



GENERAL APPLICATION FORM

DECEMBER 2017
Revised 10/01/15

For Land Use Actions

Vern Gary Don Lynn
Harold Lisa Carmen

Yakima County Public Services

128 North Second Street · Fourth Floor Courthouse · Yakima, Washington 98901
(509) 574-2300 · 1-800 572-7354 · FAX (509) 574-2301 · www.co.yakima.wa.us

(Staff Use Only)

Zoning District: NA Date: 12/28/2017
 Receipt #: _____ Reviewed By: JHL
 Proposed Land Use: Development Regulation Text Amendment Project #: 6
 Case #(s): TXT 2017-00007

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY AND ATTACH THE APPROPRIATE SUPPLEMENTAL FORM(S)

- | <u>Zoning</u> | | <u>Subdivision</u> | <u>Shoreline</u> |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Type 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> Admin. Adjustment | <input type="checkbox"/> Exemption (SSE) | <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Substantial Dev. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Type 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> Variance | <input type="checkbox"/> Short Subdivision | <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Conditional Use |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Type 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> Modification | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision (Long) | <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Variance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Type 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Conforming Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Binding Site Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Exemption |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce Resource Setback | <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation | <input type="checkbox"/> Alteration/Vacation | <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Non-Conforming |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accessory Dwelling Unit | <input type="checkbox"/> Dairy | <input type="checkbox"/> *Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Minor Revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Rezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining | <input type="checkbox"/> Sub Variance | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Rezone | | | |
| <u>Other</u> | | <u>Critical Areas</u> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Checklist | <input type="checkbox"/> Plan/Dev. Reg. Map Ad. | <input type="checkbox"/> CA Standard Development | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal - HE <input type="checkbox"/> BOCC <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plan/Dev. Reg. Text Ad. | <input type="checkbox"/> CA Adjustment | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Development Agreement | | <input type="checkbox"/> CA Reasonable Use Except. | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> CA Minor Revision | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> CA Non-Conforming Use | |

Parcel Number(s): A. N/A B. _____ C. _____

Subject Property Address: N/A

Are you requesting the Optional Consolidated Permit Review Process as provided under YCC 16B.03.060? Yes No

* In accordance with YCC16B.04.020(2)(a) please submit verification with your Short Subdivision Amendment or Subdivision Amendment that the majority of those persons having an ownership interest in the lots, tracts, parcels, or portion thereof to be revised or altered has signed the proposed application.

Applicant Information: (Please check the box indication the primary contact person)

By signing this form, I hereby state as true that all ownership interests of the property have reviewed the proposal as presented in the application materials and support the proposed change(s) in land use and hereby give Yakima County permission to enter my property during the course of this review to inspect my property as needed. **Additionally, I hereby agree to pay all additional fees associated with the processing of this application including Hearing Examiner Fees, Transportation Fees or any other fees that may be associated with the proposed project.**

(If the property is owned by a corporation or LLC please attach documentation showing that the person signing has the authority to sign on behalf of the corporation or LLC.) **Please Fill Out In Blue or Black Ink and Original Signatures only.**

Property Owner: N/A
 Day Phone: () _____ Company (if any) _____
 Mailing Address: _____ City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____
 E-mail Address: _____
 Signature: _____ Date: _____

Applicant/Agent (if different): Thomas R. Durant
 Day Phone: () 248-4156 Company (if any) Durant Development Svc, Inc.
 Mailing Address: PO Box 1723 City: Yakima State: WA ZIP: 98907
 E-mail Address: _____
 Signature: Thomas R Durant Date: 12/28/2017
If there are additional owners, provide an attachment in the same format and with the same declarations



SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

(State Environmental Policy Act)

Submission Checklist

Yakima County Public Services
 128 North Second Street · Fourth Floor Courthouse · Yakima, Washington 98901
 (509) 574-2300 · 1-800 572-7354 · FAX (509) 574-2301 · www.co.yakima.wa.us

Public Services 619

Form # PLN ENR 003-SC-A
 Revised 4/1/10

APR 26 2018

Vern Matt Don Lynn
 Carmen

(For staff use only)

APPLICANT: <u>Durant Development Services, Inc.</u>	PROJECT #:
PHONE: <u>248-4156</u>	CASE #: <u>SEP18-22</u>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION (from application form): <u>Text Amendment</u> <u>of Y/C 19.18.320(1)</u>	PC/SPC:
	DATE SUBM: <u>4/26/18</u>

NOTE: Your application is not considered complete for processing until all applicable items have been submitted.

