

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
County Item - High Priority				
A-1 NEW Staff	Review of Critical Areas Buffer Requirements and Approval Processes and Criteria Under the Critical Areas Ordinance <i>(Title 24)</i>	<p>Review current critical area buffer standards against current Best Available Science to review the range of critical area buffer and riparian area sizes.</p> <p>Review administrative approval processes using best available science and methods used by other jurisdictions for buffer and riparian area size variations to see if more flexible approaches may be available.</p> <p>Review and clarify the definition and applicability of landslide hazard areas.</p> <p>Review and revise as necessary for changes required as part of the major update required under the Growth Management Act.</p> <p>Amendments under this docket item may be brought forward separately or grouped together by subject area.</p>	<p>Permitting staff have identified issues with the current administrative processes for buffer averaging, allowable reductions from current standards, hazard tree removal, reasonable use exceptions, as well as nonconforming lot and structure provisions. Staff has requested the Board consider reviewing current standards and administrative review processes to see if more flexible approaches are available.</p> <p>The Growth Management Act requires the county to review and revise its comprehensive plan and development regulations, which includes the critical areas ordinance. The critical areas ordinance will also be reviewed to see if revisions are required to meet the state mandate.</p> <p>Wetland buffer reductions may affect protections for the Oregon Spotted Frog, a state and federally listed species. The current Habitat Conservation Plan process is reliant on current standards to help reduce and in many cases eliminate direct mitigation requirements. Changing the standards and administrative variance procedures in Oregon Spotted Frog areas will likely require recalculation of the HCP analysis.</p> <p>Wetland and riparian buffer reductions may effect the county's CRS program and Class 2 rating.</p> <p>Review will require further study of Best Available Science targeted towards the county's needs and proposed flexibility in administrative processes.</p>	<p>500+ Hours (0.25 FTE+)</p> <p>Complex Amendment</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-2 NEW Staff	Nonconforming Structure Replacement <i>All Codes</i>	<p>The replacement of nonconforming structures is addressed in all land use codes. The permitted time for replacement varies from 12 – 24 months in the various development codes. The proposal is to review current timelines to see if the county can make replacement timelines uniform across all development codes.</p> <p>The proposal will also review replacement size expansions allowed in zoning ordinances.</p>	<p>The Critical Areas Ordinance (Title 24) allows for nonconforming uses or structures to be rebuilt in their current footprint if a building permit is submitted within 24 months of destruction, and allows for vertical expansions.</p> <p>The zoning ordinances allow for a nonconforming structure to be rebuilt if the building permit is submitted within 12 months of the destruction.</p> <p>Replacement structures are only allowed within the existing footprint, which may be challenging depending on the age of the building. Modern building designs are different than historic designs, and may require variations on building footprints.</p> <p>Staff will need to research criteria used in other jurisdictions and consult with affected stakeholders</p>	<p>200 Hours (0.10 FTE)</p> <p>Straightforward Amendment</p>
A-3 From 2016-17 Official Docket	Review Regulations for State-Licensed Marijuana Producers, Processors and Retailers <i>All Zoning Codes</i>	<p>State-licensed marijuana producers, processors and retailers are authorized by Chapter 69.50 RCW. Thurston County does not currently have final regulations governing the placement of these operations.</p> <p>It is expected final regulations will be set in early 2018. Revisions may be necessary due to changing conditions.</p>	<p>On November 12, 2013, Thurston County adopted Ordinance No. 14944, which established interim regulations governing state-licensed marijuana producers, processors and retailers. This ordinance has been renewed and revised as conditions have changed since adoption.</p> <p>County will review final adopted regulations annually in the fall of 2018 and fall of 2019. Revisions may be necessary due to changing conditions.</p>	<p>120 Hours (0.06 FTE)</p> <p>Monitoring State Legislation and 2017-18 Final Review for Final Regulations</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-4 NEW Staff	Review Allowing an Increase in Square Footage for Existing Public Facilities Through Administrative Review <i>All Zoning Codes</i>	This proposal would review expansion limitations placed on public facilities initially approved through a Special Use Permit, and may allow for greater administrative review after a Special Use Permit is approved by the Hearing Examiner.	<p>Currently, new public facilities and major expansions of public facilities require a special use permit. Major and minor expansions are not explicitly defined in some zoning regulations.</p> <p>This item would apply a uniform standard across the four county zoning ordinances for minor and major public facility expansions to determine when an expansion may be approved administratively or with a special use permit.</p>	220 Hours (0.11 FTE) Straightforward Amendment
A-5 NEW Staff	Review of Administrative Variance Limits in Zoning Ordinances <i>(Title 20, 21, 22, 23)</i>	Review current administrative variance allowances in the four zoning ordinances to allow for greater administrative flexibility prior to requiring a Hearing Examiner Variance.	<p>Administrative variances are currently permitted for reductions in required setbacks (yards), replacement of nonconforming structures, incompatible use buffer reductions.</p> <p>The proposal would review these standards to see if more flexibility may be incorporated into the four zoning ordinances prior to requiring a Hearing Examiner variance.</p> <p>Staff will need to research limits used in other jurisdictions and consult with affected stakeholders.</p>	300 Hours (0.14 FTE) Intermediate Amendment

