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Urban Density Comp Plan – Land Use Element
ORDINANCE NO. 3771

AN ORDINANCE of the City Council of the city of Kent, Washington, amending the City of Kent Comprehensive Plan - Land Use Element to eliminate reference to SR-2 and adding the urban land use designation of SF-4.5 as a result of the City’s Urban Density Study (#CPA-2004-5).

RECITALS

A. The City of Kent passed Ordinance No. 3698, an update to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, on July 20, 2004, per the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA). RCW 36.70A.130(4). To address the issue of providing appropriate urban densities within the City, the City Council passed Resolution No. 1680 on June 15, 2004, requesting that Planning Services analyze this issue in accord with the update to the Comprehensive Plan. Recognizing the importance of this issue, the City Council then passed Resolution No. 1694 on December 14, 2004, declaring an emergency to pursue revision to the Comprehensive Plan in regard to the urban density study.

B. The urban density study involved considering amendments to parcels of real property with Comprehensive Plan land use map designations of Single Family one (1) unit per acre (SF-1) and Single Family three (3) units per acre (SF-3). The study also involved reviewing parcels of real property with zoning map Urban Density Comp Plan – Land Use Element.
designations of Single Family one (1) unit per acre (SR-1), Single Family two (2) units per acre (SR-2), and Single Family three (3) units per acre (SR-3). The parcels reviewed were located throughout the City, but were categorized for ease of reference into four study areas: Area A – Green River, Area B – North East Hill, Area C – South East Hill, and Area D – Lea Hill. These study areas were in turn divided into sub areas.

C. On May 12, 2005, August 16, 2005, and September 7, 2005, the city provided the required sixty (60) day notification under RCW 36.70A.106 to the state of Washington regarding the city's urban density study. Comments from the state were incorporated into the record.

D. The City’s State Environmental Policy Act responsible official issued a Determination of Nonsignificance (#ENV-2005-38) for the proposed land use and zoning map amendments as well as corresponding text amendments on August 12, 2005.

E. The urban density study began its public participation campaign with a series of open houses to apprise citizens of the issues surrounding the study and obtain input from citizens regarding the issues to be addressed by the study. These open houses were held at various locations throughout the City on November 4, 2004; November 9, 2004; November 10, 2004; and January 6, 2005.

F. Also as part of the information gathering process for the urban density study, workshops were held by the City’s Land Use and Planning Board on the following dates to review land use history, environmentally sensitive areas, infrastructure, building capacity, urban separator maps, and other topics related to analyzing appropriate urban densities: October 25, 2004; January 10, 2005; January 24, 2005; February 28, 2005; and June 13, 2005. The Land Use and Planning Board also held public hearings on the following dates to solicit comments from the public.
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regarding the urban density study in general and specifically the various land use and zoning map options being considered as well as the corresponding text amendments: March 28, 2005; April 4, 2005; August 22, 2005; and September 12, 2005. On September 19, 2005, the Land Use and Planning Board made recommendations on appropriate urban densities to the City Council for all four study areas.

G. During the urban density study, the City’s Planning and Economic Development Committee was provided information regarding the study during its meetings on August 15, 2005; September 19, 2005; and October 17, 2005. The Committee considered the Land Use and Planning Board’s recommendation at its meeting on October 17, 2005, and forwarded its own recommendations to the full City Council.

H. Prior to a final vote on the urban density issue, the full City Council held workshops regarding the urban density study on October 18, 2005 and November 1, 2005. At its regularly scheduled meeting on November 1, 2005, the City Council voted to adopt amendments to the land use and zoning maps as well as corresponding text amendments.

I. These amendments reflect the City Council’s understanding that the concept of urban density is driven by GMA’s goals related to urban growth, reducing sprawl, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing. RCW 36.70A.020(1), (2), and (4). At the same time GMA recognizes the importance of open space, protecting the environment, and providing a variety of residential densities. RCW 36.70A.020(4), (9) and (10). The Council takes very seriously its duty to the citizens of Kent to harmonize these goals in planning for the future of the City of Kent given the particular needs and circumstances of the City of Kent. With this Ordinance, the City Council has exercised its statutorily granted discretion while staying within the framework provided by GMA. RCW 36.70A.3201. This
ordinance eliminates from the Comprehensive Plan – Land Use Element the low
density zoning designation of SR-2 and adds the urban land use designation of SF-
4.5.

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENT,
WASHINGTON, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

ORDINANCE

SECTION 1. – Amendment. The City of Kent’s 2004 Comprehensive Plan –
Land Use Element is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”.

SECTION 2. – Amendment. Table 4.1 of the Comprehensive Plan – Land
Use Element is to be amended to reflect the “area (acres)” and “% of Total Acres”
after the City adopts new land use and zoning designations as part of the urban
density study.

SECTION 3. – Savings. The existing element of the City of Kent’s
Comprehensive Plan, which are amended by this ordinance, shall remain in full force
and effect until the effective date of this ordinance.

SECTION 4. – Severability. If any one or more section, subsections, or
sentences of this ordinance are held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision
shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance and the same
shall remain in full force and effect.
SECTION 5. – Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after passage as provided by law.

ATTEST:

BRENDA JACOBER, CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

TOM BRADBIEKER, CITY ATTORNEY

PASSED: 15 day of November, 2005.
APPROVED: 15 day of November, 2005.
PUBLISHED: 19 day of November, 2005.

I hereby certify that this is a true copy of Ordinance No. 3771 passed by the City Council of the City of Kent, Washington, and approved by the Mayor of the City of Kent as hereon indicated.

BRENDA JACOBER, CITY CLERK
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EXHIBIT 'A'
LAND USE ELEMENT

The Land Use Element outlines the proposed general distribution and location of various uses of land within the Planning Area, which consists of the City of Kent and the Potential Annexation Area, which is the area within unincorporated King County that is Kent's designated annexation area. The element consists of two major components: (1) a map that illustrates the general location of land use designations; and (2) goals and policies that guide future development. In addition, there are reviews of existing land use trends, including future development potential and a review of policy decisions, which together have laid the foundation for the goals and policies in the element.

More important than the components of the element, however, is the purpose that the element serves. The Land Use Element will guide all decisions about where development takes place. It also will guide when development takes place, because land use policies determine the scheduling of capital improvement expenditures. In addition, it will guide the character of the development pattern of the Kent area. The Land Use Element is not only a critical part of the Comprehensive Plan, but it is a required component of the plan under the Growth Management Act.

Requirements of the Growth Management Act

When the State Legislature adopted the Growth Management Act (GMA), they found that "...a lack of common goals expressing the public's interest in the conservation and the wise use of our lands pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state. It is in the public interest that citizens, communities, local governments, and the private sector cooperate and coordinate with one another in comprehensive land use planning." (RCW 36.70A.010). This finding, which summarizes the intent of the GMA, emphasizes the central role of the Land Use Element.

The Act requires the Land Use Element to designate the general distribution, location, and extent of land for various land uses, including resource lands, housing, commerce, industry,
parks and open space, and public facilities. This element considers all these land uses, with the exception of public facilities, which is considered in detail within the Capital Facilities Element. The Land Use Element shall consider population densities, building densities, and estimates of future population growth. It also shall provide for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies, and consider and mitigate the impacts of storm water runoff both in the immediate area and in surrounding jurisdictions.

Most importantly, however, the GMA requires that other elements of the Comprehensive Plan relate back to the Land Use Element. For example, the Act specifically requires both the Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements to be coordinated and consistent with the Land Use Element. It also states that the entire Comprehensive Plan shall be internally consistent, and that all elements shall be consistent with the Land Use Map. Additionally, the GMA requires that planning efforts for regional growth centers, such as Urban Centers or Activity Centers be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the GMA puts the Land Use Element in the central role of defining the direction of the Comprehensive Plan, and thereby defining the vision of the community.

The focus of the Land Use Element is the Goals and Policies and the Land Use Map. The goals and policies found in the Land Use Element are the product of both existing conditions and plans and policies which previously have been adopted.

**BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS**

As noted in the introductory chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, Kent has undergone a number of changes since the 1977 Comprehensive Plan was adopted, as the City and the Puget Sound region have experienced unprecedented growth over the past decades. This section analyzes the extent of existing land uses in the City, and outlines the growth, which is expected to occur within the City and the Potential Annexation Area (PAA) within the next ten (10) to twenty (20) years. This analysis sets the stage for the level of growth and development, which this plan will accommodate.

**Urban Growth Area Boundary**

The GMA mandates each county to designate an urban growth area (UGA) within which urban growth is to be encouraged, and outside of which urban growth and annexations may not occur. The UGA must contain enough land to accommodate twenty (20) years of projected residential growth, as determined for each county by the State Office of Financial Management. The entire city limits of each city must be included in the UGA, and
unincorporated areas also may be included. However, the GMA states that an urban growth area may include land outside of a city only if this land is "...already characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth..." (RCW 36.70A.110).

The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) adopted and ratified in 1992 included an urban growth boundary for King County. The Kent Planning Commission and City Council also considered an urban growth area for the City of Kent. The primary purpose of this process was to delineate a planning area for the Comprehensive Plan. The UGA also was intended to help define the City's future annexation area. After considering several alternatives, the Kent City Council designated an Interim Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundary in November 1992 (Resolution #1334). In the 2002/2004 Update, the UGA was superseded by a final boundary delineation of Kent's Potential Annexation Area.

**Potential Annexation Area**

In addition to urban growth areas which are mandated by the GMA, the King County CPPs discuss future annexation areas. The CPPs state that within the County's UGA boundary, each city shall identify land needed for its growth during the twenty (20) year horizon of the Comprehensive Plan. The policies further state that although the GMA does not explicitly equate urban growth areas with municipal annexation areas, the urban growth areas around cities may be considered their expansion area.