NOTE: It is recommended that construction plans not be submitted until after Planning permits are obtained since your permit may be denied or changes may be require to the construction plans, resulting in wasted or additional consultant and permit fee costs.


SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE 2

Required Items (supplied by applicant)	INTAKE STAFF COMMENTS (reviewed by Staff)	Intake Verification
1. Complete SEPA Application Form * Did the property owner of record sign? <u>YES</u> NO * Is there a contact phone number listed? <u>YES</u> NO	List other related applications (zoning, subdivision, etc.): <u>on General Application</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Completed Environmental Checklist • Are all questions answered? <u>YES</u> NO • Did the property owner of record sign? <u>YES</u> NO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Complete written description of the project.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Site Plan <u>N/A</u> • Are all Site Plan Requirements met? YES NO • Are all structures shown? (see air photos) YES NO • Are all Critical Areas present shown? YES NO • Have reproducible copies been provided? YES NO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Appropriate fees paid		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

By signing this form you are certifying that the above information is attached and accurate.

Landowner/Representative Signature: [Signature] Date: 4/25/18

NOTE: Representatives must be listed on the Application Form, with their signature.



SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

SUBMITTAL SUPPLEMENTAL

Form # PLN ENR 003-SS1-A
Revised: 8/12/14

Yakima County Public Services
128 North Second Street · Fourth Floor Courthouse · Yakima, Washington 98901
(509) 574-2300 · 1-800 572-7354 · FAX (509) 574-2301 · www.co.yakima.wa.us

WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

For nonproject proposals complete this checklist and the supplemental sheet for nonproject actions (Part D). The lead agency may exclude any question for the environmental elements (Part B) which they determine do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

(For Staff Use Only)

DATE: _____

REVIEWED BY: _____

PROJECT #: _____

CASE #: _____

RELATED FILES: _____

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

2. Name of applicant:

Durant Development Services, Inc.

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

**Thomas R Durant, Durant Development Services, Inc.
513 N. Front St, Suite Q, PO Box 1723, Yakima, WA 98907
(509) 248-4156**

4. Date checklist prepared:

April 25, 2018

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Yakima County

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

Text amendment adopted by the end of the year 2018

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Present and/or future clients may apply for mini-storage approvals on sites allowed by the proposed text amendments

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

Not aware of any.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

N/A.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

Adoption by the Board of County Commissioners on recommendation of the Planning Commission.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

Amendment of YCC 19.18.320(1) to limit its current restriction of the location of mini-storage facility development to certain zones. As now written, the code provision requires sites to be contiguous to arterial or collector arterial streets but does not require them to actually access those streets. Under this amendment, this requirement would not apply in the M-1 and M-2 zones. The application suggests that the County may want to also eliminate the restriction in the General Commercial zone. The Planning Commission has requested consideration of this change in other zoning districts in which mini-storage is allowed.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The amendment is not limited to a specific site. It would apply County-wide although as proposed it would be limited to areas zoned M-1 and M-2 or rezoned to these classifications in the future. Because of other restrictions in County Code, project proposals that result from the amendment would probably be limited to urban growth areas. Likewise, the General Commercial zone is only found in UGAs. If expanded to include other zones, it could apply to projects in the Rural 10/5, Rural Settlement and Highway Tourist Commercial zones, which do occur outside of UGAs.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other.....

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Steep slopes occur throughout the County. Mini-storage projects are generally developed on flat sites.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

A variety of soil types County-wide. Mini-storage projects could occur on prime agricultural soils but are not allowed in the Agricultural zone, which is agricultural land of long-term commercial significance as designated by Yakima County.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

N/A.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

N/A.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

N/A.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

N/A.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

N/A.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

N/A.

b. Are there any offsite sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

N/A.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

N/A.

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

There are surface water bodies throughout the County.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

Mini-storage development could occur within 200 feet of water bodies. There is no change in the applicability or requirements of the Shoreline Management Act or critical areas ordinance as a result of this proposal.

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

N/A.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

N/A.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year flood plain? If so, note location on the site plan.