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-6 NEW Staff	Critical Areas Ordinance Revisions to Ensure Consistency with the Shoreline Management Program Update <i>Title 24</i>	Amend the critical areas ordinance to ensure consistency with amendments proposed with the Shoreline Master Program Update.	<p>The Shoreline Master Program Update was added to the 2017-18 Official Comprehensive Plan Docket, as a continuation from previous Official Comprehensive Plan Dockets. The docket item did not specifically include amending the critical areas ordinance to be consistent with the Shoreline Master Program. There may be amendments to critical area buffers and protections included with the Shoreline Master Program Update. The Growth Management Act requires consistency between regulations. The county either needs to add an item to the development code docket addressing proposed changes, or amend the Official Comprehensive Plan Docket.</p> <p>This docket item is expected to be completed with the Shoreline Master Program Update. The Shoreline Master Program Update is considered a complex amendment which requires significant staff time to complete.</p>	<p>Docket item to be completed with Shoreline Master Program Update on the Comprehensive Plan Official Docket.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">200 Additional Hours Projected (0.10 FTE)</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
<p style="text-align: center;">A-7</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NEW</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Staff</p>	<p>Review Low Impact Development Standards <i>All codes</i></p>	<p>Thurston County's four zoning ordinances were updated as required under state law by December 2016.</p> <p>Issues have been brought forward as county staff</p>	<p>Low impact development is a stormwater and land use management strategy that strives to preserve and mimic the natural hydrology of a site by integrating conservation, use of natural features, and storm water management practices into project design.</p> <p>Areas for review include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop special use permit conditions for sites requesting additional hard surface coverage • Review and modify hard surface limits and credits • Address other implementation issues <p>Updates to standards and processes will require additional review to ensure any changes are compliant with the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State of Washington. Staff time from appropriate departments and Resource Stewardship divisions will be required.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">300 Hours (0.14 FTE)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Intermediate Amendment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">A-8</p>		Intentionally Left Blank		