Following this reasoning, and to facilitate intergovernmental planning efforts, the policies direct cities to establish Potential Annexation Areas. The policies state:

> In collaboration with adjacent counties and cities and King County, and in consultation with residential groups in affected areas, each city shall designate a Potential Annexation Area. Each Potential Annexation Area shall be specific to each city. Annexation areas shall not overlap. (CPP, LU-19)

King County established a Potential Annexation Areas Subcommittee in January 1993 to coordinate a regional process for the designation of municipal annexation areas. As a result of the work of this subcommittee and in coordination with adjacent jurisdictions, the Kent City Council adopted an Interim Potential Annexation Area (PAA) in May 1993, (Resolution #1360). The Council amended the boundaries in March 1995 as a result of negotiations with adjacent jurisdictions. In May 2003 revisions to the CPPs were ratified, removing the Lower Green River Agricultural Production District from the Urban Growth Area. Both the
GMA (RCW 36.70A.110), and Countywide Planning Policies (LU-2 and LU-7), prohibit urban expansion through annexation into designated rural areas. The 2002/2004 Update reflects the new Potential Annexation Area (PAA) for Kent (see Figure 4.1). Kent city limits and the PAA together form the Planning Area for the City's Land Use Map and for all the elements in the Comprehensive Plan.

Existing Zoning Pattern

The City of Kent has five general categories of zoning districts: agricultural, single-family residential, multifamily residential, commercial, and industrial. Within each of these general categories, there are several zoning districts, which allow varying levels of land uses and bulk and scale of development. Table 4.1 shows the land area of each of these zoning categories and Figure 4.2 shows the distribution of these zoning districts.

In the unincorporated area within the northeastern portion of the Potential Annexation Area (PAA), the predominant land use is single-family residential. Most of the residential land is zoned either R-6 or R-8, which are generally comparable to the City's SR-6 and SR-8 zones. There is one (1) commercial and multifamily residential node in the unincorporated area, located at SE 208th and 108th Avenue SE. The zoning for the unincorporated area was adopted in 1991 as part of the Soos Creek Community Plan, and was amended on November 5, 2001, by Ordinance #14241 as part of King County's process to update their comprehensive plan. The southern portion of Kent's PAA is located adjacent to King County's Lower Green River Agricultural Production District. King County's land use for the area to the west is R-4 (i.e., single-family 4 dwelling units per acre) and to the east is I (industrial) where an existing wrecking yard is located and R-1 where steep slopes dominate the landscape.

Inventory of Critical Areas & Resource Lands

The Growth Management Act requires cities to inventory, designate and protect through development regulations all critical areas and designated resource lands. "Critical Areas" are defined as wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologic hazard areas. Designated "Resource Lands" within Kent are agricultural in nature and are considered to have long-term commercial significance. The development rights for the Agricultural Resource Lands in Kent were purchased under King County's Agricultural Preservation Program during the 1980's, ensuring they will remain in agricultural land use in perpetuity.
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Table 4.1
2004 CITY OF KENT LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>AREA (ACRES)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL AREA</th>
<th>ALLOWED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-R</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-S</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>272.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>290.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>SR-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-1</td>
<td>570.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>SR-1 SR-2 SR-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-3</td>
<td>935.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>SR-1 SR-2 SR-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-6</td>
<td>6,304.6</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>SR-1 SR-2 SR-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-8</td>
<td>305.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>SR-1 SR-2 SR-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>MHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,521.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDMF</td>
<td>710.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>SR-8 MR-D MR-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDMF</td>
<td>756.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>MR-M MR-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,467.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>670.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>GC CC O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NCC MRT-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>856.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>GC GWC CC O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>292.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>DC DCE GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,826.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2,232.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>MA M1 M2 M3 M1-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>1,968.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>M2 M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,200.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>2,030.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,338.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City already has adopted policies and development regulations to protect critical areas. Because critical areas have a major effect on how land uses are distributed throughout the City and the Potential Annexation Area (PAA), their general location will be described in this section. There are many notable natural features in Kent. Kent is distinguished by the Green River Valley, which runs north to south through the center of the City. To the east and west of the valley are East Hill and West Hill, respectively. One of the most significant natural features is the Green River, which extends through a major portion of the City. The Green River is considered a Shoreline of Statewide Significance and falls under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA), which places restrictions on shoreline development. Lake Meridian located on East Hill is also a Shoreline of Statewide Significance with similar restrictions. There are two additional significant water bodies located in Kent city limits: Clark Lake and Lake Fenwick. While Clark Lake and Lake Fenwick do not meet the parameters for protection under the Shoreline Master Program, they are significant natural resources. In the PAA, Panther Lake is also a significant natural resource but does not meet the SMA parameters for protection. However, these three (3) smaller lakes will be protected by the Critical Areas Ordinance. Due to the natural drainage patterns of the valley and upland, and the amount of development that has taken place over the past thirty (30) years, there are a significant number of wetlands located in the City of Kent. These wetlands have been inventoried and encompass over 2,414 acres of the planning area. The hydrology of Kent also includes several major creeks, including Mill Creek, Garrison Creek, Springbrook Creek, and Big Soos Creek and its tributaries. Big Soos Creek serves as the eastern boundary of the planning area and the City of Kent, and a portion of this creek is provided protection under the SMA. Many of these creeks, wetlands and the Green River corridor are fish and wildlife habitat areas. Two notable habitat sites are publicly owned: The Green River Natural Resources Area (304 acres) and Clark Lake Park (125 acres).

In addition to the water-related natural constraints to development, the other predominant natural feature in Kent is steep slopes. Slopes in excess of 25% are found along both East Hill and West Hill. There also are several ravines that typically are associated with creek beds. These hillsides along East Hill and West Hill provide a natural, wooded border to the more developed Green River Valley area, and they are a distinct part of the City's natural landscape.

Environmentally Critical Areas are shown on Figure 4.3 (i.e., Hazard Areas) and Figure 4.4 (i.e., Inventoried Wetlands). These natural features are valued by the community and must
be protected as part of the comprehensive planning process. The protection of these areas
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will constrain development. Therefore, it is important to note their location and consider their influence on the location and density of future land uses.

Additional constraints are placed on Agricultural Resource Land. When the development rights are purchased from Agricultural Resource Land, covenants dictate uses and some development standards. Because Agricultural Resource Land is protected for farming only, the GMA requires that adjacent property owners who propose development must be notified of the Agricultural Resource Land protected status to ensure there are no conflicts between land uses. Kent's Agricultural Resource Land and the County's Lower Green River Agricultural Production District are illustrated in Figure 4.5.

**Analysis of Development Capacity**

A final, but critical measure of existing conditions and future development potential is the analysis of development capacity. Development capacity refers to an estimate of the amount of development, which could be accommodated on vacant and redevelopable land in Kent if it were developed. The level of development, which could occur on a particular parcel of land is influenced by the size of the parcel, the zoning district in which the parcel is located, and any environmental constraints that restrict development. Development capacity shows the estimated amount of development, which could be accommodated under existing zoning, considering recent market activity. It serves as a benchmark from which to gauge to what extent current land use and zoning policies can accommodate growth.

In 1991, the City estimated capacity for residential, commercial, and industrial development. The City updated the information in 1993, 1997, and again in 2001. King County estimated capacity for the unincorporated area located within the City's Potential Annexation Area. A detailed explanation of the 1993 and 1997 methodology and assumptions used for estimating capacity can be found in the supporting documents. In brief, vacant land and land deemed appropriate for redevelopment were aggregated for each zoning district. The overall development potential of each zone then was calculated, taking into consideration reductions for critical areas, land which was unlikely to develop or redevelop (such as parks, churches), and right-of-way and other public purpose dedications.

The 2001 methodology to estimate capacity was based on the Buildable Lands Program and differs from earlier work. The Buildable Lands Program was established by a legislative amendment to the GMA in 1997 (RCW 36.70A.215). Under Buildable Lands, the City is required to implement a review and evaluation program for the purpose of determining the adequacy of the current supply of "lands suitable for development" to accommodate future growth.
growth needs for housing and employment and to evaluate the effectiveness of local plans and regulations. In order to accomplish this, the Buildable Lands Program requires annual data collection to determine the amount and density of recent development, an inventory of the land supply suitable for development, and an assessment of the ability to accommodate expected growth for the remainder of the twenty (20) year planning horizon.

It is important to note that these estimates of capacity represent maximum potential build out; they are not projections of expected growth. In the 1995 Comprehensive Plan, the City used a methodology which was developed by the King County Data Resources Technical Forum. This methodology projected maximum theoretical buildout in most residential, commercial and industrial zoning categories. This methodology was revised countywide with the implementation of the 1997 Buildable Lands Program. Revisions reflect the statutory requirement that projections of future capacity reflect the actual densities of recent development projects. The resulting Buildable Lands analysis gives a January 2001 snapshot of land supply and development capacity throughout Kent. Both methodologies are consistent with those used by other jurisdictions in the county. Figure 4.6 shows the location and extent of vacant and redevelopable sites in Kent based on the Buildable Lands Analysis. Table 4.2 summarizes the residential household capacity for the City of Kent based on Buildable Lands Analysis.

### Table 4.2

**CITY OF KENT 2001 RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Zones</th>
<th>Vacant Capacity</th>
<th>Redevel. Capacity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>1,956 households</td>
<td>3,725 households</td>
<td>5,681 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>832 households</td>
<td>903 households</td>
<td>1,735 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY TOTALS:</td>
<td>2,788 households</td>
<td>4,628 households</td>
<td>7,416 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1995, King County staff estimated capacity for the unincorporated area based on the adopted zoning in the Soos Creek Community Plan. The 2002 update of capacity used the King County Zoning Atlas and recent data from the King County Assessor’s Office. The summary of King County’s estimated capacity for Kent’s PAA is found in Table 4.3. This
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capacity is based upon King County land use and zoning designations and could change once the area is annexed to the City of Kent.

Table 4.3
UNINCORPORATE 2002 KING COUNTY RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY WITHIN KENT'S PAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>Vacant Capacity</th>
<th>Redevel. Capacity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>702 households</td>
<td>821 households</td>
<td>1,523 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>193 households</td>
<td>47 households</td>
<td>240 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSING</td>
<td>895 households</td>
<td>868 households</td>
<td>1,763 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kent's 2001 Buildable Lands Program also provided estimates of commercial and industrial capacity expressed in number of employees. Staff did not report capacity for the unincorporated area because the amount of land zoned for these uses in this area is minimal. Estimating non-residential capacity is similar, in part, to the methodology used for residential capacity. Recent projects provide the projected potential floor area in commercial and industrial zoning districts based on floor-area-ratios (FAR = building square feet/parcel square feet). Projected employment is based on an analysis of current building occupancy rates (building square feet/employee), which is divided into the calculated FAR’s of commercial or industrial capacity. Table 4.4 shows the results expressed in both building floor area and number of potential employees.

