

ORDINANCE NO. 2249

1
2 AN ORDINANCE applying the Zoning Code, Resolution No. 25789,
3 K.C.C. TITLE 21 to land in the eastern portion of King County known
4 as Selleck, Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester, Friday
5 Creek and adjacent wilderness area and repealing Resolution No. 18801
6 for those same lands.

7
8 PREAMBLE: In 1964, the County adopted a new Comprehensive Plan
9 and started adopting official zoning maps in June, 1965, under a new
10 zoning ordinance, text of which was adopted May 15, 1963. Western
11 King County is now regulated by the new zoning code. To reclassify
12 Eastern King County, it was divided into seven study areas;
13 (1) Enumclaw, (2) Maple Valley, (3) Lower Snoqualmie, (4) North
14 Bend, (5) Snoqualmie Pass, (6) Upper Skykomish Valley, and
15 (7) Selleck, Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester,
16 Friday Creek and adjacent wilderness area.

17 The report on characteristics and issues and the Environmental
18 Development Commission's final report for each of these study areas
19 was developed by both the Division of Land Use Management and the
20 Land Use Committee of the Environmental Development Commission
21 through meetings with area residents and property owners. The
22 zoning maps described below is the Environmental Development
23 Commission's recommendation for zoning under Resolution 25789,
24 K.C.C. TITLE 21 as prescribed in Section 2, Article 4 of Ordinance
25 No. 00263 and K.C.C. 20.20.020.

26 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

27 SECTION 1. Previously adopted zoning for the areas described under Section
28 2 herein also known as Selleck, Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester,
29 Friday Creek, Snoqualmie Pass and adjacent wilderness area under King County
30 Resolution No. 18801 is hereby repealed.

31 SECTION 2. NEW SECTION. The zoning maps attached hereto for the area
32 described below are hereby adopted pursuant to the provisions of King County
33 Resolution No. 25789, K.C.C. TITLE 21 and County Ordinance No. 00263, K.C.C.
TITLE 20, for that portion of unincorporated King County described as follows:

A. SELLECK, KANGLEY, KANASKAT, PALMER, CUMBERLAND, LESTER,
FRIDAY CREEK AND ADJACENT WILDERNESS STUDY AREA: Sections 1, 2,

11, 12, 13, and 24; T 26N, R 7E;

T 26N, R 8E; T 26N, R 9E;

Sections 4 through 9 inclusive and 14 through 36 inclusive; T 26N, R 10E;

Sections 1 through 6 inclusive; 8 through 14 inclusive; and, 24, 30, 31 and 32;

T 26N, R 11E;

1 Substitute
Ordinance No. _____

2 Sections 1 through 24 inclusive, T 26N, R 12E;

3 Sections 2 through 11 inclusive, T 26N, R 13E;

4 T 25N, R 8E; T 25N, R 9E; T 25N, R 10E; T 25N, R 11E; T 25N, R 12E; T 25N,
5 R 13E;

6 T 24-1/2N, R 11E; T 24-1/2N, R 12E; T 24-1/2N, R 13E; T 24-1/2N, R 14E;

7 Sections 1 through 18 inclusive, 20 through 29 inclusive, 32 through 36
8 inclusive, T 24N, R 9E;

9 T 24N, R 10E; T 24N, R 11E; T 24N, R 12E; T 24N, R 13E; T 24N, R 14E;

10 Sections 5 through 9 inclusive, 11 through 36 inclusive, T 23N, R 7E;

11 Sections 7, 17 through 21 inclusive, 28 through 36 inclusive, T 23N, R 8E;

12 Sections 1 through 5 inclusive, E 1/2 6, E 1/2 7, 8 through 17 inclusive,
13 E 1/2 18, 20 through 26 inclusive, 31 and 32, T 23N, R 9E;