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-9 From 2016-17 Official Docket	Amend the Planned Industrial Park District to Allow Correctional Facilities as a Special Use in the PI District <i>Title 20</i>	<p>Amend Chapter 20.27 Planned Industrial Park District (PI) to allow prisons/prerelease facilities as a special use.</p> <p>The State of Washington is currently considering other uses for the old Maple Lane juvenile detention facility in Grand Mound. One of the uses is a correctional facility which would specialize in housing inmates with mental illnesses.</p>	<p>The current zoning district does not permit prisons/prerelease or other like correctional facilities.</p> <p>Prisons/prerelease facilities are currently allowed in the Rural 1/20, Rural 1/10, Rural Residential/Resource 1/5, Rural Residential 1/5 and Long Term Forestry zoning districts as a special use.</p> <p>Criteria may be added to limit correctional facilities in the PI zone to existing locations such as the former Maple Lane juvenile detention facility. Other current criteria may need to be amended to allow the use at an existing site historically used as a detention/correctional facility that is closer than two miles from an existing or proposed school. Other amendments may also be considered to the special use criteria.</p>	<p>500 Hours+ (0.25 FTE+) Complex Amendment</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-10 Citizen NEW and 2016-17 Preliminary Docket	Review Private Pet Kennel Standards and Waste Management Plans <i>(Title 20)</i> <i>20.54.070 (16) (D)</i>	<p>Review dog kennel requirements to allow private dog owners to have a kennel with more than three dogs, but less than ten outside of urban growth areas on larger lots.</p> <p>This item would also include amending the code to require the waste management plan for a kennel within the McAllister Geologically Sensitive Area to be approved by County Environmental Health. Kennels are currently subject to a waste management plan approved by the Hearing Examiner.</p>	<p>Currently, dog kennels include locations with more than three dogs either for private or commercial use. These are required to have a special use permit in the rural area.</p> <p>Kennels housing 4 to 10 dogs require an Administrative Special Use Permit as a Home Occupation whether or not the dogs are personal pets or kept for a commercial use such as breeding or a small scale kennel.</p> <p>The request proposes a higher limit for dogs kept for private use with fewer requirements than a commercial kennel. Kennels housing 11 or more dogs require a Hearing Examiner Special Use Permit. The proposal does not include requirements for larger kennels.</p> <p>Prior to approval by the Hearing Examiner, the Health Department must give approval. Thus, it appears to be unnecessary to add the time and cost for the Examiner to make the decision. The Examiner has requested that this change be considered.</p>	200 Hours (0.10 FTE) Straightforward Amendment
A-11	Amend Final Map Process to Change Approval Process <i>Title 18</i>	<p>During this past legislative session, the final plat approval process required in state law was amended to allow the Board to delegate final plat approval to the Planning Commission or other administrative staff.</p> <p>Final plat approval is current done by the Board of County Commissioners following review by department directors, or their designee.</p>	<p>It is largely a verification review to ensure all conditions are met and appropriate facilities are constructed.</p> <p>If approved, this will create a more efficient process, reduce processing time for final plats by at least two weeks, and reduce staff costs to the county.</p> <p>It will save applicants time and money.</p>	120 Hours (0.5 FTE)