Evaluation of Development Capacity & Growth Targets

As stated in the Community Profile Chapter, the City's residential target is 4,284 households, and its employment target is 11,500 employees to the year 2022. The residential target for the unincorporated area within the City's Potential Annexation Areas is 619 households and the employment target is 44.

The 2002 Comprehensive Plan development capacity analysis differs from the methodology devised in 1993 by the interjurisdictional King County Data Resources Technical Forum discussed earlier. The Buildable Lands Program, implemented in 1997, provided a more accurate assessment of household and employment capacity because it was based on a five
Table 4.4
CITY OF KENT 2001 COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>Vacant Capacity</th>
<th>Redevel. Capacity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,765,788 sq ft</td>
<td>1,886,245 sq ft</td>
<td>3,652,033 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5,512,676 sq ft</td>
<td>2,251,166 sq ft</td>
<td>7,763,842 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY TOTALS:</td>
<td>7,278,464 sq ft</td>
<td>4,137,411 sq ft</td>
<td>11,415,875 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3,237 employees</td>
<td>3,447 employees</td>
<td>6,684 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5,513 employees</td>
<td>2,251 employees</td>
<td>7,764 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY TOTALS:</td>
<td>8,750 employees</td>
<td>5,698 employees</td>
<td>14,448 employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) year (1996-2000), analysis of development trends. A review of development trends caused the commercial and residential splits for mixed-use development to be adjusted, much of which was downward. In 2000, a vacant and redevelopable land inventory was conducted within Kent’s Urban Center that accurately accounted for potential capacity, further adjusting the numbers downward. Lastly, continued development within the City resulted in additional downward adjustments to both household targets and capacity, as well as adjustments to employment targets and capacity. In spite of all the adjustments, the City of Kent has a generous amount of capacity to absorb the 2022 housing and employment targets as shown in Table 4.5.

However, targets are not inherently a reflection of market trends in a specific city. It is likely that with limited capacity in other areas of the County, the next wave of development will occur incrementally in various South County cities. Demand could far exceed targets and absorb capacity very quickly.

With regard to employment and household growth in the unincorporated area, there appears to be more than adequate capacity to meet growth targets. The 1,763 household capacity is more than enough to absorb the 619 household target for Kent’s PAA. The jobs target for the PAA of 44 employees also can be accommodated. However, once again the capacity figures would be affected by decisions made upon annexation.
Table 4.5

**EVALUATION OF HOUSING & EMPLOYMENT CAPACITY TO MEET TARGETS FOR CITY OF KENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential Target:</th>
<th>Residential Capacity:</th>
<th>Employment Target:</th>
<th>Employment Capacity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,284 households</td>
<td>7,416 households</td>
<td>11,500 employees</td>
<td>14,448 employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This updated table shows that the City of Kent continues to have enough capacity to meet the City's housing target with a 73% cushion and the employment target with a 25% cushion. Additional housing capacity was added after the 2001 Buildable Lands report, as a result of a lengthy study in 2001 of the remnant agricultural lands located along the Green River. The study determined that the land did not meet the GMA definition of Agricultural Resource Land by having "long-term commercial significance". The zoning of approximately 635 acres changed from Agricultural (A-1, 1 unit/acre), to Single-Family Residential (SR-1 and SR-3). Much of the land is encumbered with wetlands or within the 100-year floodway. There is, however, the potential for 453 additional units, which have been added to Kent's capacity.

**POLICY BACKGROUND**

The previous section provided the technical background which will influence the City's future land use decisions. There also are many policy decisions which were made in past years by state, regional, and local elected officials along with additional public input on innovative housing forms. The decisions will have a substantial effect on the land use policies contained in this element. The policy documents referenced in this section are provided in more detail as supporting documents in the appendices. However, it is important to briefly review these policy documents here in order to provide a better understanding of the rationale behind many of the goals and policies in this element.
Kent's Existing Land Use Plans

The 1977 Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Map guided the City's current policies on overall land use. In 1995, the Comprehensive Plan was substantially updated, and since then, the Land Use Map has been amended several times. The amended map provides the starting point for the Land Use Map, which is part of this element.

In addition to the overall citywide Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Map, there are four subarea plans, each of which contains goals, policies, and a Land Use Map. These plans are the Valley Floor Plan, the East Hill Plan, the West Hill Plan, and the Downtown Plan. These plans were adopted in 1979, 1982, 1984, and 1989, respectively. The Downtown Plan deserves special mention, because it was completed just prior to passage of the Growth Management Act (GMA). It led to substantial zoning changes in the Downtown area in 1992 and set the stage for designating the area as an Urban Center in 1995 under GMA. In an effort to translate the Downtown Plan’s general objectives into a redevelopment strategy, the City Council adopted the Kent Downtown Strategic Action Plan in 1998. The Action Plan serves as a basis for developing the Urban Center and implementing the Kent Comprehensive Plan. In a very real sense, the Downtown Plan was the springboard for many of the recommendations in this element, as they relate to the Downtown area. The Downtown Strategic Action Plan and Downtown Plan guide future development in the Downtown area.

State Growth Management Policies

The Growth Management Act (GMA) lists thirteen (13) planning goals which summarize the policy intent of the Act. These goals guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans, and set the framework for local comprehensive plans. Several of these goals relate to land use planning. For example, the goals encourage development in already urbanized areas where adequate public facilities and services exist, and conversely discourage the conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development. The goals also encourage the conservation of resource lands, the retention and preservation of open space areas, and protection of the natural environment. The goals and policies in this element were prepared to be consistent with these, and other, State planning goals.

Regional Policies

There are two regional policy documents which were adopted and ratified by local governments in the Puget Sound area: VISION 2020 and the Countywide Planning Policies. VISION 2020, which was adopted in 1990, is the result of a four-county regional planning
process undertaken by the Puget Sound Council of Governments (the predecessor agency to the Puget Sound Regional Council). After an extensive review of regional land use and transportation alternatives, the General Assembly of the Puget Sound Council of Governments (PSCOG), which consisted of elected officials from many jurisdictions including Kent, adopted a regional plan which emphasized targeting growth to major and minor centers throughout the region. VISION 2020 subsequently has served as the framework for many other planning efforts, such as the Regional Transit Project and the Countywide Planning Policies for Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, and King Counties. Destination 2030, published in 2001, adds to VISION 2020 by refining regional transportation goals based on projected land uses.

The impetus for Countywide Planning Policies came from the 1991 amendments to the Growth Management Act. These amendments require all counties planning under the GMA to prepare countywide planning policies. These policies must address several issues, including the designation of urban growth areas, promotion of "contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services to such development", affordable housing, and policies for joint county and city planning within urban growth areas. In King County, the Countywide Planning Policies were developed by the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC), a group of fifteen (15) elected officials from Seattle, King County, and suburban cities. The policies were adopted by the County Council and ratified by the cities (including Kent), in 1992, and amended in 1994. According to the GMA, the intent of these policies is to establish a framework from which county and city comprehensive plans are developed, and to ensure that county and city plans are consistent. Therefore, these policies have a significant impact on Kent's local land use policies. The Countywide Planning Policies incorporated the VISION 2020 concept of directing growth to centers.

**Kent Growth Management Planning Goals**

In the summer of 1992, in conjunction with the City's review and ratification of the Countywide Planning Policies, the City adopted local growth management planning goals. These goals were based on the state goals in the Growth Management Act and the regional goals outlined in the Countywide Planning Policies and VISION 2020. The City's 2002-2004 Comprehensive Plan Update has integrated goals and policies of Destination 2030, a regional transportation plan produced by Puget Sound Regional Council in 2001.

More importantly, the local growth management policy goals are based on local priorities as reflected in the City's Growth Management Public Participation Program (see the Introduction chapter). During the 2002-2004 update of the Comprehensive Plan, particular
attention was paid to housing forms, initiating an additional public participation opportunity. The results have been incorporated into the Land Use Element.

In September 2002, staff facilitated an “Innovative Housing Workshop” to determine what Kent residents thought of cottage, cluster, and attached single-family housing forms. Design professionals specializing in these housing forms made a presentation, followed by a question and answer period. The workshop concluded with a survey intended to determine if innovative housing forms would be appealing and whether or not these housing forms would “fit into” the neighborhoods of Kent.

Of the forty-six (46) housing workshop participants, thirty-nine (39) completed the survey, and of those, thirty-three (33) identified themselves as Kent residents. Looking only at the surveys of Kent residents, 67% responded “yes”, 21% responded “maybe”, and 2% responded “no” when asked whether they could see themselves, or other family members, at some point in their lives living in a cottage or clustered housing development. When asked the same question about attached single-family housing development 39% responded “yes, 30% responded “maybe”, and 27% responded “no”. When asked whether cottage or cluster housing would fit into their neighborhood, 61% responded “yes”, 6% responded “maybe”, and 27% responded “no”. When asked the same question about attached single-family housing, 36% responded “yes”, 15% responded “maybe”, and 42% responded “no”. Many of those who thought these housing forms would not fit in their neighborhood were site specific in their reasoning (e.g., “there was no vacant land”, “the area was restricted by slopes”, “wrong style of home”). Some were concerned about the units being “rented” or felt that “Everyone needs a little elbow room”. Respondents that were positive toward attached single-family housing presently live in a condominium or “given my future living requirements, I may need attached housing” while others said single-family attached would be a good addition if they were well designed or “the architectural details blend with the existing housing”. Generally, the public’s reaction was positive toward all of the innovative housing forms presented, opening the way toward providing a wider range of housing types for home ownership.

