policy issues related to the comprehensive plan, including infrastructure challenges for transportation, parks and drainage, economic development, resource land preservation, fully-contained communities, and others; and

WHEREAS, on April 19, 21, and 28, 2005, PDS held public open houses on the department's recommended package of comprehensive plan amendments for the 10-Year update, including amendments to the GPP, the Transportation Element, the Capital Facilities Plan, the Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan, the Future Land Use Map, the county zoning map, and selected sections of the code; and

WHEREAS, on May 24 and 26, and June 1 and 2, 2005, the planning commission and the county council held joint public hearings to receive public testimony concerning the proposed amendments to the comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 7, 9, 14, 16 and 21, 2005, the planning commission deliberated on the PDS recommended package of comprehensive plan amendments at an advertised public hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the public hearing the planning commission voted to recommend adoption of the proposed package of comprehensive plan amendments, with certain modifications as enumerated in its recommendation letter of July 26, 2005; and

WHEREAS, the county council held public hearings on October 3, 4, 5 and 6, 2005 to consider the entire record, including the planning commission's recommendations on the full package of comprehensive plan amendments, and to hear public testimony on this Amended Ordinance No. 05-073; and

WHEREAS, the county council deliberated on the planning commission recommendations, executive alternatives, and public testimony on October 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 31, 2005 and November 3 and 9, 2005 and December 14, 19 and 21, 2005.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:

**Section 1:** The county council makes the following findings:

- A. The county council adopts and incorporates the foregoing recitals as findings as if set forth fully herein.
- B. The county council hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the findings and conclusions adopted and the legislative records developed in adopting Amended Ordinance No. 94-120 and Amended Ordinance No. 94-125.
- C. These expansions to the Arlington UGA, as depicted in Exhibit A to this ordinance which is attached hereto, are consistent with applicable GPP Policies, particularly those contained in the Population and Employment and Land Use sections including Goal LU 1, "Establish compact, clearly defined UGAs" and Goal LU 2 "Establish development patterns that use urban land more efficiently."
- D. These expansions to the Arlington UGA are consistent with the following final review and evaluation criteria of chapter 30.73 SCC:
  - 1. This amendment maintains consistency with other elements of the GMA comprehensive plan;
  - 2. All applicable elements of the GMA comprehensive plan support this amendment;
  - 3. This amendment meets the goals, objectives, and policies of the GMA comprehensive plan as discussed in the specific findings; and
  - 4. This UGA amendment is consistent with the CPPs.
- E. This scale of expansion to this Arlington UGA is necessary to accommodate the population and employment growth forecasts for the year 2025, and to provide additional economic development opportunities through new jobs-creation. UGA-level growth targets were determined through the growth allocation process conducted through Snohomish County Tomorrow in 2003. Initial UGA-level growth targets were determined through the growth allocation process conducted through

SCT in 2003. Adjusted UGA-level growth targets were determined through the 10-year update process. These adjusted growth targets, set forth in Appendix D to the GPP, are within the range of growth management population projections provided for Snohomish County by OFM in January 2002.