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-12 NEW	Add a Real Estate Disclosure Statement Requirement for Joint Base Lewis McChord JBLM Operations County Code	<p>As part of the County's efforts at ensuring future operations at Joint Base Lewis McChord, members of the South Sound Military Communities Partnership (SSMCP) have been asked to add a real estate disclosure requirement to their jurisdiction's code.</p>	<p>Currently, there is no disclosure requirement to ensure new residents in close proximity to JBLM will be aware of base operations, particularly noise impacts.</p> <p>Noise impacts primarily affect Dupont, Lakewood, Tacoma and unincorporated Pierce County within the flight paths of McChord Field and Grey Army Air Field. However, there is a small portion of eastern Thurston County which is also in the noise impact area.</p> <p>County staff has been working with other jurisdictions on a template for SSMCP jurisdictions.</p> <p>County staff will consult with the Thurston County Realtors and Olympia Master Builders on a final noise disclosure statement for the code.</p> <p>The amended code may be added to the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance or another appropriate section of the Thurston County Code.</p> <p>County staff continues to serve on technical teams for the SSMCP.</p>	<p>120 Hours (0.06 FTE)</p>
A-13	Miscellaneous Clerical Errors <i>All Land Use Codes</i>	<p>Amend minor clerical errors in the various codes.</p> <p>Errors will be corrected if and when a related amendment is moving forward.</p>	<p>Periodically, staff finds minor grammatical and textual errors in the codes that should be corrected. To make corrections, the formal adoption process must be followed. Having this docket item allows staff to move forward with correcting these errors as staffing permits.</p>	<p>Various Depending on Associated Amendment</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-14 New Hearing Examiner	Five-Year Review Requirement on Mineral Extraction Special Use Permits	<p>The Hearing Examiner has requested the Board of County Commissioners examine the five (5) year review requirement for mineral extraction special use permits.</p>	<p>Current code requires the five year review to be completed no less than every five years from the date of decision. The Hearing Examiner has interpreted this to mean that benchmark for the review is that the public hearing must be completed within five years.</p> <p>The five year review has been delayed because of application submittal timing, staffing availability, compliance with conditions of approval, enforcement issues, and other matters.</p> <p>It is requested that the county review the current code to see if additional clarification is needed, and/or tools need to be added.</p> <p>The Hearing Examiner is currently allowed to impose new conditions to comply with code amendments since the original approval. This provision should be reviewed to ensure it is consistent with state law.</p>	
A-15 NEW Hearing Examiner	Change the name of Chapter 20.60 Violations and Enforcement to Administrative Procedures	<p>Chapter 20.60 Enforcement and Violations includes the Administrative Procedures for permitting in the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance (Title 20).</p> <p>Thurston County adopted the Thurston County Code Enforcement Ordinance (Title 26) in 2016.</p> <p>Enforcement and violations no longer reside in Chapter 20.60.</p>	<p>The current name for this chapter does not accurately describe what is included in the chapter, and should be renamed.</p> <p>Because this is located in the zoning ordinance, Planning Commission review is required. This may be combined with another code amendment.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">16 Hours</p> <p>Processing will occur in conjunction with another code amendment.</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
A-16	Amend Zoning Ordinances to Add a Site Plan Review Process for Single Family Residential, Other Permits, and Review Vesting for All Other Permits <i>Titles 20, 21, 22, 23, 24</i>	<p>This amendment would add a site plan review process with a specified vesting period for agricultural buildings and single family residences, including accessory structures. Other application types in the development codes will also be reviewed to ensure vesting requirements are clear.</p> <p>Currently the four zoning ordinances do not include a process to review these projects for compliance with county zoning, critical area, shoreline, health, road and other applicable codes.</p>	<p>A Conditional Site Approval (CSA) process has been developed to review building sites for residential and agricultural structures for land use code compliance. CSA approval is required prior to submittal of a building permit application.</p> <p>Recent court decisions have indicated that CSA issuance carry no legal vesting authority under state law. Other application types may also be affected by the decision. Counties and cities are permitted to add vesting time limits to their individual permits in conformance with applicable state law.</p>	<p>± 250 Hours to completion</p> <p>350 Hours for original estimate</p> <p>Intermediate Amendment</p>
Interjurisdictional/Joint Planning Requests				
JP-1 New School District Request Impact Fees	Amend Impact Fee Code to add Impact Fees for North Thurston School District <i>(Title 25)</i>	<p>Impact fees were added to the Thurston County Code in 2012 for school districts. Impact fee collection began on April 2, 2013. North Thurston S.D. was not part of initial request.</p> <p>The current code is based on those school districts that expressed interest in impact fees.</p> <p>Currently, Thurston County collects State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) mitigation fees for those projects requiring SEPA review.</p>	<p>Thurston County collects impact fees for several school districts including Olympia, Rochester, Tumwater and Yelm. In addition, Thurston County Code authorizes fee collection for Tenino and Griffin school districts with the approval of an inter-local agreement and an appropriate capital facilities plan that includes impact fees.</p> <p>Since the adoption, the City of Lacey has moved to implement impact fees. In order to have uniform collection of fees, North Thurston has requested Thurston County to also begin collecting impact fees on their behalf.</p> <p>Inter local agreements and previous code may be used. Only a Board public hearing is required prior to adoption.</p>	<p>50 Hours</p> <p>Minimal time is required.</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
JP-2 New City of Tumwater UGA Zoning Ordinance Updates	Update the Tumwater UGA Zoning Ordinance to be Consistent with City Zoning Ordinance Title 22	<p>The Tumwater UGA Zoning Ordinance (Title 22) is currently inconsistent with the current City of Tumwater Zoning Ordinance (City Title 18).</p> <p>This work is not expected to begin until 2019.</p>	<p>Thurston County and the City of Tumwater are parties to a 1995 joint planning agreement and 1998 follow up implementation agreement for zoning and other regulations in the Tumwater UGA. The joint planning agreement spells out which city regulations the county will consider for implementation and adoption.</p> <p>This project would review the current county regulations in Title 22 to address amendments not enacted over the previous 17 years, and bring the changes forward for Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners consideration.</p> <p>The city has enacted numerous changes to their zoning regulations since 2000, some of which have been adopted by the county. The city has offered to provide staffing for the zoning ordinance update. City staff is projected to provide the majority of the time for the estimated project time.</p> <p>County and city staff will return in early 2019 to brief the board on the final project schedule.</p> <p>County staff will review amendments and participate in the development of staff reports and presentations.</p>	500+ Hours To be determined in 2019