14 T 23N, R 10E;

15 Sections 1 through 24 inclusive, 30 and 31, T 23N, R 11E;

16 T 23N, R 12E;

17 Section 1 through 4 inclusive; section 5 less the south 1/2 of the south 1/2;
18 section 8, less the west 1/2 of the northwest 1/4 and also less the west 3/4 of the
19 northwest 1/4 of the southwest 1/4; section 9 through 17 inclusive; section 18, less
20 the north 1/2 of the northeast 1/4 and also less the northwest 1/4; section 19 through
21 28 inclusive; section 33 through 36 inclusive; all in T 22N, R 7E;

22 T 22N, R 8E;

23 Sections 3 through 36 inclusive, T 22N, R 9E;

24 Sections 1 through 5 inclusive, 18 through 36 inclusive, T 22N, R 10E;

25 Section 19, 20, 29, 30, 31 and 32, T 22N, R 11E;

26 The east 2/3 of T 21N, R 7E; T 21N, R 8E; T 21N, R 9E; T 21N, R 10E; T 21N,
27 R 11E;

28 The east 2/3 of T 20N, R 7E; T 20N, R 8E; T 20N, R 9E; T 20N, R 10E; T 20N,
29 R 11E; T 20N, R 12E;

30 The east 2/3 of T 19N, R 7E; T 19N, R 8E; T 19N, R 9E; T 19N, R 10E; T 19N,

1 Substitute
Ordinance No. _____

2 R 11E; T 19N, R 12E.

3 B. SNOQUALMIE PASS AREA: The East 1/2 sections 19, 27, 28, 29, East 1/2
4 Sections 30 and 33 through 36 inclusive, T 23N, R 9E. Less County and State roads;

5 Sections 26 through 29 inclusive, 32, 33 and 34, T 23N, R 11E. Less County
6 and state roads. Also less that portion lying within Kittitas County;

7 Sections 1 and 2, T 22N, R 9E. Less County and State roads;

8 Sections 6 through 17 inclusive, T 22N, R 10E. Less County and State roads;

9 Sections 4 through 9 inclusive and 17 and 18, T 22N, R 11E, Less County and
10 State roads. Also less that portion lying within Kittitas County.
11

12 For purposes of identification, each of the maps for the above described area
13 is numbered. For example, E 1/2 T 20N, R 6E shall mean the East 1/2 of Township
14 20 North, Range 6 East, W.M.
15

16 SECTION 3. NEW SECTION. The Area Zoning Guidelines for the Selleck,
17 Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester, Friday Creek; Snoqualmie Pass
18 and adjacent Wilderness area are attached and hereby adopted pursuant to the
19 provisions of Article 4, Section 2 of Ordinance No. 00263 and K.C.C. 20.20.020.
20

21 INTRODUCED AND READ for the first time this 4th day

22 of February, 1974

23 PASSED at a regular meeting of the King County Council this 16th day

24 of December, 1974

25 KING COUNTY COUNCIL
26 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

27 THOMAS M. FORSYTHE

28 Chairman

29 ATTEST:

30 DOROTHY M. OWENS

31 Clerk of the Council

32 APPROVED this 19th day of December, 1974

33 JOHN D. SPELLMAN

King County Executive

AREA ZONING GUIDELINES FOR THE
SELLECK, KANGLEY, KANASKAT, PALMER, CUMBERLAND
LESTER, FRIDAY CREEK, AND ADJACENT WILDERNESS
STUDY AREA

This document represents the area zoning guidelines adopted by ordinance as prescribed in Article 4, Section 2(b) of Ordinance No. 00263 and K.C.C. 20.20.020(b) and is the official County policy when considering reclassification requests in the area.

DEFINITIONS

1. The term "area zoning" is defined in the King County Ordinance, No. 00263, as follows:

"SECTION 3. 'Area Zoning' as used in this ordinance is synonymous with the terms of 'rezoning or original zoning' as used in the King County Charter and means: The procedures initiated by King County which result in the adoption or amendment of zoning maps on an area-wide basis. This type of zoning is characterized by being comprehensive in nature, deals with natural homogeneous communities, distinctive geographic areas and other types of districts having unified interests within the County. Area zoning, unlike a reclassification, usually involves many separate properties under various ownerships and utilizes several of the zoning classifications available to express the County's current land use policy in zoning map form."

