

## **KING COUNTY**

## Signature Report

May 16, 2000

## 1200 King County Courthouse 516 Third Avenue Seattle, WA 98104

## Ordinance 13851

	Proposed No.	2000-0185.2	Sponso	)rs	Sullivan
1		AN ORDINANCE	relating to zoning;	; ou	tlining phasing
2	<u>ل</u> تاريخ	requirements relativ	ve to mixed (reside	entia	al/commercial)
3		use developments;	and adding a new s	sect	tion to K.C.C.
4		chapter 21A.14.			
5		*			
6					
7	STAT	EMENT OF FACTS	:		
8	1. Bef	ore the adoption of	he current zoning	coc	le, K.C.C. Title 21A,
9	King C	County had two mixe	ed use zones within	n th	e former zoning code,
10	K.C.C	. Title 21. The two	zones were the bus	sine	ss residential -
11	neighb	orhood scale (BR-N	) zone and busines	ss r	esidential - community
12	scale z	one (BR-C).			
13	2. In t	he former zoning co	de, K.C.C. Title 2	1, t	hese two mixed use
14	zones	required both the res	idential and comn	nerc	cial component to be
15	housed	l in one structure an	d to utilize a vertic	al c	configuration; that is, the
16	resider	ntial component of t	he project was to b	e lo	ocated above the
17	comm	ercial component.	s.		
18	3. The	e code was silent on	the issue of wheth	er c	commercial had to

19	precede the residential because the required vertical configuration had
20	the de facto effect of making the structure contain both residential and
21	commercial components from the beginning.
22	4. During the development of the current zoning code, K.C.C. Title 21A,
23	the council considered several factors that made the mixed use zones of
24	the former zoning code unfeasible and that resulted in parcels with
25	mixed use zoning remaining undeveloped.
26	5. The council determined that while the vertical configuration may be
27	workable in densely developed urban cores, a horizontal configuration,
28	allowing the two components of a mixed use development to be
29	developed separately on the same site, was often more appropriate in less
30	densely developed urban areas.
31	6. Furthermore, the council determined that the low percentage of
32	residential use worked against providing the critical mass of residential
33	density that is needed for the financial feasibility of such a development.
34	The council recognized that market conditions would dictate which
35	component would be most feasible to developed first and concluded that
36	phasing should not be pre-judged in the code.
37	7. In reviewing possible solutions to the mixed use dilemma, the council
38	weighed the options against the key goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
39	Two of these goals were to improve housing affordability and increase
40	the financial viability of our commercial lands. The council looked to
41	mixed used projects as one way of achieving these goals.

42	8. Mixed-use projects, which often develop at higher densities, provide
43	additional opportunities for moderately priced housing. The higher
44	residential density has the added effect of creating the market demand
45	that is a key requirement for commercial viability.
46	9. To that end, the council sought to eliminate the provisions of the old
47	code, K.C.C. Title 21, that were barriers to mixed use development and
48	adopted a code that:
49	a. Broadens the mixed use concept to allow mixed use of a site,
50	which is horizontal configuration, as well as the more traditional
51	vertical configuration,
52	b. Sets a percentage limit for residential use to ensure that the
53	entire site or structure could not be used totally for residential
54	purposes, yet remains silent and neutral on the issue of whether
55	commercial component had to precede the residential component.
56	c. Allows a higher percentage of residential use in order to
57	increase housing affordability; and
58	d. Improves commercial viability by allowing higher residential
59	densities that create market demand and compensate for the
60	additional cost of health and safety requirements associated with
61	residential use.
62	10. The department would be in error in requiring that the commercial
63	component be built prior to or at the same time as the residential
64	component and that such a requirement has no basis in code.

65 11. This ordinance clarifies council intent and existing code provisions
66 relative to mixed use developments.

67 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

68 <u>NEW SECTION. SECTION 1.</u> There is hereby added to K.C.C. chapter 21A.14 69 a new section to read as follows:

Mixed use development - phasing. When residential and commercial uses are proposed to be contained in separate structures and the structures containing residential uses are proposed to be built prior to those containing commercial uses, then a commercial site development permit shall be required and as well as the following:

A. The applicant shall submit a site plan showing the entire mixed use development. The plan shall show project features including the location of the residential and commercial structures, parking areas, landscaping planters, sidewalks, and pedestrian linkages. The plan shall be drawn to scale and provide sufficient detail to ensure all zoning and development standards are met for the entire development.

B. Infrastructure plans, including storm drainage facilities, shall be sized to
accommodate the needs of the entire mixed use development. The infrastructure shall be
installed with the first phase of the development up to or near the commercial building(s)
unless the applicant demonstrates to the department's satisfaction that there is potential
for significant damage to the infrastructure during the construction of any later phase of
construction.

C. For the purpose of informing future property owners of limitations on future development because of the mixed use provisions of this title, the applicant shall record a covenant on the property that states the restrictions upon the remaining portions of the

88	site that they shall only be used for commercial uses. The covenant shall be recorded
89	prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residential structure(s). The covenant
90	shall be subject to review and approval by the department.
91	
92	SECTION 2. Pursuant to King County Code section 20.44.080, the Metropolitan
93	King County Council finds that the requirements for environmental analysis, protections
94	and mitigation measures in the chapter of King County Code Title 21A amended by this
95	ordinance, provide adequate analysis of and mitigation for the specific adverse

environmental impacts to which the requirements apply. 96

97

98

Ordinance 13851 was introduced on 3/6/00 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 5/15/00, by the following vote:

> Yes: 12 - Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Miller, Ms. Fimia, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Pelz, Mr. McKenna, Ms. Sullivan, Mr. Nickels, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Mr. Vance and Mr. Irons No: 1 - Mr. Pullen Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL IGTON UNT

Pete von Reichbauer, Chair

ATTEST:

NAN

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council APPROVED this  $\alpha^{\prime}$ , 2000. day of

is

Ron Sims, County Executive

Attachments

None