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
JP-3 New City of Lacey UGA Zoning Ordinance Updates	Update the Lacey UGA Zoning Ordinance to be Consistent with City Zoning Ordinance Title 21	<p>The Zoning Ordinance for the Lacey UGA (Title 21) is currently inconsistent with the current City of Lacey Zoning Ordinance (City Title 16).</p> <p>This is not expected to begin until 2019.</p>	<p>The City of Lacey and the County are currently working on an update to the city/county joint plan for the Lacey UGA. The city is also working on an audit of their zoning and other development codes to see what updates or changes need to take place.</p> <p>The city has enacted numerous changes to their zoning regulations over the previous 12 years. Many of the code updates applicable in the UGA were completed with the Low Impact Development Code update in December 2016. However, not all could be completed at that time.</p> <p>Once both the joint plan and the city's code audit are done, the city and county staff will have more detail on draft updates to the Lacey UGA Zoning Ordinance. City and county staff will bring forward amendments that would be applicable to the UGA.</p> <p>County and city staff will return in early 2019 to brief the Board on the current status of proposed updates, more specifics, and estimated staff time.</p>	<p>500+ hours (0.25 FTE+)</p> <p>Final Project Hours to be Determined in 2019.</p>

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

<p>JP-4</p> <p>New</p> <p>City of Olympia UGA Zoning Ordinance Updates</p>	<p>Update the Olympia UGA Zoning Ordinance to be Consistent with the City Zoning Ordinance</p> <p><i>Title 23</i></p>	<p>The Zoning Ordinance for the Olympia UGA (Title 23) is currently inconsistent with the current City of Olympia Zoning Ordinance (City Title 18).</p> <p>This is not expected to begin until 2019.</p>	<p>The City of Olympia and the County are currently working on an update to the city/county joint plan for the Olympia UGA. The city is also working on several other changes to their zoning and other development codes to address housing issues, which are likely to result in code changes that would allow greater variety of housing types in the Residential 4-8 and 6-12 zoning districts. This review may make it easier to permit some higher density housing types, such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and courtyard apartments.</p> <p>The city has also enacted numerous changes to their zoning regulations over the previous 12 years. Some of the code updates applicable in the UGA were completed with the Low Impact Development Code update in December 2016. However, not all could be completed at that time.</p> <p>Once both the joint plan and the city's current code amendments are done, the city and county staff will have more detail on draft updates to the Olympia UGA Zoning Ordinance. City and county staff will bring forward amendments that would be applicable to the UGA.</p> <p>County and city staff will return in early 2019 to brief the Board on the current status of proposed updates, more specifics, and estimated county and city staff time.</p>	<p>500+ hours (0.25 FTE+)</p> <p>Final Project Hours to be Determined in 2019.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
Comprehensive Plan Code Updates				
CP-1 Wireless Industry From 2016-17 Docket	Wireless Communication Facilities <i>Titles 20, 21, 22, and 23</i>	A development code request has been submitted requesting the county revise regulations in its wireless communications regulations (Chapter 20.33 TCC) to permit programmatic approvals, implement recently adopted federal laws (2012), update language, and simplify the site upgrade process, including fence requirements.	Chapter 20.33 TCC was enacted in 2003. It has not been amended since then to accommodate changes in federal law regarding site upgrades. As currently written, the county may not be able to meet review timelines set in federal law. Changes may also need to be made to wireless communication regulations in the urban growth area zoning ordinances. Staff will assess applicable zoning regulations in all four zoning ordinances.	300 Hours (0.14 FTE) Intermediate Amendment
CP-2 From 2016-17 Docket	Permitted Childcare Centers <i>All Zoning Codes</i>	Amend codes to allow childcare centers as a permitted use in the Rural Commercial Center Zone and other commercial zones.	State agencies are in the process of addressing the growing need for childcare by widening the types of areas in which childcare can be provided. This proposed amendment would allow the County to assist in addressing the childcare needs of Thurston County. This is fairly straight forward, however, it may require more than minimal staff research.	250 (0.12 FTE) Intermediate Amendment
CP-3 From 2016-17 Docket Citizen	Amend the Tumwater UGA and Rural Zoning Codes for the Airport Overlay <i>Titles 20 & 22</i>	The County added an airport overlay to the comprehensive plan in 2005, but did not amend the zoning ordinances in the Rural area to add the overlay. The City of Tumwater updated their regulations in 2004. The County has received a citizen request to update the zoning ordinances.	Airport hazard overlays are intended to ensure compatible land uses in airport approach areas. The County has no special overlay for airport approach zones in Title 20. A section is in the Tumwater UGA Zoning Ordinance, but has not been updated to reflect changes to the overlay made by the City in 2004. Work on this may be combined with other updates to the Tumwater UGA Zoning Ordinance in 2019. This may reduce estimated project hours because of the combined public process.	275 Hours (0.13 FTE) This is an intermediate to straight forward amendment.