Together, these local and regional planning goals, and the results from various public participation programs, provide an overall framework for the goals, policies, and objectives, which are included in the Comprehensive Plan and this element. Several of the goals found in the Framework Policies chapter relate specifically to land use, including:

Land Use Element
- A future growth and development pattern shall be encouraged which minimizes urban sprawl, particularly the conversion of undeveloped land not presently in the City into low-density urban development. (UG-1)

- Areas shall be designated within the City's planning area for medium to high-density development, in order to preserve existing neighborhoods and open space areas and enhance transit opportunities. (UG-4)

- Mixed-use development shall be encouraged in designated areas within the planning area. (UG-5)

- The City shall ensure that its land use and transportation policies protect the City's critical areas, endangered species habitat, air and water quality. (E-2)

There are several other planning goals which provide a framework for the policies and objectives in this element. These goals will be referenced throughout the element; they are listed in their entirety in the Framework Policies chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

Summary

The Land Use Element provides the vision for the City's growth for the next twenty (20) years. The vision is established in both the Land Use Map and the Land Use Goals and Policies. It reflects the state, regional, and local policy framework previously identified, as well as the City's policy documents and capacity analysis. More importantly, it reflects the preferences and views of the citizens as they were expressed in the City's public participation process. The Land Use Element is divided into two major sections: Goals and Policies, and a description of the Land Use Map.

LAND USE GOALS AND POLICIES

The Land Use Goals and Policies cover a broad spectrum of issues. They are divided into several sections to make it easier for the reader to find the policies relating to a specific issue, such as housing or environmental protection. However, it is important to note that all of the Goals and Policies function together as a coherent and comprehensive vision of future growth in the community. This is reflected in the overall goal of the Land Use Element, which is:
Overall Goal: Encourage a future growth and development pattern which implements the Community’s vision, protects environmentally sensitive areas, and enhances the quality of life of all Kent residents.

URBAN GROWTH GOALS & POLICIES

The Land Use Element provides the overall comprehensive vision of future growth for the community. As mandated by the Growth Management Act, it is fundamentally important to establish the policy framework for managing this growth, particularly with regard to controlling and discouraging urban sprawl. The following Goals and Policies establish and reinforce that framework:

Goal LU-1:
Designate a Potential Annexation Area which will define the City’s planning area and projected city limits for the next twenty (20) years.

Policy LU-1.1: Provide enough land in the City’s Potential Annexation Area to accommodate the level of household growth projected to occur in the next twenty (20) years.

Policy LU-1.2: Monitor the Potential Annexation Area as build-out occurs.

Policy LU-1.3: Refine the Potential Annexation Area, working with King County, adjacent cities, and citizens in Unincorporated King County.

Policy LU-1.4: Do not propose or approve any annexations which are outside of the Potential Annexation Area.

Goal LU-2:
Establish a land use pattern throughout the Potential Annexation Area that will facilitate a multi-modal transportation system and provide efficient public facilities. Ensure that overall densities in the Potential Annexation Area are adequate to support a range of urban services.

Policy LU-2.1: Establish transportation levels-of-service which will help guide development into desired areas.

Policy LU-2.2: Concentrate development in order to promote public transit.
Policy LU-2.3: Emphasize in development regulations and design review processes site design standards which facilitate public transit, cyclist and pedestrian circulation.

Policy LU-2.4: Give funding priority to capital facility projects which are consistent with the City's Land Use Element.

Policy LU-2.5: Via a public participation process, allow certain public and private infrastructure, community, open space, and social service facilities that serve the general population the freedom to locate throughout the City. Such uses may include utility, transportation and communication facilities; schools; public facilities; open space uses such as cemeteries, golf courses, and so forth; and retirement homes, convalescent facilities and certain other welfare facilities.

URBAN CENTER GOALS & POLICIES

Kent's Downtown area has been a focus of the City's planning and policy development for some time. Over the past decades, several citizen committees have made recommendations to the Mayor and City Council to improve the function of Kent's downtown as a city and regional Urban Center. The culmination of the work of these committees was the adoption of the Downtown Plan by the City Council in 1989. This plan established a policy framework for creating a vibrant downtown community with an abundance of employment, housing, shopping, and recreational opportunities. The City took important steps toward implementation of this plan when it adopted zoning changes in 1992, and in 1995, completed studies of downtown parking management and infrastructure capacity. The Downtown Kent Strategic Action Plan, adopted in 1998, further helps guide development within the Downtown area and is incorporated into this document by reference.

The Council's policy direction for the Downtown area was reaffirmed in September 1992, when they elected to propose much of Downtown Kent as an Urban Center, pursuant to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). The CPPs envisions urban centers as areas of concentrated employment and housing which are served by high capacity transit. Using the updated minimum targets standards from VISION 2020 for urban center employment and housing targets, Kent's Urban Center would need to accommodate 7,437 employees and 2,975 households, which is quite ambitious. The target assigned Kent's Urban Center from VISION 2020 is 11,500 employees and 2,500 households by 2010. The Buildable Lands Analysis illustrates the market trend in Downtown Kent has been slow to capitalize on the zoning district's openness to increased residential development. The 2000 Census further illustrates this trend, reporting only 877 households within the Urban Center. Understanding
that the Urban Center CPPs targets are not expected to be reached within the twenty (20) year horizon of this plan, other criteria for urban centers are applicable to the Downtown area. These include: convenient access to the Sound Transit commuter rail and other regional transit opportunities; a bicycle and pedestrian-oriented streetscape; zoning which encourages a mixture of uses at high densities with an emphasis on superior urban design; historic preservation and adaptive reuse of historic places; proximity to facilities to meet human services needs; and a local commitment to fund infrastructure and public improvements in the area.

Because the 1989 Downtown plan establishes policy direction which is consistent with the Growth Management Act and Countywide Planning Policies, the goals, policies, and objectives in that plan are incorporated herein (see appendices). The Goals and Policies listed below are designed to summarize the goals in the Downtown Plan, to reflect actions which have occurred since its adoption, and in part, to reflect the “Center Plan Checklist” recently developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council. Collectively, goals for the Urban Center are placed in the context of the overall Land Use Element.

**Goal LU-3:**
*Focus both city and regional household and employment growth in the designated Urban Center.*

**Policy LU-3.1:** *Allow and encourage mixed-use development which combines retail, office, and residential uses, or as a portion of the total mixture of uses, to provide a diverse, vibrant and well designed Urban Center.*

**Policy LU-3.2:** *Focus office employment growth in the Urban Center as a percentage of overall mixed-use development.*

**Policy LU-3.3:** *Encourage medium- and high-density residential development in the Urban Center. Emphasize design standards to provide an attractive and high-quality residential environment.*

**Policy LU-3.4:** *Enhance links between the Urban Center and adjacent residential neighborhoods. Design the Urban Center development to preserve adjacent neighborhoods.*

**Policy LU-3.5:** *Encourage pedestrian-oriented retail uses and development in the Urban Center. Promote and encourage retail uses which serve the residential population in, and adjacent to, the Urban Center.*
Goal LU-4:
Plan and finance transportation and other public facilities which support the mixed-use development of the Urban Center.

Policy LU-4.1: Establish transportation levels-of-service (LOS) which facilitate medium to high-density development in the Urban Center that is consistent with concurrency requirements.

Policy LU-4.2: Focus future public transportation investments in the Urban Center.

Policy LU-4.3: Enhance pedestrian circulation systems and bicycle lanes in the Urban Center. Place emphasis also on pedestrian and cyclist circulation systems which link adjacent neighborhoods to Urban Center.

Policy LU-4.4: Take actions to ensure that adequate public parking is available to facilitate development in the Urban Center. This includes efficient management of on-street spaces and future development and enhancement of structured, off-street parking.

Policy LU-4.5: Plan and finance city water and sewer systems to ensure that adequate capacity exists to support medium- and high-density development in the Urban Center.

Policy LU-4.6: Develop park and open space areas to serve both residents and employees in the Urban Center.

Policy LU-4.7: Support public art projects to enhance the Urban Center, particularly along the Sound Transit corridor.

Policy LU-4.8: Locate civic buildings and facilities in the Urban Center.

Policy LU-4.9: Locate facilities and services that meet the Community's human service needs to be near the Urban Center.

Goal LU-5:
Emphasize the importance of good design, historic preservation, and aesthetics for development in the Urban Center.

Policy LU-5.1: Require design review for development projects in the Urban Center. Review projects for site design, effects upon historic properties, landscaping design, and pedestrian orientation.
Policy LU-5.2: Ensure that the City's street and construction design standards enhance pedestrian, cyclist, transit, and aesthetic objectives throughout the Urban Center.

Policy LU-5.3: Continue to undertake beautification projects in the Urban Center, including pedestrian amenities, street trees, and parks.

ACTIVITY CENTER GOALS & POLICIES

One of the fundamental themes behind many of the state, regional, and local planning goals is the idea of using urban land more efficiently in order to reduce sprawl of residential and commercial development into rural areas. In the past decade, several commercial areas in Kent have seen a large amount of new development. These areas, which are located on East Hill, West Hill, and in the Valley adjacent to Downtown, have an existing base of retail and office uses, and typically are surrounded by medium-density residential areas. The idea behind the Activity Center concept is to encourage more development in these areas, because infrastructure to support growth is already in place, and to allow a mixture of uses (residential and commercial), which brings housing closer to jobs and shopping, and which supports public transit. Allowing a mixture of uses in the community also will increase housing options. This concept is consistent with VISION 2020, Destination 2030 and the Countywide Planning Policies, and has also been supported by citizens during the Community Forums and Visual Preference Survey undertaken for this plan.

Goal LU-6:
Designate Activity Centers in portions of the City and in the Potential Annexation Area. Allow in these areas a mix of retail, office, and residential development.

Policy LU-6.1: Locate Activity Centers in areas which currently contain concentrations of commercial development with surrounding medium-density housing. Intensify these areas to support public transit to increase housing options.

Policy LU-6.2: Allow residential uses in Activity Centers. Develop residential uses as part of a commercial area in a mixed-use development or on a stand-alone basis in designated areas.

Goal LU-7:
Develop Activity Centers in such a way as to facilitate pedestrian, cyclist, public transit, and vehicular circulation.

Policy LU-7.1: Implement design review for development in designated Activity Centers to ensure pedestrian, cyclist and public transit orientation.
Policy LU-7.2: Develop site and parking design standards in Activity Centers which support public transit.