2. Study Area Boundaries:

The northern, eastern, and southern boundaries of the study area are contiguous with the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of King County. The area is bounded on the west by an arbitrary line in the vicinity of Ranges 7E and 8E. Within these general boundaries portions of the North Bend, Snoqualmie Pass Corridor, and Skykomish Valley areas have been excluded.

The boundaries are more precisely described in the attached maps.

3. The title "Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Map", designates the map shown at a second community meeting held June 28, 1972, at Tahoma Senior High School in Maple Valley.

4. The title "Proposed Zoning Guideline Map," refers to the map which has undergone further refinement by the E.D.C. team and Planning staff, including review of questionnaires and correspondence received during or following showing of the maps as described in Paragraph 3 above.

BACKGROUND

The East County Area Zoning Program was begun early in 1972. Its purpose is to concentrate the area zoning efforts of the E.D.C. and the Division of Land Use Management toward that portion of the County which is still regulated by the Old Zoning Code, Resolution No. 18801.

In 1964, the County adopted a Comprehensive Plan, and the New Zoning Code, Resolution No. 25789, was enacted to implement that Plan. One of the provisions of this new code was that it would replace the old code on an area-by-area basis as new zoning maps were prepared for adoption. The more urbanized western portion of the County has since been zoned under the New Code through the area zoning process.

The Selleck, Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester, Friday Creek and Adjacent Wilderness Study Area is the final area to be studied in the program, and is the seventh to be submitted to the King County Council for consideration.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. It was assumed at the outset of the East County Area Zoning Program that the application of the New Code would involve a greater degree of zoning control in the rural and mountainous areas of the County than has heretofore existed since the Old Code sought minimum control through a simple, broad residential classification.

Considerable responsibility for recommending land use policy would rest with the E.D.C. Study Teams assigned to each area. The Study Teams would be responsible for communicating with land owners and for gaining understanding of the land use problems of the area.

2. It was also assumed there would be no modifications in the text of the New Code to fit specific problems encountered during the Area Zoning Program.

Exceptions were made to this general rule where code changes were already contemplated: the Flood and Slide Overzones and the removal of quarrying and mining as an outright use in the Forestry and Recreation (F-R) classification. This latter change has now been accomplished.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Study Process

The official tax rolls of King County were used for property owner notification within the seven study areas which comprised the East County Zoning Program. About 18,000 public notices were mailed to East King County area residents and property owners on March 8, 1972.

The official notice included a detailed letter of explanation as to why the Area Studies were being conducted, what was expected to be accomplished as a result of the studies, and the procedures to be followed. The notice included a map which outlined each study area, as well as the schedule and location of meetings and displays.

The initial E.D.C. Team meeting to review the preliminary draft of the report on the natural characteristics and zoning issues of the study area was held in the Division of Land Use Management office on May 26, 1972.

A preview display of the natural determinant and other maps was held from June 2, to June 6, 1972, in the Division of Land Use Management Office. Copies of the report on the area's characteristics and zoning issues were also distributed at that time. The preview was designed to provide area residents with an opportunity to review the information presented by the maps and the report so that those attending the subsequent community meeting could be well informed.

The initial community meeting was held on June 6, 1972, in Room E-139 of the County Court House. Approximately 60 persons attended that meeting to discuss community issues.

The Division of Land Use Management staff members made a brief presentation on the natural characteristics of the area, such as soil conditions and surficial geology, and existing zoning, land uses and structures. Discussion topic notebooks were provided so participants could record comments to be returned at the end of the meeting or to be mailed to the Division of Land Use Management. About 40 such notebooks were returned. A majority of the persons attending indicated that the preliminary evaluation of the study area lacked adequate recognition of the study area's residents and communities.

At the request of area residents, an informational meeting was held in the Cumberland Fire Hall on June 14, 1972.

Division of Land Use Management staff attended that meeting to hear concerns and objections of approximately 350 area residents.