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
CP-4 From 2016-17 Docket	Amend the Rural Zoning Ordinance to amend Family Member Unit Regulations <i>Title 20</i>	<p>The current Family Member Unit regulations allow for a modular or manufactured home to be placed on a property without consideration of zoning density. This may lead to a violation of the density limitations in the Growth Management Act for rural areas. The units were meant to be temporary, however, the county does not have a monitoring program for ensuring Family Member Units are removed once the use is discontinued or the property is sold.</p>	<p>The Science to Local Policy grant analysis cited this as an issue that should be considered, because Family Member Units, besides adding density contribute to significantly higher percentages of new impervious surfaces. Thurston County is the last remaining county to allow Family Member Units in the rural area. Amendments could be brought forward to still allow units subject to the density limits of each zoning district, and considerations on placement and permitted square footage.</p>	250 Hours (0.12 FTE) Some of the research on this issue has been completed, however, it may generate significant public interest.
CP-5 From 2016-17 Docket Legal Counsel	Rewrite the Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) Standards <i>18.04</i>	<p>Amend the language to allow some additional latitude in the adjustment of property lines while maintaining the ability to place certain restrictions.</p>	<p>Recent case law prohibits adding conditions to a Boundary Line Adjustment approval. The current BLA code contains several conditions, thus it is noncompliant. Additionally, the current code prohibits certain boundary changes that may be desirable. The proposed language was presented to the BOCC in April 2008. Some small changes were requested. Other priorities bumped project continuation.</p> <p>The research was completed in 2008, however, because of its age the process needs to be restarted. Long Range Planning Staff that worked on this item are no longer here.</p>	230 Hours (0.11 FTE)

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
CP-6 From 2016-17 Docket Legal Counsel	Manufactured Housing <i>All Zoning Codes</i>	Amend codes as needed, to be in compliance with RCW 36.01.225.	Must be amended to reflect State law changes, including design standards. Staff research will be required, and coordination with other departments and stakeholders will also be required.	50 Hours (0.03) Straight Forward Amendment
CP-7	Address Rural Water Availability when Issuing Development Permits (Hirst Decision) <i>All Codes</i>	In Whatcom County vs. Hirst, Futurewise, et al. (2016), the Washington State Supreme Court clarified that counties are responsible for making a determination of water availability when they approve or deny building permits that use wells for a water source. This item is to review current county policies in the Comprehensive Plan and the County's development code to ensure the County is in compliance.	Thurston County is required to review and revise its comprehensive plan and development regulations to address changes in state law and case law by the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A). The Washington Supreme Court has determined counties have a responsibility under GMA to conduct an independent review to ensure water is physically and legally available when issuing development permits that rely on water withdrawals (including from individual wells). The County currently relies on determinations made by the Department of Ecology.	1,500+ Hours Complex Amendment This issue may be partially completed as part of the Comprehensive Plan update.
CP-8 2016-17 Preliminary Docket	Grand Mound UGA Zones Residential Lot Width <i>20.15.060</i> <i>20.21A.060</i>	Amend the code to reduce the minimum lot width standards for the Residential 3-6/1 and Residential 4-16/1 within the Grand Mound UGA. This item would be completed with the Grand Mound Plan update.	The current minimum lot width standards are quite large compared to other UGA residential zones with similar density requirements. The large required minimum lot widths currently make it difficult to design a subdivision while meeting the required density. This was Item C-7 on the 2016-17 Preliminary Development Code Docket.	10 Hours additional on plan update schedule.

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
CP-9 2016-17 Preliminary Docket	Resource Use Notice for Designated Mineral Lands, Long Term Agriculture, and Long Term Forestry	<p>Amend code so that homebuyers who purchase property adjacent to or near designated mineral lands, working farms or forests must be notified of activities and lifestyle impacts associated with adjacent agriculture, forestlands, and mineral land activities.</p>	<p>Current notification is only required for subdivision proposals within 1,000 feet of Designated Mineral Lands, or 500 feet of Long Term Agriculture and Long Term Forestry zones as required by Section 18.04.055 Resource Use Notice.</p> <p>It is also required in Section 14.17.030 TCC for residential building permits within 500 feet of designated mineral lands and/or zoned Nisqually Agriculture, Long Term Agriculture or Long Term Forestry.</p> <p>This amendment proposes to notify any property owner that they are purchasing property adjacent to mining, farm or forestry activities. Method of notification is to be determined.</p>	80 Additional Hours Straightforward to Intermediate Amendment
CP-10 Previous Docket	Amend the Forest Lands Conversion Ordinance 17.25	<p>Amend the code in areas previously identified by staff to clarify requirements. Review approval processes to see if administrative approval is warranted over Hearing Examiner approval.</p>	<p>The current regulations for forestlands conversion are out of date and in need of revision. In addition, Hearing Examiner review is necessary for removing the 6 year building moratorium on properties for uses other than single family development.</p>	300 Hours (0.14 FTE) Intermediate Amendment