Policy LU-7.3: Ensure that the City's street and construction design standards in Activity Centers enhance pedestrian and cyclist circulation, public transit, and aesthetics.

Goal LU-8: Emphasize the importance of good design and aesthetics in private development and public facilities in Activity Centers.

Policy LU-8.1: Implement design review for development in designated Activity Centers.

Policy LU-8.2: Encourage development of public spaces in all civic areas.

Policy LU-8.3: Encourage development of public or semi-public spaces in all retail, office, and residential areas.

Housing Goals & Policies

As noted in the earlier sections of the Land Use Element, accommodating the demand for housing may be the greatest land use challenge confronting the City of Kent. There are many factors which influence the development of housing in the community. These are explained in detail in the Housing Element. From a land use standpoint, the central issue is accommodating the City's housing target by supporting the diversity of households found in the community (i.e., household size, age, marital status, income) with housing types that are acceptable to the community, and that efficiently utilize the remaining land within Kent and its PAA. The Innovative Housing Workshop suggests that the public supports innovative housing forms that would increase the opportunity for a variety of housing sizes, styles, and densities within Kent.

Since 1995, there have been some measurable successes in providing a housing balance. There is a balance in the number of single-family and multifamily dwelling units. New housing development has typically utilized land efficiently, maximizing allowable densities. However, over a quarter of all existing single-family homes within Kent are on lots of one-quarter to one acre in size. There is a need to balance estate housing with housing that is affordable to young professionals and their families. Housing on large lots, while desirable, is not affordable for most families in Kent.
The 2000 Census illuminates the disparity between income and housing costs (see the Housing Element for more details). Of the approximately 70% of homeowners in Kent earning incomes at or above the King County median income, 15% spend 30% or more of their income on a mortgage. Approximately 24% of homeowners in Kent are considered to have a “moderate” income (i.e., 50% - 80% of median income), and of those, 57% spend 30% or more of their income on a mortgage. Sixteen percent (16%) of all housing within Kent is affordable (i.e., 30% of household income), to the median income (i.e., $46,046 median household income). There is a need for housing that is affordable to first time home buyers, and particularly those single professionals, single parents, and retirees wanting to downsize who have been identified as the fastest growing populations in the region. The ultimate goal of the housing policies is to create a policy framework that will support a wide variety of housing choices.

**Goal LU-9:**
*Provide adequate land and densities to accommodate the adopted twenty (20) year housing target of 4,284 new dwelling units within the existing city limits, and through an interlocal agreement with King County, adopt the housing target of 619 new dwelling units within Kent’s Potential Annexation Area.*

**Policy LU-9.1:** *Where appropriate, establish urban residential densities of at least four (4) units per net developable acre in order to adequately support urban densities.*

**Policy LU-9.2:** *Establish flexible regulatory methods, such as shadow platting and minimum densities, to ensure future land division that supports urban densities.*

**Policy LU-9.3:** *Plan and finance transportation and capital facilities to accommodate the City’s housing targets. Coordinate with King County on the phasing of public services and expenditures in the unincorporated area.*

**Policy LU-9.4:** *Locate housing opportunities with a variety of densities within close proximity to employment, shopping, transit, and where possible, near human and community services.*

**Goal LU-10:**
*Provide opportunities for a variety of housing types, options, and densities throughout the City and the Potential Annexation Area to meet the housing needs of the Region’s changing demographics.*

**Policy LU-10.1:** *Allow and encourage high to medium density residential development in the Downtown and designated Activity Centers.*
Policy LU-10.2: Allow and encourage a variety of multifamily housing forms, such as townhouses, residences above businesses, triplexes, fourplexes, duplexes, and attached single-family units in multifamily districts, and within designated commercial mixed-use land use areas.

Policy LU-10.3: Allow accessory dwellings in all residential districts, subject to design and development standards, to ensure minimal impact to surrounding properties.

Policy LU-10.4: Allow single-family housing on a variety of lot sizes. Locate smaller lot sizes within close proximity to the Urban Center or Activity Centers wherever possible.

Policy LU-10.5: Allow cottage housing in all multifamily land use areas and high-density single-family land use areas (e.g., SF-8, MRT-12, and MRT-16), and as demonstration projects as infill on small parcels in other single-family land use areas.

Policy LU-10.6: Allow cluster housing in all multifamily and single-family land use areas to protect environmentally sensitive areas (e.g., wetlands, steep slopes, streams), and when open space retention is desirable.

Policy LU-10.7: Allow attached single-family housing within multifamily land use areas (e.g., MRT-12 and MRT-16), and as demonstration projects in mixed-use land use areas.

Goal LU-11: Revise development regulations to encourage single-family and multifamily development that is more flexible and innovative in terms of building, street standards for private roads, and site design.

Policy LU-11.1: Support the achievement of allowable density in single-family developments through flexibility and creativity in site design.

Policy LU-11.2: Allow clustering of housing units in subdivisions and multifamily development in order to maximize allowable build-out while preserving open space and environmentally sensitive areas.

Policy LU-11.3: Allow more flexibility in single-family and multifamily residential setbacks, vehicle access, and parking, particularly on small lots, to encourage more compact infill development and innovative site design.
Policy LU-11.4: Allow modular housing on single-family lots, subject to the Uniform Building Code requirements as administered through Washington State Labor and Industry.

Policy LU-11.5: Adopt minimum density requirements for residential development.

Policy LU-11.6: Allow more flexibility for private street standards to encourage a variety of compact innovative residential developments.

Goal LU-12:
Encourage high-quality site and building design for all residential developments.

Policy LU-12.1: Establish a design review process for multifamily residential development projects. Focus design review on integrating multifamily development into surrounding neighborhoods.

Policy LU-12.2: Promote residential streetscape patterns which foster more opportunities for pedestrians and community interaction. Such measures include narrower paved roadways, smaller front-yard setbacks, and a pattern of streets, sidewalks and pathways that encourages connectivity between neighborhoods.

Policy LU-12.3: Design subdivisions and residential site plans to maximize solar access and protection of view.

Policy LU-12.4: Develop design standards for compact innovative single-family housing (e.g., cottage, cluster, and attached), where allowed, to ensure high quality development integrates well into surrounding neighborhoods in terms of bulk, scale and design.

COMMERCIAL GOALS & POLICIES

Kent's major centers of commercial activity are located Downtown which is identified in the “Kent Strategic Action Plan” and includes the Urban Center: on East Hill along the 104th Avenue SE corridor; and along Pacific Highway on West Hill. Downtown businesses are dispersed widely along General Commercial zoned corridors north and west of the Urban Center. At this time, opportunities exist for infill development of vacant and redevelopable properties within the Urban Center and with the larger Downtown area as defined in the “Kent Strategic Action Plan”. Commercial developments located adjacent to major arterials west and north of the City Center and on East Hill and West Hill are composed of predominantly one-story buildings with large surface parking lots which are accessed by
separate driveways from the arterials. At key points along these corridors, opportunities exist to develop pedestrian and transit-oriented Activity Centers. The Activity Centers would incorporate commercial, office, and residential development.

**Goal LU-13:**
Promote orderly and efficient commercial growth within the existing commercial districts in order to maintain and strengthen existing commercial districts, to minimize costs associated with the extension of facilities, and to allow businesses to benefit from their proximity to one another.

**Policy LU-13.1:** Maintain and enhance Kent's Downtown as a vital and unique commercial district.

**Policy LU-13.2:** Encourage large office building development and regionally oriented retail uses to locate in the Downtown.

**Policy LU-13.3:** Develop regulatory incentives to encourage infill development in existing commercial areas. Regulatory incentives may include urban, mixed-use zoning and higher-density zones, planned unit developments, transfer of density credits, planned action ordinances, tax incentives, and streamlined permit processes.

**Policy LU-13.4:** Develop City investment incentives to encourage infill development in existing commercial areas. Investments may include improved sidewalks and outdoor public spaces such as urban parks or small public squares. Other public investment incentives include facilities such as a performing arts center, permanent public market space, daycare facilities, libraries, and community centers.

**Goal LU-14:**
Determine the size, function, and mix of uses in the City's commercial districts based on regional, community, and neighborhood needs.

**Policy LU-14.1:** Develop subarea plans for the Activity Centers and the Urban Center to identify visual and physical focal points, edges, and connections. Reserve open space and select target areas for development and public infrastructure. Identify pedestrian-oriented streets and paths, and links with multi-modal transportation facilities.

**Policy LU-14.2:** Provide opportunities for residential development within existing business districts to provide support for shops, services, and employment within walking distance.
Policy LU-14.3: Subject to City review and approval, add color and life to commercial districts by allowing appropriate commercial uses to be conducted on sidewalks and in other public spaces. Examples include sidewalk cafes, public markets, espresso stands, flower pushcarts, and sidewalk sales or outdoor retail displays.

Policy LU-14.4: Allow home occupations in all residential districts, subject to criteria which will ensure compatibility with neighboring residences.

Policy LU-14.5: Encourage commercial design elements which will minimize impacts to surrounding established residential uses for all new development and redevelopment in the existing Neighborhood Commercial zoning district. Ensure that projects are pedestrian-oriented and developed with minimum parking provisions.

Policy LU-14.6: Discourage expansion of Neighborhood Service land uses in areas where the adjacent land use designation is predominately single-family.

Policy LU-14.7: Promote redevelopment of existing commercial properties by limiting the conversion of residential land uses to commercial land uses.

Policy LU-14.8: Ensure that commercial and mixed-use developments adjacent to existing single-family residential areas are compatible in height and scale. Establish guidelines for design of edges where commercial and mixed-uses abut single-family use and medium- and low-density residential.

MANUFACTURING/INDUSTRIAL CENTER GOALS & POLICIES

The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) state that Manufacturing/Industrial Centers are key components of the regional economy. These centers are defined as areas with a significant amount of manufacturing, industrial, or other related employment (at least 10,000 employees). The Kent North Valley Industrial Area clearly meets this criterion. This industrial area, which is over 6 square miles in size, has been well-established over the past two decades, and is home to dozens of companies which employ over 33,000 people. This North Valley Industrial Area is an extremely important part of both the City's and the Region's economic and employment base, and 3.1 square miles of this industrial area has been designated as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

Goal LU-15:
Preserve a portion of the Valley Floor Industrial Area as a Manufacturing/Industrial Center for manufacturing and related land uses.
Policy LU-15.1: Define the Manufacturing/Industrial Center as that area within which the most intensive manufacturing, industrial and warehouse uses should locate. Ensure the boundaries reflect accessibility to truck and rail corridors.