- F. Snohomish County, in consultation with the City of Arlington and other cities, conducted a review and evaluation program of the densities being achieved in urban areas and the land use policies of the GPP as required by RCW 36.70A.215.
- G. The "Buildable Lands Report" completed in January 2003 evaluated development in the Arlington UGA and concluded that urban densities are being achieved within the Arlington UGA. The urban densities being achieved within the Arlington UGA are consistent with the policies contained within the county GPP and CPPs.
- H. The "Buildable Lands Report" determined that urban level densities are being achieved within the UGA and that the densities are consistent with the policies contained within the GPP. It was therefore determined that consideration of "Reasonable Measures" was not required under RCW 36.70A.215.
- I. SCT, with a consultant, ECONorthwest, developed a Phase II report titled "Recommended Method for Evaluating Local Reasonable Measures Programs" in June of 2003.
- J. A "Reasonable Measures" report was completed by Snohomish County in 2005 covering all of the unincorporated UGAs throughout Snohomish County including the Arlington UGA. The methodology recommended in the ECONorthwest report for evaluating Reasonable Measures was used in evaluating the Snohomish County effort to implement Reasonable Measures as documented in the 2005 report.
- K. The Reasonable Measures report concluded that Snohomish County has implemented a wide range of Reasonable Measures including permitting accessory dwelling units, providing housing tax credits and allowing density bonuses to developers.
- L. Consideration of Reasonable Measures, prior to consideration of expansion of the UGA, is required by CPP UG-14b. A list of Reasonable Measures to increase population, commercial or industrial capacity was included in the adopted CPPs as "Appendix C," and was considered. The Buildable Lands Report revealed no inconsistency between actual and planned for growth, so implementation of reasonable measures is not a condition to UGA expansions. However, pursuant to the countywide planning policies, the county has nonetheless implemented several reasonable measures and considered additional reasonable measures, as documented in the Snohomish County Reasonable Measures Background Report.

- M. The City of Arlington self-certified its compliance with reasonable measures requirements under RCW 36.70A.215.
- N. Snohomish County conducted a land capacity analysis for the entire county, culminating in a report entitled the Snohomish County UGA Land Capacity Analysis Technical Report, consistent with RCW 36.70A.110 and CPP UG -14d.
- O. The UGA Land Capacity Analysis Report concluded that the land capacity of the existing UGA, even with expected increases in residential densities anticipated through changes to land use designations and other measures undertaken by the city and the county to increase land capacity, will not be sufficient to meet these growth forecasts.
- P. The UGA Land Capacity Analysis Report concluded that with the UGA modifications, the county as a whole can accommodate the population and employment growth projected through 2025 consistent with GPP LU1.A.1.
- Q. These expansions to the Arlington UGA, as depicted in Exhibit A to this ordinance which is attached hereto, include areas contiguous with the existing boundary and adjacent to areas characterized by urban growth and that have relatively few development constraints.
- R. These expansions to the Arlington UGA, as depicted in Exhibit A to this ordinance which is attached hereto, include areas that can be reasonably served with public services and facilities and that are generally supported by the city for inclusion within its UGA.
- S. The City of Arlington has been consulted regarding these expansions to its UGA. The Mayor of the City of Arlington recently submitted a package of documents to the members of the county council at the December 7, 2005, public hearing (Document No. 8.6 000178), summarizing recent work to ensure adequate water and sewer services are available to serve the projected population growth, which would be added to the UGA through this expansion.
- T. In one of the documents submitted by the Mayor of Arlington on December 7, 2005, entitled "Resolution No. 721", the city council acknowledged that the city had hired a consultant who is currently drafting a revised Comprehensive Water System Plan for Arlington, which is scheduled to be completed by March 2006. The city council also noted in the resolution that the city hired a consultant to revise the Comprehensive Sewer System Plan, which is scheduled to be completed by August 2006.
- U. The City of Arlington also submitted a memorandum to members of the county council, dated November 16, 2005, which discusses utilities and outlines additional work conducted recently by the city toward ensuring adequate water and sewer service will exist for the projected population target. The memo highlights steps

Arlington has taken to ensure adequate water will exist at the time of development, including:

1. Identifying a variety of additional water supply sources, including consideration of buying water from Marysville or Snohomish County PUD, and exploring the availability of such sources to meet their growth needs;
  2. Finalizing an upgrade to Arlington's water quality treatment capability which now provides improved water quality;
  3. Recent adoption of regulations establishing connection fees for all new residential development to support the construction of the necessary capital facilities; and
  4. Proposed adoption of increased water rates to support the construction of the necessary capital facilities.
- V. The county council has considered the documents submitted by the city of Arlington and acknowledges the work conducted by Arlington to ensure adequate water and sewer availability for anticipated growth.
- W. The November 16, 2005, memo also outlines steps the city has taken towards ensuring adequate sewer service for the projected population target including:
1. Addressing short-term solids issues by studying options and ultimately leasing equipment to operate until permanent infrastructure is financed and built;
  2. Consideration of current technology to increase efficiency and address new treatment standards for sewer treatment plant;
  3. The city's commitment to evaluate adoption of connection fees in the first quarter of 2006; and
  4. Procuring a \$7,000,000 Public Works Trust Fund loan from the State Public Works Board to handle short-term solids issues.
- X. The information submitted by the City of Arlington assures that adequate urban services will be available to serve the expansion areas at the time of development.
- Y. The proposal has been broadly disseminated and there has been early and continuous public participation in the review of these expansions to the Arlington UGA as part of the 10-year update process.
- Z. Following an extended scoping period that included a public scoping meeting held on July 22, 2003, a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) was prepared and issued in May 2004. The DEIS analyzed the environmental impacts of three



alternative growth and land use scenarios to address the state forecasts of population and employment growth to the year 2025.

- AA. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) was prepared and issued in December 13, 2005 that provided responses to 382 comments on the DEIS received during the 60-day comment period and which provided supplemental analysis and information relating to the preferred alternative land use plan.
- BB. Population, employment and housing elements are analyzed for the Arlington UGA expansion in Appendix A of the DEIS/FEIS.
- CC. The population expansions to the Arlington UGA, as depicted in Exhibit A to this ordinance which is attached hereto, are supported by the UGA Land Capacity Analysis Technical Report adopted by the Snohomish County Council pursuant to RCW 36.70A.110 and the review of UGAs for the 10-year update to accommodate the succeeding 20 years of projected growth, as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3) and thus are consistent with CPP UG-14d condition 2.
- DD. The commercial expansion to the Arlington UGA, as depicted in Exhibit A to this ordinance which is attached hereto, is necessary to better and more efficiently serve the nearby existing and future residential neighborhoods of Arlington and Snohomish County.
- EE. A 5-acre non-population, non-employment based proposed UGA expansion on the south side of the Arlington High School off SR-9 is consistent with CPP UG-14d condition 7 because the proposed expansion is for school purposes and will carry a Public Use/Institutional land use designation.
- FF. A 1.5-acre UGA expansion along the northwest edge of the Arlington UGA boundary, and a change of land use designation from Rural Commercial Farmland (RCF) with a Transfer of Development Rights Overlay (TDR) to Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR), represents a technical correction of the boundary to reflect the site's soil, topographic characteristics and proximity to existing urban development. The 1.5-acre area that is proposed to be added to the UGA is part of a 15-acre parcel. See Exhibit C, aerial photo of the 15 acre parcel, with the 1.5-acre portion identified by an orange border. The 15-acre parcel has three distinct areas: 1) an upland portion; 2) a steep slope portion; and 3) a lower river portion. The upland area, located at the southern end of the parcel, is composed of approximately 5-acres, 3.5 of which are located within the Arlington UGA with the remaining 1.5-acres located outside the UGA. This 1.5-acre area is proposed for inclusion within the UGA. The steep slope portion of the property, which is located in the middle of the parcel, contains the edge of a plateau that falls away sharply to the Stillaguamish River Valley. The third portion of the property, the river valley portion, is located in the northern section of the parcel.

The proposed incorporation of 1.5-acres into the UGA and redesignation from agricultural to non-agricultural lands is supported by the two-prong test for

identifying and designating agricultural resource lands in RCW 36.70A.030(2). The first requirement is that the land must be "devoted to" agricultural usage; the second is that the land must have "long term commercial significance" for agriculture. Under the first prong of the test, the soils of the 1.5-acre area are not prime agricultural soils and therefore, the soils weigh in favor of being redesignated non-agricultural lands. While the entire parcel contains three soils types, including some "prime" agricultural soils, the 1.5-acre area does not have prime or even marginal agricultural soils. Most of the upland portion of the site, including the 1.5-acre area recommended for incorporation into the UGA, contains Everett Gravelly Sandy Loam (soil type 17) which is not considered a prime agricultural soil type. The steep slope portion of the site is identified as Alderwood-Everett Gravelly Sandy Loams (soil type 4) which is not considered a prime agricultural soil. Finally, the lowland portion of the property contains Mukilteo Muck soils (soil type 34). This soil type is considered a prime farmland soil according to Charles Natsuhara, a Resource Soils Scientist at the Natural Resources Conservation Service (SRCS) See Exhibit B, December 9, 2002, letter.