Mini-storage development could occur in 100-year flood plain areas. There is no change in the regulatory requirements for development in flood hazard areas as a result of this proposal.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

N/A.

b. Ground:

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well? Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

N/A.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

N/A.

c. Water runoff (including storm water):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

N/A.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

N/A

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

N/A

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

N/A

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- Deciduous tree: Alder, maple, aspen, other
- Evergreen tree: Fir, cedar, pine, other
- Shrubs
- Grass
- Pasture
- Crop or grain
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- Wet soil plants: Cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- Water plants: Water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- Other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

N/A

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

N/A

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

N/A

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

N/A

5. Animals

a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include:

Birds: Hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

Mammals: Deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

Fish: Bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

N/A

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

N/A

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

N/A

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

N/A

6. Energy and natural resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

N/A

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

N/A

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

N/A

7. Environmental health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

N/A

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

N/A

2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

N/A

3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

N/A

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

N/A

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

N/A

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

N/A

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

N/A

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

N/A

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

As proposed, the amendment would apply to M-1 and M-2 zones which would usually be in industrial use, although it could be in areas that are in transition and have other pre-existing land uses and there could be other nearby zoning districts. If expanded to include GC zones, the same characteristics would apply except that they would generally be commercial rather than industrial. Other zones in which mini-storage is permitted include certain residential and rural zones.

The assumption being made is that the current standard, requiring mini-storage projects to be on sites that have frontage on, but not necessarily access to collector or arterial streets was intended to protect neighborhoods by limiting these developments to areas on the edges as defined by major streets. It is not believed that these developments pose substantial impacts on industrial areas because they are generally compatible with land uses in those zones. The same is true in commercially zoned areas. It is for this reason that the amendment as proposed is not believed to adverse compatibility impacts. If expanded to zoning districts in which residential is a primary use, other measures such as sitescreening may be appropriate.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

Because mini-storage projects are not permitted in the Agricultural or Forest Watershed zones, and it is not a land use for which a rezone to M-1 or M-2 can be made outside of urban growth areas, little if any conversion of agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance would be expected. It is possible that sites with current use tax status could be converted to this use, although the extent to which that would occur as a result of this amendment as opposed to what could occur under current code provisions is probably minimal.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

No.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

N/A.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

N/A.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The proposal is limited to the M-1 and M-2 zoning districts, although it could be expanded to include the GC zoning district by the Planning Commission or the other zones in which mini-storage is allowed including Rural 10/5, Rural Settlement, HTC, R-3 and B-2.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Any plan designation in which M-1 and M-2 zoning is allowed, usually Industrial. The other zoning districts in which mini-storage can be allowed are in areas with commercial, residential, Rural Settlement and Rural Self-Sufficient plan designations.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Shoreline areas could be included, if properly zoned. Most likely master program designation would be Urban.

h. Has any part of the site been classified critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

There are critical areas in some of the Industrially zoned areas

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

N/A.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None, by this amendment.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

None.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

No plan policies have been identified with which this proposal would conflict. Plan policies that encourage transition from more to less intensive land uses in residential areas would not apply to the M-1 and M-2 zones. Policies to limit traffic generated by some land uses to collector and arterial streets would not apply because the standard proposed for modification only requires frontage on, not access to these streets.

Compatibility with existing land use would be evaluated on a project by project basis, but in the industrial zones, there is nothing inherent to this proposal that would result in significant land use impacts.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

None proposed. Significant impacts on agricultural or forest lands of long-term commercial significance are not expected.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

N/A.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

N/A.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

N/A.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

N/A.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

N/A.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

N/A.

11. Light and glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

N/A.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

N/A.

c. What existing offsite sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

N/A.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

N/A.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

N/A.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

N/A.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

N/A.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.

N/A.

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation. This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Is there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

N/A.

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

N/A.

d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

N/A.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

Under current code provisions, mini-storage development sites must have frontage on arterial and collector streets but they do not require them to have access to those streets. For this reason, the amendment should have no substantial effect on transportation.

b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

N/A.

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or nonproject proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

N/A.

d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

N/A.

e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

N/A.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

N/A.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

N/A.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

See response to 14.a. above.

15. Public services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: Fire protection, police protection, public transit health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

N/A.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

N/A.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: Electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

N/A.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

N/A.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: Thomas R. Quinn

Date Submitted: April 25, 2018

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

It is not expected to have any effect.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

None.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

It is not expected to have any effect.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

None.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

It is not expected to have any effect.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

None.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, flood plains, or prime farmlands?

Since mini-storage is not a land-use for which an industrial rezone can be made outside of urban growth areas, the amendment would not be expected to have any substantial effect on agricultural land of long-term commercial significance. To the extent that the use could be allowed in such areas, the amendment would only increase the potential for sites that don't front on arterial or collector roads. Areas with prime farmlands could be developed for such use if zoned to allow it, but this amendment should not significantly increase that potential from what it is now. The same is true for areas such as floodplains, critical areas and historic and cultural sites.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

None.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed amendment allows some parcels to be developed for mini-storage that would not be allowed under current code provisions but in a manner that is generally consistent with land uses permitted by the underlying zoning.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

None.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

It is not expected to have any effect.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

None.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

No known conflicts.