Policy LU-15.2: Discourage and limit land uses other than manufacturing, high technology and warehousing within the boundaries of the Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

Goal LU-16:
Plan and finance in the Manufacturing/Industrial Center those transportation and infrastructure systems which can accommodate high-intensity manufacturing, industry and warehouse uses.

Policy LU-16.1: Facilitate mobility to and within the Manufacturing/Industrial Center for goods, services, and employees. Work with the Regional Transit Authority and King County to enhance public transit service to and within the Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

Policy LU-16.2: Upgrade water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater management facilities as necessary to support development in the Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

Goal LU-17:
Utilize development standards in the Manufacturing/Industrial Center to create an attractive employment center and to mitigate the impacts of manufacturing and warehouse uses.

Policy LU-17.1: Utilize setbacks and landscaping to protect wetlands, shorelines, and streams from adjacent manufacturing and warehouse development.

Policy LU-17.2: Ensure development standards for the Manufacturing/Industrial Center are conducive to transit. Place emphasis on building setbacks, the location of parking areas, and revise parking standards to support commute trip reduction goals and multi-modal forms of transportation.

Policy LU-17.3: Discourage or minimize parking lots between the building and the sidewalk when manufacturing and warehouse development is located on a public transit corridor.

Policy LU-17.4: Utilize development standards that create an attractive streetscape, including street trees.

Policy LU-17.5: Utilize development standards and code enforcement that supports a distinctive and orderly character along the Sound Transit Corridor.
INDUSTRIAL GOALS & POLICIES

Nearly one-quarter of land in Kent is zoned for industrial use; this industrial area accounts for most of the City's employment and tax base. Therefore, the existing and future development pattern and potential in this area is very important to the economic health of the community. This Land Use Element designates a portion of Kent's Valley Floor Industrial Area as Industrial, which will support the Manufacturing/Industrial Center, but will also allow business and office parks and bulk retail. The following goals and policies apply to all areas in the City designated as Industrial.

Goal LU-18:
The Industrial land use designation within the Valley Floor Industrial Area will be an employment center for both the City of Kent and South King County.

Policy LU-18.1: Encourage a mix of land uses which are compatible with manufacturing, industrial, and warehouse uses. These shall include office development, retail uses which serve the surrounding manufacturing and office park uses, and retail uses which require large parcels of land that may not be available in commercial districts.

Policy LU-18.2: Zone adequate land for manufacturing and warehouse uses to accommodate the City's anticipated employment growth in these sectors. Do not zone additional land for these uses, however, unless it is demonstrated that more manufacturing land is needed for future employment growth.

Policy LU-18.3: Expand retail opportunities to provide necessary personal and business services for the Valley Floor Industrial Area, by implementing the recommendations of the West Valley Industrial Study regarding potential areas for expanded retail opportunities within the M1 and M1-C Industrial Park zoning districts.

Goal LU-19:
Utilize development standards to create an attractive employment center and to mitigate the impacts of manufacturing and warehouse uses, business and office parks, and bulk retail uses.

Policy LU-19.1: Revise parking standards to support commute trip reduction goals and to discourage reliance on commuting via single-occupancy vehicles.

Policy LU-19.2: Consider appropriate amenities for cyclists to support commute trip reduction goals.
Policy LU-19.3: Utilize setbacks and landscaping to protect wetlands, shorelines, and streams from adjacent industrial development and impervious surfaces.

Policy LU-19.4: Ensure development standards for industrial, warehousing, business and office parks are conducive to transit. Place emphasis on building setbacks and the location of parking areas with pedestrian access to retail uses.

Policy LU-19.5: Discourage or minimize parking lots between the building and the sidewalk when a business or office park is located on a public transit corridor.

Policy LU-19.6: Utilize development standards that create an attractive streetscape, including street trees.

Policy LU-19.7: Utilize development standards and code enforcement that supports a distinctive and orderly character along the Sound Transit Corridor.

PARKING GOALS & POLICIES

During the Community’s visioning process (see full explanation in the Community Design Element), the citizens of Kent wanted a place less dominated by automobiles and parking lots, and instead a community that was more accommodating to pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. The Land Use Element, as well as the Housing, Transportation, and Community Design Elements support this vision that seeks to focus growth within urbanized areas to encourage more pedestrian and transit oriented development. To achieve these goals, parking as a land use must be considered.

While parking may be linked to mobility, it is considered a land use issue because it is integral to land development patterns. Whether it is commercial, industrial, or housing development, all must accommodate the vehicle by providing parking. The goals and policies found in this section apply to all forms of development and are intended to promote land development patterns that are less auto-dependent and that better support travel options. They recognize that compact large- and small-scale site design close to services and transit will reduce vehicular trips, many of which may occur through transit, ridesharing, bicycling, or walking.

Goal LU-20: Promote a reasonable balance between parking supply and parking demand.
Policy LU-20.1: Develop parking ratios which take into account existing parking supply, minimums and maximums, land use intensity, and transit and ride-sharing goals.

Policy LU-20.2: Incorporate ground-level retail and/or service facilities into any parking structures that are constructed within the downtown Urban Center.

Policy LU-20.3: Provide an option for developers to construct the minimum number of parking spaces on-site or pay an in-lieu fee to cover the cost of the City's construction and operation of parking at an off-site location.

Policy LU-20.4: Evaluate the parking requirements for all uses within the DC and DCE zones on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the following factors:

a) the potential of shared parking and transit facilities in proximity to the site;
b) the employee profile of a proposed site, including the number and type of employees and the anticipated shifts;
c) the potential for "capture" trips that will tend to reduce individual site parking requirements due to the aggregation of uses within concentrated areas;
d) the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation report and other publications which provide parking generation indices; and
e) any studies of similar specific uses conducted either by the City of Kent or the applicant. The City of Kent parking coordinator, with the Planning Manager's concurrence, will prepare a report recommending specific parking requirements.

Policy LU-20.5: Require reduced allowable parking ratios for development projects that are in close proximity to intermodal transit/commuter rail facilities. A development project may provide up to 50% of the applicable maximum parking standard if the development is located within five hundred (500) feet of a designated intermodal transit/commuter rail facility. Such project may provide up to 75% of the applicable parking standard if the development is located between 500 and 800 feet of an intermodal facility.

Policy LU-20.6: Develop bicycle parking standards for remodel and new commercial, office, or industrial development.

**NATURAL RESOURCES GOALS & POLICIES**

The natural environment of the Green River Valley, and adjacent hillsides and plateaus, provide a unique and distinctive character to the City of Kent. The major hydrologic feature is the Green River which encompasses a system that consists of associated creeks and
wetlands. Some of the creeks in the Green River system, such as Mill Creek and Garrison Creek, flow through steep ravines into the valley floor. While Big Soos Creek, Springbrook Creek and Meridian Valley Creek flow at lower grades, they also contribute habitat. Significant fish and wildlife habitat areas within this system support local and regional fish and wildlife resources. These include smaller streams and their associated wetlands, and several small lakes, namely Fenwick, Clark and Panther. While these lakes are not regulated by the State Shorelines Act, they are protected through local Critical Areas regulations.

In 2002, the City of Kent began revising Critical Areas regulations as required by the GMA, using best available science standards tailored specifically for Kent. Once complete, the final regulations will guide future development in and near sensitive areas that will protect the ecological functions and values of critical areas from cumulative adverse environmental impacts. Designated critical areas include aquifer recharge areas, frequently flooded areas, geologic hazard areas, wetlands, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. In addition to protecting and preserving critical areas through regulations, a number of other programs work cooperatively to form a systematic approach toward Kent’s natural resource policies. These other programs include: stormwater regulation, environmental capital improvement projects, inter-jurisdictional collaborative efforts, and the support of the adjacent King County’s Lower Green River Agricultural Production District and the “Agricultural Resource” land within Kent.

As a complement to new Critical Areas regulations, Kent’s 1999 Shoreline Master Program provides for the management and protection of local shoreline resources by planning for reasonable and appropriate uses. The goals, policies, and regulations in the Shoreline Master Program apply to activities in all lands and waters under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW). The goals and policies of Kent’s Shoreline Master Program are incorporated herein (see appendices).

Kent is home to four watersheds namely Big Soos Creek, Mill Creek/Springbrook, Green River, and Puget Sound Watersheds, each with major creek systems, all with varying degrees of urban development. The Big Soos Creek Watershed is a region of approximately 70 square miles, and within the Kent City limits, includes the Soosette, Lake Meridian, and Meridian Valley Creek subbasins, as depicted in Figure 4.7, as well as areas draining directly to Big Soos Creek located outside Kent’s Planning Area. The system has nearly ninety (90) miles of streams flowing into the Green River, and the basin includes many wetlands and lakes. The Soos Creek Basin Plan, adopted by King County in January 1992, recommended a combination of tools for basin management aimed at correcting surface water problems.
and providing protection for the basin's water resources. One of the tools recommended was to maintain rural densities, especially in areas of the Soosette Creek subbasin.

Big Soos Creek is a major creek lying within the Green River Basin. The creek meanders in and out of the easterly city limits of Kent and provides a natural open space corridor between the cities of Kent and Covington and between Urban Growth Areas and Rural Areas of unincorporated King County. Big Soos Creek provides significant habitat for fish and wildlife, and it is an area of natural beauty that provides recreational and educational opportunities throughout the region. The Soos Creek Trail, which runs for four (4) miles from Gary Grant Park at SE 208th and 137th Avenue SE to Lake Meridian Park, provides opportunities for walking, bicycling and horseback riding.

The east and west banks of the Green River Valley and other unique natural features such as the Olsen Creek Canyon provide natural opportunities for Urban Separators. The eastern plateau in particular provides a natural separation between the cities of Kent and Covington, and between the urban and rural areas of unincorporated King County.