The portions of the property that have prime agricultural soils (the northern half of the property on the valley floor) or marginal agricultural soils (the sloped bank separating the agricultural area to the north from the non-agricultural area to the south) will retain the RCF land use designation. The 1.5-acre area proposed for inclusion in the UGA has non-agricultural soils, and is physically separated from prime agricultural soils and active farming activity in the lowland to the north. Based on the nonprime soils, the 1.5-acre area does not meet the "devoted to" prong of the test and, rather, favors redesignation from agricultural to rural usage.

The second prong of the test, that of long-term commercial significance, also supports redesignation of the 1.5-acre area; the 1.5-acre area is not land that has long-term commercial significance for agriculture pursuant to the WAC 365-190-050(1) criteria.

The locational factors weigh in favor of redesignating the 1.5-acre area from agriculture to urban. Public water is available to the 1.5-acre area from the City of Arlington water line in 188<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE. Due to the proximity to the UGA, public services, including schools, police and fire services, are available to the 1.5-acre area. Another factor that weighs in favor of redesignation from agriculture to urban is the proximity to urban growth areas; this 1.5 acre area physically abuts the UGA. Additionally, the existing land use patterns on neighboring properties and their impact on agricultural practices support redesignation of the 1.5-acre area. All development south of the top of bank is urban in nature and not compatible with agricultural practices. The inclusion of the 1.5-acre area into the UGA and redesignation from agriculture to urban does not impact the lowland Stillaguamish River Valley area which is designated agricultural resource lands that is actively farmed. The steep slope portion of the 15-acre parcel, which runs through the center of the property, severs the connection between the urban development in

the uplands portion of the parcel and the prime agricultural soils and agricultural activity in the lowland area.

The intensity of nearby land uses and land development permits also favors inclusion of the 1.5-acre area into the UGA. As stated above, the entire upland portion of the 15-acre parcel, including the 1.5-acres proposed for inclusion in the UGA, is located immediately adjacent to urban development, which occurs along the eastern property line. Those plats are being developed with a 7,200 square foot minimum lot size. Properties to the east of the 1.5-acre area have been consistently developed for residential use from the top of bank with the steep slopes and the valley floor agricultural lands being retained for agricultural purposes. Finally, if the 1.5-acre area is included into the UGA, the lowland northern portion of the parcel outside the UGA would remain larger than 10-acres in size, consistent with agricultural use.

GG. The proposed expansions of the Arlington UGA are supported by the city and are consistent with the city's adopted UGA map. The City of Arlington currently has a Comprehensive Plan update under review. Any inconsistency between a UGA map adopted by the City of Arlington in the future and the county proposed UGA map will be resolved through the process specified in the CPPs adopted through SCT.

HH. Criteria used in establishing an area's suitability to be included in the UGA are a compilation of applicable state laws (RCWs and WACs), the CPPs, the GPP policies and input from public meetings. The criteria used to evaluate intensification or expansion of UGAs was included in a 2004 document titled "Summary Evaluation of Geographical Areas Under Consideration for Urban Intensification or Expansion in the 10-Year Update." Specific areas to be added to the Arlington UGA were evaluated using these criteria and are appropriate for urban land use designations, based on criteria from the UGA expansion evaluation sheets, for the following reasons:

1. First priority is given to areas that are characterized by urban growth and have existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development.
2. Second priority is given to areas adjacent to areas already characterized by urban growth and that will be served by existing and planned public facilities and services.
3. Consideration is given to the ease of extending utilities to the area.
4. Consideration is given to the adequacy of the transportation network to serve the area.
5. Consideration is given to areas that do not require conversion of farmland.