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
County Items Low PRIORITY “B”				
B-1 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Clarify Expiration Deadlines <i>All Land Use Codes</i>	Amend all land use codes with similar language to clarify the circumstances under which an approved special use permit or other approval, will expire, including each approved phase of development.	The code is unclear regarding expiration thresholds on approved projects, both built and unbuilt, most particularly on projects with multiple phases or buildings. Adding specific language to clarify that certain actions, not just moving dirt, are necessary to avoid expiration would improve consistency and predictability. Importantly, it would also avoid indefinite extensions after codes have changed.	To Be Determined
B-2 2016-17 Preliminary Dockets	Site Plan Review for Uses that do not Require a Building Permit <i>Titles 20 & 23</i>	Currently some commercial projects do not trigger an administrative site plan review because there is no associated building permit. These include auction yards, parking lots, and businesses operating from vehicles or tents, and other uses.	Chapters 20.37 TCC and 23.60 do not include these uses for needing a site plan review. The zoning codes for the Tumwater and Lacey UGAs already address this issue. Uses that do not require a building permit may still cause off-site impacts that need to be addressed. These impacts can be addressed through the site plan review process.	To Be Determined
B-3 New Citizen	Amend the Building Size Limits for Resorts and Retreat Facilities <i>Chapter 20.54</i>	Amend the special use permit limitations in all applicable zoning districts to remove the maximum building size limit of 20,000 square feet. The size limits would be scaled depending on the property size.	These zones were amended in 2007 to place blanket restrictions on building size. The size limits were increased in July 2010 for fire stations. The unintended effect was to severely limit or prohibit some traditionally rural and public land uses. The proponent has provided information indicating that all current facilities in Thurston County exceed these limits. Staff has not formally analyzed the proposal. This would be done at the time it is brought forward for consideration.	To Be Determined

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
B-4 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Work Prohibition During Appeal Period <i>Administration Section of all Land Use Codes</i>	Amend all development regulations to prevent work during the appeal period for administrative decisions.	This would bring consistency with Hearing Examiner decisions. The affect would be to avoid having to “stop work” and potentially restore a site upon a successful appeal. This change would need to be in conjunction with B-3, Notification of Adjacent Property Owners. It would also add 14 days to the approval process.	To Be Determined
B-5 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Notification of Adjacent Property Owners <i>Administration Section of all Land Use Codes</i>	Amend all codes to provide notification to adjacent property owners for specified administrative decisions, including variances, administrative special use permits and short plats.	This change would give the most affected property owners notice of a proposed development prior to the actual construction. This may result in more appeals, but may also lead to more careful design.	To Be Determined
B-6 From 2014-15 Docket	Set Regulations for Food Trucks and Espresso Stands <i>Titles 20, 21, 22, 23</i>	The codes are currently silent on food trucks and espresso stands. They are becoming increasingly popular. The codes need to be updated to acknowledge their existence.	Currently, for land use purposes staff treats them either as accessory to an existing convenience store with no permit required or as a stand-alone business requiring site plan review similar to a stick-built store. A middle ground may be more appropriate and should be driven by the length of stay at a site.	To Be Determined
B-7 2014-15 Preliminary Docket Citizen	Recreational Lots <i>All Zoning Codes</i>	There currently is no definition of "recreational lot" and no listing of allowed uses within such lot.	There are numerous vacant lots within older subdivisions that are not buildable for various reasons. There is no clarity on what use can be made of these lots.	To Be Determined
B-8 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Better Define “Agricultural Structure” <i>Definition Section of all Land Use Codes</i>	Add standards, such as parcel size, building size and other factors, for a structure to be considered an agricultural building for land use purposes.	Without specific standards, property owners can and do claim various code exemptions for agricultural buildings when the buildings are not actually used for agriculture.	To Be Determined