Detailed Narrative

The proposed text amendment would limit the current requirement of YCC 19.18.320(1) to certain zoning districts, specifically by eliminating it in the M-1 and M-2 zones. The current code provision restricts mini-storage facilities to locations that are contiguous to arterial or collector streets but does not require them to actually access those streets. The basis for the request is that, while this standard may be applicable to those residential and rural zoning districts in which mini-storage may be allowed, it is not to industrial zones. The Planning Commission may want to consider also excluding commercial zoning districts, since the same justification may apply to them as well. However, we are representing a developer with industrially zoned property who does not have a specific interest in its effect on other zoning districts and will leave that determination to the County as to whether additional zones should be included. This application is being made on a County-wide basis, because justification for the amendment applies uniformly to all areas and should not be influenced one way or the other by specific characteristics of a given location.

The standard, that mini-storage facilities are to be located contiguous to major (arterial or collector) streets, but are not required to access them, is not based on any specific comprehensive plan policy or regulatory intent statement that we can identify, although it does appear to be consistent with certain comprehensive plan policies for multiple-family residential development and zoning. It is assumed that since mini-storage can be allowed in some residential and rural zoning districts, the purpose of the standard is to restrict it to the edges of residential neighborhoods, in which arterial and collector streets tend to act as neighborhood boundaries. If mini-storage development was then required to access those major streets, it could be assumed that the standard is also intended to keep non-residential traffic off of residential streets; there are comprehensive plan policies that support this. But this is not the case, so it appears that the sole purpose is to not allow the location of these non-residential facilities in the middle of a neighborhood.

None of this would apply to an industrial "neighborhood," because mini-storage is similar to and substantially compatible with other industrial land uses. The same argument could probably be made in most, if not all commercial areas. Since there is no useful purpose in imposing the requirement in industrial zones, the text amendment is being proposed.

- 1. A detailed description of what is proposed to be changed. Please site the specific text and provide a copy of the suggested edits. Edits must be shown in strikethrough and underline format.**

The detailed description is provided in the above introduction.

19.18.320 Mini Storage Facilities

- (1) Mini storage facilities as defined in Section 19.01.070, shall be subject to the following minimum requirements:
 - (a) Location. In all zoning districts except for M-1 and M-2, ~~The site is shall be~~ contiguous to a designated arterial or rural collector road, although access may or

may not be directly onto such arterial or collector, as determined through the review process;

2. Explain why the development regulation text amendment is needed. What public land use issue or problem is resolved by the proposed amendment?

As it is currently, the regulatory requirement prevents the location of mini-storage facilities in certain locations where they would not pose adverse impacts on surrounding land uses. There is currently substantial demand for these facilities, based on high occupancy rates, and a number of new facilities being proposed and constructed. From a land use compatibility standpoint, all other things being equal, a site in an industrial zone that is not contiguous to an arterial or collector street is preferable to a site in a residential zone that is. The public purpose then, is to make more locations that have preferable characteristics available to future demand.

3. Explain how the proposed amendment is consistent with the goals of the Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.020) as amended.

The proposed amendment is either consistent with or has no effect on most of the thirteen goals of RCW 36.70A.020. The effects, whether positive or negative, are minor and incremental. Consistency is summarized as follows:

Reduce Sprawl (Goal #2): It should be positive to the extent that it makes more non-residential land available for this use, reducing the need for residential land in outlying areas.

Housing (Goal #4): Similarly, increasing available sites in non-residential areas could keep more land available for housing, reducing demand and associated costs.

Economic Development and Property Rights (Goals #5 and #6): Reducing regulatory constrictions is positive to both of these goals.

Natural Resource Industries (Goal #7): This is the only goal for which there might be any inconsistency since industrial zoning is allowed outside of urban growth areas and to the extent that this amendment might allow development of this type on internal properties in such areas. However, the potential for this inconsistency is minimal, if at all, because of the required standards for establishing an industrial zoning district outside of an UGA. Mini-storage is not one of the land uses for which such a zone change can be made, therefore, if it were allowed at all, it would be limited to a location already zoned and available for non-resource use.

Environment (Goal #10): The potential neighborhood (environmental) impact of allowing mini-storage anywhere in a residential area is greater (all other factors being equal) than allowing it in an industrial zone, whether or not it is contiguous to a collector or arterial street.

Citizen Participation and Coordination (Goal #11): If it is true that there is a greater neighborhood impact in a residential area, a greater potential for citizen opposition should also be expected in those areas.