6. Consideration is given to expansions that are supported by the City of Arlington.
7. Consideration is given to expansions that do not create illogical boundaries.
8. Consideration is given to expansions that do not impact habitat for threatened or endangered species.
9. Consideration is given to expansions that are supported by the affected property owner.
10. Consideration is given to expansions that provide retail and commercial use in more locations to better serve the residential neighborhoods of Arlington and Snohomish County.
11. Consideration is given to expansions that provide a large industrial site to support employment expansion.
12. Consideration is given to expansions that do not impact environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands, areas with high water table or steep slopes.

II. The following areas will be added to the Arlington UGA:

1. An area of 201 acres is being added for population and employment capacity, including re-designation of 34 acres of Rural Residential (RR-5) to Urban Commercial (UC), 116 acres of RR-5 to Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR), 10 acres of RR-5 to UMDR, 14 acres of Rural Residential - Basic (RR) to UC, 10 acres of RR to ULDR and 12 acres of RR to Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR), located at the intersection of 172<sup>nd</sup> St. NE and SR-9 adjacent to the existing UGA boundary is appropriate for addition to the UGA because the City of Arlington supports the proposal, the owners support the addition of the area into the UGA, the area is located at an intersection of arterials for an additional retail and residential node. This expansion will also provide for distribution of retail and commercial services away from congested road segments to the west. In addition, a 5-acre parcel on the east side of SR-9 is being brought into the UGA, but is not being given a county land use designation because it is currently used for City of Arlington municipal purposes and has already been annexed into the City of Arlington.
2. An area of 1.5 acres located on 188<sup>th</sup> St. NE near 47<sup>th</sup> Ave NE adjacent to the existing UGA boundary is being added as a refinement of the UGA boundary, including re-designation from RCF with a TDR sending area overlay to ULDR. This proposed UGA expansion would align the UGA boundary with the existing zoning boundary line between the AG-10 zoning of the north half of the property and the SA-1 zoning of the uplands portion established in 1989. See Finding AA above.

3. An area of 5 acres on the south side of Arlington High School off SR-9 is appropriate for addition to the UGA with a re-designation from RR with a Rural Urban Transition Area (R/UTA) Overlay to Public Use/Institutional (PU/I) because the proposed change would not include a residential or employment capacity change, would allow additional land for school district activities, is supported by the City of Arlington and the Arlington School District. The UGA boundary change would also create a more logical boundary.
  3. An area of 11 acres located on the east side of SR-9 and south of the Arlington High School is being added to the UGA for population capacity. The area is appropriate for addition to the UGA and redesignation from Rural Residential to Urban Low Density Residential because 1) the property is adjacent to the existing UGA boundary and provides residential capacity to meet the succeeding twenty years of population growth; 2) the property is adjacent to the Arlington High School and SR-9; 3) the expansion is supported by the City of Arlington and by the affected property owner; and 4) it creates a logical UGA boundary.
- JJ. These revisions to the Arlington UGA are within the scope of analysis contained in the DEIS and FEIS.
- KK. Other areas considered for potential expansion of the Arlington UGA in the DEIS alternatives and/or through property owner or developer request for adjustments to the preferred alternative were not included because they were inconsistent with the GMA, county GPP or CPPs or the areas were less suitable for urban land use and development than the areas that have been included for one or more of the following reasons: they contained sensitive areas including wetlands, and/or high water table; they would create a less logical boundary; they have inferior road access and/or higher road improvement costs; they would be more difficult to serve with urban utilities or services or are not supported by the affected city; and/or they include more land than is necessary to accommodate projected growth.

**Section 2.** The county council makes the following conclusions, based on its findings of facts and on the entire record of testimony and exhibits, including all written and oral testimony before the planning commission and county council.

- A. These expansions to the Arlington UGA represents an appropriate response to the population and employment growth targets for this UGA for the year 2025 as adopted by county council and as reflected in Appendix D to the General Policy Plan (GPPs).
- B. These expansions to the Arlington UGA are consistent with the requirements of the GMA and the planning goals set out in RCW 36.70A.020(1) and (2).