The Olsen Creek Canyon provides separation between a portion of Kent and Auburn. This separation continues as a result of both natural features and existing land use preservation within the Lower Green River Agricultural Production District of King County. In addition, the wetlands and floodplains of the Northeast Auburn drainage ditch, Mill Creek (Auburn) and Mullen Slough limit development potential. The result is a complete east-west corridor of environmental, visual, recreational, and wildlife benefits.

In 1985, the City of Kent, in conjunction with the establishment of the City stormwater drainage utility, adopted the following water quality goal: "Reduce the environmentally detrimental effects of present and future runoff in order to maintain or improve stream habitat, wetlands, particularly water quality, and protected water-related uses." Beginning in 1986, the City worked with Green River Community College to analyze samples each month from eleven (11) stream locations in Kent for twenty-four (24) water quality parameters. In recent years, the City of Kent has been monitoring water quality. Documentation of water quality conditions within Kent may be found in the 1999 – 2000 Ambient Monitoring “Draft” Final Report. The data collected indicate that water quality problems continue to exist.

To address water quality problems within the City, a number of capital improvement projects have been constructed and are being designed. Non-point source pollution is
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treated at numerous public and private stormwater treatment facilities throughout the City. One example may be found at the 304-acre Green River Natural Resources Area (GRNRA). The GRNRA provides regional treatment of surface water runoff from an 832-acre area on the valley floor, flood control of 100-year flood events in the valley, wildlife habitat, and public education opportunities. Since 1980, Kent has completed several projects to protect the water quality of Lake Fenwick. In 1995, the City installed an aeration system to improve Lake Fenwick's water quality. Water quality monitoring continues for all lakes within the City.

The principal sources of water supply for the City's water system, Clark Springs, Kent Springs, and Armstrong Springs, are located outside Kent city limits, adjacent to the jurisdictions of unincorporated King County and the cities of Black Diamond, Covington and Maple Valley. A Wellhead Protection Plan (Resolution #1563) has been prepared in cooperation with Covington Water District and King County Water District #111. This plan identifies aquifer recharge areas, potential contamination sources, and management strategies for protection of aquifers. Today these management strategies are being implemented in cooperation with Covington Water District and King County Water District #111.

Native plants, trees and shrubs are found throughout the City. Preservation and planting of native trees and shrubs, particularly near streams and wetlands on individual properties, in parks, schools, and other public spaces protect and enhance environmental quality for fish and wildlife habitat. Today preservation of open space, fish and wildlife habitat, and other critical areas occurs through the development process using "Sensitive Area Easements".

It is the City of Kent's goal to participate in regional efforts to ensure long-term protection of our salmonid resources to harvestable levels for today and future generations. Successful restoration and maintenance of healthy salmon populations will require time, money, and collaboration with tribal governments, federal, state, and local jurisdictions, as well as private citizens, businesses, and environmental groups.

In March 1999 the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) listed the Chinook salmon as "threatened" under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In December 1999 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listed the Puget Sound and Coastal Bull trout as threatened under the ESA. In the future, additional salmonid species such as Coho may also be listed under the ESA. In accordance with the ESA, the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the USFWS issued regulations deemed necessary to provide for the conservation of Puget Sound Chinook Salmon and other salmonids. Commonly
referred to as the 4(d) rule, the rule legally establishes the protective measures deemed necessary to conserve the species. Local governments will be required to comply with these protective measures.

In cooperation with federal, state, and tribal governments, and other major stakeholders, local governments in the Puget Sound region have begun to identify early actions and develop long-range strategies for the permanent conservation of the species. These strategies are developed at the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA), which include the boundaries of multiple jurisdictions. Kent has interest in two WRIA's: WRIA 9 (the Green/Duwamish Watershed) and WRIA 8 (the Cedar/Sammamish Watershed).

Historically, the commercial agricultural lands in the Green River Valley have added to the City's economic support. Today, the majority of protected agricultural resource lands in the Valley are located south of Kent's municipal limits within King County's Lower Green River Agricultural Production District. There are a few designated “Agricultural Resource” lands within Kent whose development rights have been purchased and protected from conversion to a more intensive land use. Activities within the land use designation “Agricultural Support” (i.e., AG-S) will help sustain the agricultural community by providing land dedicated to the processing and retailing of local agricultural production.

Kent is committed to a multi-faceted approach toward the protection and enhancement of local and regional natural resources. As such, the City will continue to protect natural resources through the promulgation of development standards, enhancement of natural resources through a variety of capital improvement programs, and looking for opportunities to support regional efforts to preserve our resources for future generations.

Goal LU-21:
Foster recognition of the significant role played by natural features and systems in determining the overall environmental quality and livability of the community.

Policy 21.1: Educate City staff, developers, and other citizens on the interaction between natural features and systems, such as wetlands, streams, and geologically hazardous areas, and human activities

Goal LU-22:
Coordinate with appropriate individuals and entities to create a long-term, sustainable relationship among local and regional natural resource protection entities, for future growth and economic development, through enhancement of wildlife, fisheries, and recreational
opportunities; protection of cultural resources; protection of water quality in wetlands, aquifers, lakes, streams, and the Green River; provision of open space and screening to reduce impacts of development; protection of environmentally sensitive areas to preserve life, property, water quality and fish and wildlife habitat; and retention of the unique character and sense of place provided by the City's natural features.

Policy LU-22.1: Provide incentives for environmental protection and compliance with environmental regulations. Foster greater cooperation and education among City staff, developers, and other citizens. Determine the effectiveness of incentives by establishing monitoring programs.

Policy LU-22.2: Continue to evaluate programs and regulations to determine their effectiveness in contributing to the conservation and recovery of ESA listed species.

Policy LU-22.3: Continue to participate in regional and WRIA planning efforts to support the conservation of listed species.

Goal LU-23:
Protect and enhance environmentally sensitive areas via the adoption of City regulations and programs which encourage well-designed land use patterns such as clustering and planned unit development. Use such land use patterns to concentrate higher urban land use densities and intensity of uses in specified areas in order to preserve natural features such as large wetlands, streams, geologically hazardous areas, and forests.

Policy LU-23.1: Create development regulations for clustering single and multifamily residential developments that are constrained by critical areas.

Policy LU-23.2: Where practical, allow planned unit developments in single-family neighborhoods.

Goal LU-24:
Encourage well designed, compact land use patterns to reduce dependency on the automobile, and thereby improve air and water quality and conserve energy resources. Establish mixed-use commercial, office, and residential areas to present convenient opportunities for travel by transit, foot, and bicycle.

Policy LU-24.1: Incorporate bike lanes in designated roadway designs, ensure that sidewalks and other pedestrian amenities are provided in conjunction with private and public development, and incorporate convenient transit stations in designs for mixed-use development.

Goal LU-25:
Ensure that the City's environmental policies and regulations comply with state and federal environmental protection regulations regarding air and water quality, hazardous materials,
noise and wildlife and fisheries resources and habitat protection. Demonstrate support for environmental quality in land use plans, capital improvement programs, code enforcement, implementation programs, development regulations, an site plan review to ensure that local land use management is consistent with the City's overall natural resource goals.

Policy LU-25.1: Protect and enhance environmental quality via maintenance of accurate and up-to-date environmental data, and by City support of environmental management programs, park master programs, and environmental education and incentive programs.

Policy LU-25.2: Provide to property owners and prospective property owners general information concerning natural resources, critical areas, and associated regulations. Ensure developers provide site-specific environmental information to identify possible on- and off-site constraints and special development procedures.

Policy LU-25.3: Indemnify the City from damages resulting from development in naturally constrained areas. To the extent possible or feasible, require that developers provide to the City accurate and valid environmental information.

Policy LU-25.4: Continue a periodic storm drainage/environmental inspection program to ensure constant maintenance and upkeep of storm systems and on-going compliance with general environmental processes.

Policy LU-25.5: Ensure that decisions regarding fundamental site design are made prior to the initiation of land surface modifications. Grade and fill permits, which do not include site development plans, may be issued by the City where such activities do not disturb sensitive areas, such as wetlands.

Policy LU-25.6: Require site restoration if land surface modification violates adopted policy or if development does not ensue within a reasonable period of time.

Policy LU-25.7: Adopt a clearing and grading code to protect upland habitat, as well as site designations and special restrictions relevant to Kent's construction standards and detention criteria.

Policy LU-25.8: As additional land is annexed to the City, assign zoning designations, which will protect natural resources and environmentally sensitive areas.

Policy LU-25.9: Continue to support waste reduction and recycling programs in City facilities, and in the City at large, to meet State and County waste reduction and recycling goals.
Policy LU-25.10: Work cooperatively with tribal, federal, state and local jurisdictions, as well as major stakeholders, to conserve and work towards recovery of ESA listed threatened and endangered species.

Goal LU-26:
Protect and enhance natural resources for multiple benefits, including recreation, fish and wildlife resources and habitat, flood protection, water supply, and open space.

Policy LU-26.1: Maintain the quantity and quality of wetlands via current land use regulation and review, and increase the quality and quantity of the City's wetlands resource base via incentives and advance planning.

Policy LU-26.2: Protect wetlands not as isolated units, but as ecosystems, and essential elements of watersheds. Base protection measures on wetland functions and values, and the effects of on-site and off-site activities.

Policy LU-26.3: When jurisdictional boundaries are involved coordinate wetland protection and enhancement plans and actions with adjacent jurisdictions and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe.

Policy LU-26.4: Maintain rivers and streams in their natural state. Rehabilitate degraded channels and banks via public programs and in conjunction with proposed new development.

Policy LU-26.5: On a regular basis, evaluate the adequacy of the existing building setback and stream buffer requirements in relation to goals for water resource and fisheries and wildlife resource protection. When necessary, modify the requirements to achieve goals.

Policy LU-26.6: Coordinate with King County to produce critical area maps of the Potential Annexation Area which are consistent with the City of Kent Critical Areas Maps.

Policy LU-26.7: Protect the quality and quantity of groundwater used for water supply in accordance with the City of Kent Water Quality Program recommendations.