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
B-9 2014-15 Preliminary Docket Citizen	Special Uses - Composting <i>20.54</i>	Amend to eliminate the requirement for commercial composting operations to be conducted entirely under a roof.	Based on other composting facilities in the state, there is no need for a roof to cover composting facilities, including commercial operations. Composting usually requires the addition of water to be successful and is compatible with outside processing. Other issues such as traffic, stormwater, and odor would be addressed through the Special Use Permit and Solid Waste Permit.	To Be Determined
B-10 Citizen 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Off Road Vehicle Restrictions <i>Titles 20, 21, 22, and 23</i>	Amend all zoning codes to limit use of Off Road Vehicles (ORV) near neighboring residential structures in certain zones.	Residents frequently complain of noise and dust related to ORV use in their neighborhood. The code is currently silent on the siting of personal use ORV tracks.	To Be Determined
B-11 Citizen 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Allow Recreational Vehicle and Boat Storage in the RCC District <i>Chapter 20.24</i>	Currently, the Rural Commercial Center District permits mini-warehousing as a permitted use. The County has received a citizen request to also allow RV and Boat storage as a permitted use.	<p>In the RCC district, Warehousing and storage is currently permitted, but only when adjacent to a rail line. Also, RV and Boat Sales and Service is a permitted use.</p> <p>Storage facilities are currently permitted as a special use in the most of the rural residential zoning districts (R 1/20, R 1/10, RRR 1/5, RR 1/5, UR 1/5, RL 2/1 and the RL 1/1 zoning districts). It is also allowed as a permitted use in the Arterial Commercial District.</p>	To Be Determined

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
B-12 Citizen 2014-15 Preliminary Docket	Permit Recreational Vehicles to be Used as a Dwelling Unit. <i>Titles 20, 21, 22, and 23</i>	Recreational vehicles are intended and designed for temporary habitation. In the rural area occupancy of recreational vehicles is limited to 30 days, within a 6 month period, or two 30 day periods in 12 months. In the UGA and the rural area, RV's are not permitted as a permanent dwelling unit.	Recreational vehicles may not be designed to meet building code requirements for manufactured and site built homes for permanent occupancy. State law has limitations on the use of recreational vehicles that will have to be analyzed to see if the county may permit recreational vehicles to be used as a permanent dwelling unit. The cities of Lacey, Tumwater, and Olympia will need to be consulted on code amendments in the unincorporated area of their UGA's for consistency with their comprehensive plan and development codes.	
B-13	Prohibit Heat Pumps and Other Noise Generating Equipment within Setbacks <i>Titles 20, 21, and 23</i>	Amend the codes to specifically prohibit noise generating equipment from locating within the setback area.	Keeping noise generating equipment outside the setback would help attenuate noise. This would also make all four zoning codes consistent.	To Be Determined
B-14	Clarify School Mitigation for Short Plats and Large Lots <i>18.28.030 and 18.32.140</i>	Amend to specify mandatory mitigation for school impacts on short plats and large lot subdivisions.	Current language is silent on school mitigation. It is currently required by the County, but if challenged, may be not be legally defensible. This item would only apply to school districts where the county does not collect impact fees. These currently include Griffin, Rainier, Tenino and North Thurston school districts. North Thurston has requested the county amend the code to allow for the collection of impact fees.	To Be Determined

2018-19 PRELIMINARY DOCKET OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

	Proposal Title & Affected Code	Summary	Issues/Analysis	Estimated Project Time
B-15 2016-17 Preliminary Docket D-3	Yard Setbacks from Active Rail Lines and from Trails <i>All Zoning Codes</i>	Minimum building setbacks from rail lines are different depending on the front, side or rear designation. There are no required setbacks from trails.	For noise and safety concerns, the setback from an active railroad right of way should be consistent regardless of the front, rear or side yard designation. For trail preservation, there should be structure setbacks from the trail right-of-way.	To Be Determined
B-16 2016-17 Preliminary Docket D-4	Lot Size Measurements <i>Title 20 (Fig. 13)</i>	Amend figure to clarify dimensions of corner lots.	Title 20, Figure 13 is not clear and does not match the written text in TCC 20.07.070. Add 30' to describe "triangle leg" on plan view; add 2'6" and 7'6" length for total 10 foot horizontal plane on side view and perspective view.	To Be Determined