4. A statement of how the proposed text amendment complies with or supports the Comprehensive Plan's goals and/or any applicable County-Wide Planning Policies.

There are a number of goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan that deal with location of development in relation to major (arterial and collector) streets and access to them. However, the proposed text amendment is not inconsistent with any of them, because they are specific to residential neighborhoods as opposed to non-residential neighborhoods and as currently written, the code provision proposed for amendment does not require access to major streets, which is a consideration in some of these policies. The proposed amendment supports policies for industrial development.

Policies YKLU-U 1.1 and 1.2 prescribe high density residential development as a transitional use between commercial and medium density residential with development located along arterials and collector streets. Likewise, Policies YKLU-U 8.1 and 8.2 state that commercial development should avoid encroachment into residential areas and encourage transitional development. Policy YKLU-U 13.7 encourages "Transitional Zoning," placing higher density residential zones between single family residential and commercial areas. These policies might support the current code standard with respect to mini-storage being permitted in the R-3, high density residential zone, but it does not support it in industrial zones, which are not appropriate as transitional areas between commercial and residential.

Goal YKLU-U 9 and Policy YKLU-U 9.1 require commercial uses and services that are heavily dependent on convenient vehicle access to be located on major travel routes. These uses include fast food services, auto oriented services and other commercial services. They would not include mini-storage because, while convenient access is important, it is not heavily dependent on it. It does not generate high traffic volumes and it is not highly competitive with other businesses for visibility in the same manner as fast food restaurants or convenience stores. Moreover, if the code standard proposed for amendment was intended to be consistent with this policy it would have required access to, not just frontage on, major travel routes.

Other policies that encourage or require development to access major roads include institutions (Policy YKLU-U 15.3) so as not to increase traffic on residential streets and schools (Policy YKLU-U 16.2) on the periphery of residential neighborhoods. All of these policies demonstrate that the concern with respect to location of non-residential land uses is to keep their traffic off of residential streets and to provide a transition from lower density residential and non-residential areas. None of these policies are applicable to sites in industrial zoning districts.

Policies specific to industrial areas include Policies YKLU-U 14.1 through 14.6. They encourage the location of industries in locations with *adequate* access (emphasis added) and

in areas that take advantage of access to the major highways, airport and rail facilities. These policies give no indication of needing industrial uses to have direct frontage on major roads. Policy YKLU 14.1 indicates that access only need be adequate.

Policies YKLU-U 14.3 and 14.5 encourage infill and the efficient utilization of vacant land within areas *designated for industrial use* and that new storage, warehousing and industrial development should be located in clusters with existing development (emphasis added). The current code requirement preventing the development of appropriately zoned properties because they lack frontage on arterial or collector streets should be considered inconsistent with these plan policies. Policy YKLU-U 14.6 describes various ways that industrial development should mitigate impacts and ensure that they do not adversely affect residential areas but requiring frontage, without access to a major street, is not specifically required, and should not be considered necessary, except on a case by case basis, and it could be required where it is.

5. Will the proposed amendment affect lands designated as resource lands of long term commercial significance and/or critical areas? If so, how will the proposed amendment impact these areas?

Although industrial zoning districts are sometimes allowed in agricultural, forest and mineral resource lands of long term commercial significance, the amendment should not significantly affect them because industrial rezoning in these areas is usually not permitted for this type of land use under State siting criteria (Comprehensive Plan Policy ED 3.14). To the extent that it could be, the proposed amendment has no effect on how the siting criteria are applied and is not itself inconsistent with them. If allowed at all in a resource area, it would likely be on a site that has already been rezoned and therefore committed to non-resource use.

There is no effect on critical areas.

6. Explain how the proposed change would serve the interests of the public as a whole, including health, safety and welfare.

- a. There is no useful purpose in imposing this requirement in non-residential areas.
- b. The proposed amendment serves the public interest in that it makes more locations that have preferable characteristics available to future demand.
- c. It makes more non-residential land available for this use, reducing the need for residential land in more outlying areas keeping more land available for housing, reducing demand and associated housing costs.
- d. It supports Comprehensive Plan policies for industrial use that encourage infill and the efficient utilization of vacant land within industrial designated areas.

19.18.320 Mini Storage Facilities

(1) Mini storage facilities as defined in Section 19.01.070, shall be subject to the following minimum requirements:

- (a) Location. In all zoning districts except for M-1 and M-2, ~~t~~The site is shall be contiguous to a designated arterial or rural collector road, although access may or may not be directly onto such arterial or collector, as determined through the review process;