Policy LU-26.8: Update the City of Kent Critical Areas Maps as new information about aquifer recharge areas and wellhead protection areas becomes available.

Policy LU-26.9: In accordance with GMA regulations, update critical areas development regulations to identify, protect, and preserve wildlife species and areas of local significance.

Land Use Element 4-52
Policy LU-26.10: Protect the habitat of native and migratory wildlife by encouraging open space conservation of beneficial habitat through public capital improvement projects and private development.

Policy LU-26.11: Provide incentives for on-going water conservation activities and practices, in accordance with the City of Kent Water System Plan.

Goal LU-27:
Ensure that uses, densities, and development patterns on lands adjacent to the shorelines of the Green River are compatible with shoreline uses and resource values, and support the goals and policies of the City of Kent's Shoreline Master Program and the Green-Duwamish Watershed Nonpoint Action Plan.

Policy LU-27.1: Reserve appropriate shoreline areas for water-oriented uses.

Policy LU-27.2: Minimize the loss of vegetation as new development occurs. Continue to recognize the value of trees and other vegetation in increasing the livability of Kent.

Policy LU-27.3: Promote and support a systematic approach to enhancing the City through carefully planned plantings and ongoing maintenance of street trees, public landscaping, and greenbelts. Require the use of native and low water use vegetation.

Policy LU-27.4: Require protection of ecologically valuable vegetation, when possible, during all phases of land use development. In cases where development necessitates the removal of vegetation, require an appropriate amount of native or low water use landscaping to replace trees, shrubs, and ground cover, which were removed during development.

Policy LU-27.5: Record and protect established greenbelts to preserve existing natural vegetation in geologically hazardous areas, along stream banks, wetlands, and other habitat areas, and where visual buffers between uses or activities are desirable.

Goal LU-28:
Regulate development in environmentally critical areas to prevent harm, to protect public health and safety, to preserve remaining critical areas, and enhance degraded critical areas in the City.

Policy LU-28.1: Encourage enhancement of existing environmental features such as rivers, streams, creeks, and wetlands.
Policy LU-28.2: Promote the creation and preservation of natural corridors adjacent to areas such as the Green River, Soos Creek, and other streams and wetlands within the City of Kent for fish and wildlife habitat, open space and passive recreation. Whenever possible, preservation of these lands should link other properties with similar features to create a natural corridor.

Goal LU-29: Include provisions in the City's land use regulations to preserve reasonable access to solar energy for all lots in the City where access or potential access exists.

Goal LU-30: Ensure the conservation and enhancement of productive agricultural land via regulation, acquisition, or other methods.

Policy LU-30.1: Establish a notification process as specified by the GMA to ensure incompatible land uses adjacent to agricultural lands are aware of adjacent agricultural resource land.

Goal LU-31: Establish Urban Separators to protect environmentally sensitive areas, including lakes, streams, wetlands, and geologically unstable areas such as steep slopes, to create open space corridors that provide environmental, visual, recreational and wildlife benefits within and between urban growth areas, and to take advantage of unusual landscape features such as cliffs or bluffs and environmentally unique areas.

Policy LU-31.1: Establish Urban Separators as low-density areas of no greater than one dwelling unit per acre.

Policy LU-31.2: Only allow amendments to the Urban Separator policy at the time coinciding with King County's twenty (20) year review of its 1994 Policy Update of the Comprehensive Plan or by Kent City County initiation because of pending danger or public safety.

Policy LU-31.3: Require subdivisions within or adjacent to Urban Separators to provide open space linkages within or to the Urban Separator.

Policy LU-31.4: Establish Urban Separators as links between, and for protection of, sensitive areas, public parks, open spaces or trails, critical aquifer recharge areas, floodplains, high value wetlands, unstable slopes, regionally or locally significant resource areas, fish and wildlife habitat and other unique environmental features.

Policy LU-31.5: Coordinate with appropriate South King County agencies, adjacent cities, and unincorporated King County to create a regional approach to Urban Separators.
Policy LU-31.6: Link Urban Separators within the City of Kent to those of adjacent cities and unincorporated King County.

Policy LU-31.7: Encourage well-designed land use patterns, including clustering of housing units, transfer of development rights, zero lot lines and other techniques to protect and enhance urban separators.

Policy LU-31.8: Consider funding options, land trusts, purchase of development rights, and other methods for public acquisition of Urban Separators.

LAND USE MAP

Along with the Goals and Policies listed above, the Land Use Element also includes the Land Use Map. This map is a vital part of the Land Use Element and the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, because it establishes the framework for amendments to the City's official zoning map. It also establishes the land use and zoning framework to be used as land currently in the Potential Annexation Area is annexed into the City.

DEFINITION OF MAP DESIGNATIONS

There are several different land use designations. They relate to various types of land uses, such as residential, commercial, industrial, and the like. These designations are found on the Land Use Map (Figure 4.8) and are explained below. One needs to bear in mind, however, that there are certain types of land uses that need relative freedom of location and, thus, should not be restricted to certain districts. These types of uses may be allowed via general conditional use permit in many of the listed districts, whether residential, commercial or industrial. The uses include utility, transportation, and communication facilities; schools; public facilities; open space uses such as cemeteries, golf course, and so forth; and retirement homes, convalescent facilities and certain other welfare facilities.

Single-Family Residential (SF)

The Single-family Residential designation allows single-family residential development at varying densities and housing forms (e.g., cottage and cluster). In the city limits, there are five single-family designations: SF-1, SF-3, SF-4.5, SF-6, and SF-8. These designations allow development of up to 1, 3, 4.5, 6, and 8 dwelling units per acre, respectively. It should be stressed that these designations represent a range of densities, with the designation being the
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maximum allowable density. For example, the SF-6 designation allows zoning which could accommodate up to 6 units per acre; it also could accommodate less than that.

In the unincorporated area, there are two (2) single-family designations: Urban Residential, Low (UR-1) allows one (1) dwelling unit per acre; and Urban Residential, Medium (UR-4-12) allows development at a range of four (4) to twelve (12) units per acre. On a countywide basis, these designations have been updated since the 1991 Soos Creek Community Plan to reflect the November 2001 amended King County designated land uses.

**Multifamily Residential (MF)**

Multifamily Residential areas allow multifamily and single-family residential development at varying densities and housing types. In the city limits, there are two designations: Low Density Multifamily (LDMF) and Medium Density Multifamily (MDMF). The Low Density Multifamily designation allows densities of up to 16 dwelling units per acre, while the Medium Density Multifamily designation allows densities of 17-23 dwelling units per acre. In Kent’s PAA of Unincorporated King County, a multifamily designation of Urban Residential, High (UR12+) allows 18-48 dwelling units per acre.

**Urban Center (UC)**

This designation identifies a portion of the Downtown area as an Urban Center. This designation allows high-density, mixed-use development. Retail, office, multifamily residential, and public facility land uses are permitted outright.

**Mobile Home Park (MHP)**

The Mobile Home Park designation allows mobile and manufactured homes and recreational vehicles within existing commercial mobile home parks.

**Mixed-Use (MU)**

The Mixed-Use designation allows retail, office, and multifamily residential uses together in the same area. The Mixed-Use designation is distinguished from the Urban Center designation in that the Mixed-Use areas do not allow as much density as the Urban Center area. All residential development within a Mixed-Use area must be a component of a retail or office development.
Neighborhood Services (NS)
Neighborhood Services allows for small nodal areas of retail and personal service activities to provide everyday convenient goods to residential areas.

Commercial (C)
Commercial areas allow a variety of retail, office, and service uses located along major thoroughfares that serve local residential neighborhoods or serve regional clients and customers and consists of a contiguous strip of commercial activities. Many areas on the Land Use Map, which were previously designated for commercial uses, now are designated as Mixed-Use areas.

Manufacturing/Industrial Center (MIC)
The Manufacturing/Industrial Center is an area reserved for manufacturing, industrial, and advanced technology uses, or those uses closely related to industrial development such as warehousing. Office uses related to the primary land use is permitted, but they are otherwise limited. Retail uses are also permitted, but limited in the Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

Industrial (I)
The Industrial designation is an area for manufacturing and warehouse uses. However, office and business park development is allowed in this area, as are certain types of retail uses which serve the surrounding manufacturing and office park uses, and bulk retail.

Agricultural Resource (AG-R)
The Agricultural Resource designation is for land reserved for long-term agricultural use. Single-family residential uses may also be allowed, but at very low densities.

Agricultural Support (AG-S)
The Agricultural Support designation is reserved for agriculturally related industrial and retail uses near areas designated for long-term agricultural use.

Urban Separator (US)
The Urban Separator designation is reserved for low-density lands that define community or municipal identities and boundaries, protect adjacent resource lands, rural areas, and
environmentally sensitive areas, and create open space corridors within and between urban areas which provide environmental, visual, recreational and wildlife benefits.

Parks and Open Space (POS)

The Parks and Open Space designation represents publicly owned land that is either large active park or undeveloped or developed for passive recreation open space land that may have environmental sensitivities.

LAND USE ELEMENT DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

The Land Use Map provides adequate capacity to meet the City's household and employment targets for the next twenty (20) years. Industrial employment and development capacity is not expected to change, because the amount of land, which is designated for industrial uses, is not changed from the existing plan. Commercial capacity is likely to increase somewhat. There are areas on East and West Hill that are positioned for redevelopment. Kent’s large mixed-use areas, while allowing residential uses, ensure commercial capacity will not be displaced by residential development. Areas currently zoned for office uses will allow retail uses, while bulk retail uses will be permitted in the industrial area. Capacity in the unincorporated area is not expected to change in the short term, because the King County Comprehensive Plan designations are adopted for this area. King County’s Land Use Plan designations provide a wide variation of densities in this area and the present zoning provides adequate capacity.

It is envisioned that this proposed element, once implemented through changes in the zoning and subdivision codes, will increase potential for single-family residential development and home ownership. Therefore, this plan not only will meet the City’s growth targets, but it will create more flexibility and variety of housing types. At the same time, it will preserve single-family neighborhoods and restrict the growth of stand-alone multifamily zoning. This increased development flexibility and variety also has important implications for providing housing that is affordable to a broader segment of the population, as will be discussed further in the Housing Element.