- C. These expansions to the Arlington UGA maintain the GPP's consistency with the CPPs for Snohomish County.
- D. These expansions to the Arlington UGA achieve the objectives specified for the 10-year update requirements in the GMA of accommodating projected growth for the succeeding 20-year period.
- E. These expansions to the Arlington UGA are consistent with the Future Land Use Map and all other elements and components of the 10-year update.
- F. The county has met all state and local requirements for interjurisdictional coordination, public notice and environmental review with regard to the UGA.
- G. These expansions to the Arlington UGA retain the overall direction and growth management strategy of the original GMA comprehensive plan adopted in 1995 and as amended since then in response to changing conditions and to specific directives from various orders and decisions of the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board regarding the plan's consistency with the GMA.
- H. The scoping, environmental analysis and public involvement activities associated with the DEIS issued on May 5, 2004, and the FEIS issued on December 13,, 2005, satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).
- I. These expansions to the Arlington UGA are within the range of the alternatives analyzed in the DEIS and the scope of additional analysis contained within the FEIS and related environmental documents adopted by the county.
- J. There has been early and continuous public participation in the review of the proposed amendments, as required by the GMA and consistent with chapters 30.73 and 30.74 SCC.
- K. Consistency and coordination of the UGA with the city's GMA-based comprehensive plans is addressed and ensured by the continuing joint city/county planning process established in the CPPs, interlocal planning agreements between the county and the cities and the city and county comprehensive plans.
- L. The county council hereby adopts the amendment to the Arlington UGA as shown on Exhibit A (attached).

**Section 3.** The county council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire record of the planning commission and the county council, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding, which should be deemed a conclusion, and any conclusion which should be deemed a finding, is hereby adopted as such.


**Section 4.** Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan – General Policy Plan, adopted as Exhibit A in Section 4 of Amended Ordinance No. 94-125 on June 28, 1995, and last amended by Ordinance No. 04-118 on November 23, 2004, including the appendices and maps contained therein, is hereby amended as indicated on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated by reference into this ordinance as if set forth in full.

**Section 5. Effective Date.** The provisions of this ordinance shall take effect on February 1, 2006.

**Section 6. Severability and Savings.** If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance shall be held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the Growth Management Hearings Board (Board), or a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance. Provided, however, that if any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid by the Board or court of competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence, clause or phrase in effect prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and effect for that individual section, sentence, clause or phrase as if this ordinance had never been adopted.

PASSED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2005.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL  
Snohomish County, Washington

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Council Vice-Chair

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Asst. Clerk of the County Council

- Approved  
 Emergency  
 Vetoed

Date 12/30/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
County Executive

APPROVAL AS TO FORM ONLY

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Date 12/30/05

AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 05-073  
REVISING THE EXISTING URBAN GROWTH AREA FOR THE  
CITY OF ARLINGTON AND AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 04-012



# GMA Comprehensive Plan

## Arlington

### Urban Growth Area



Snohomish County



#### Legend

- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Arlington Unincorporated UGA
- Marysville Unincorporated UGA
- Incorporated Cities
- Road ROW
- Section Grid
- Township-Range Grid

Feet  
1,100 0 1,100 2,200 3,300



Adopted: December 21, 2005  
Effective Date: February 1, 2006

W:\plg\cartof\to\tenup\prefalt6\uga\_maps\_locator\Arlington UGA.mxd

Snohomish County disclaims any warranty of merchantability or warranty of fitness of this map for any particular purpose, either expressed or implied. No representation or warranty made concerning the accuracy, currency, completeness or quality of data depicted on this map. Any user of this map assumes all responsibility for use thereof, and further agrees to hold Snohomish County harmless from and against any damage, loss, or liability arising from any use of the map.

Produced by Snohomish County Department of Planning and Development Services, Cartography/GIS Team