The Study Team met on June 20, 1972, to review comments previously submitted by residents of the area. On June 25, 1972, the Team toured the Cumberland, Palmer and Kanaskat community areas guided by local residents.

Division of Land Use Management staff developed, for public review, the Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Map. The Study Team then held an additional community meeting at the Tahoma High School on June 28, 1972, to present this map and other supporting documents. At that meeting, some 250 citizens attending were divided, according to areas of geographic interest, into individual discussion groups to evaluate and comment on the Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Maps. Each of the discussion groups were led by two E.D.C. Study Team members with staff support.

On October 5, 1972, the Study Team reviewed questionnaires and letters submitted regarding suggested changes in the Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Map, and approved a Proposed Zoning Guideline Map for submission to the Land Use Committee.

2. Supporting Documents

The following material provided much of the technical data needed to analyze the Selleck, Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester, Friday Creek, and Adjacent Wilderness Study Area:

- Patent Mining Claims Map
- Generalized Life Zone Map
- Surficial Geology Map
- Land Ownership Map
- Existing Land Use Map
- "Forests, Mountains and Watersheds - A Report on Characteristics and Issues," published June, 1972
- Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Map
- Proposed Zoning Guideline Map

The King County Zoning Code, Title 21, enacted by Resolution No. 25789 established the following zone titles and abbreviations.

RS	Single-Family Dwelling Classification; (Three (3) Area Districts Establishing Lot Minimum Area of Fifteen Thousand (15,000); Ninety-Six Hundred (9,600); and Seventy-Two Hundred (7,200) square feet.
RD-3,600	Two-Family (Duplex) Dwelling Classification
RM-2,400	Medium Density Multiple Dwelling Classification
RM-1,800	High Density Multiple Dwelling Classification
RM-900	Maximum Density Multiple Dwelling Restricted Service Classification
S-E	Suburban Estate Classification
S-R	Suburban Residential Classification
A	Agricultural Classification
G	General Classification
B-N	Neighborhood Business Classification
B-C	Community Business Classification
C-G	General Commercial Classification
M-L	Light Manufacturing Classification
M-P	Manufacturing Park Classification
M-H	Heavy Manufacturing Classification
F-R	Forestry and Recreation Classification
F-P	Flood Plain Classification
Q-M	Quarrying and Mining Classification

Potential Areas enclosed with a heavy dashed line on the zoning map indicate potential zones as provided in Section 24.46.060 and .070.

ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS

The complexity of physical factors has provided this area with a variety of social and economic values which should be recognized in the classification of land uses. The Study Area produces vast amounts of timber. Some places are highly mineralized and large portions have been set aside as municipal watersheds. Large portions manifest significant recreational values.

ZONING ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS

Overriding issues in the Study Area were the necessity of the County to recognize existing communities within the Study Area, and the desire of many of the residents of those communities for the government to exercise only minimal land use regulation powers.

Except for the areas containing existing communities, the major portion of the Study Area including most of the area east of Range 7E is proposed to be classified Forest-Recreation. This classification will recognize existing land use as well as protect an important economic base of King County. It will allow the development of forest land for sustained timber production and the development of compatible uses.

The remaining areas were assigned the following classifications:

1. General (G): The diverse needs of the citizens of the communities lying generally in the southwest portion of the Study Area must be recognized. Therefore, most of the land in the Range 7E portion of the Study Area is proposed to be classified G. This classification is typically used in areas which are generally undeveloped and which are not yet subjected to urban development pressures. The General Classification is a low-density holding zone and is used for areas having a long-range potential for urban density residential development. It prevents improper location and intrusion of business and industrial uses in the area, while minimizing governmental interference with the private pursuits and livelihoods of the citizens.
 2. Quarrying and Mining (Q-M): Within that large block of F-R classified land, three large parcels have been recognized as established and continuing quarrying and mining areas. Those areas are generally located in the vicinity of the northwest 1/4 of Section 15, Township 20, Range 10E and the east 1/2 of southeast 1/4 of Section 9 Township 20, Range 10E, both northwest of Lester; and in the vicinity of the southwest 1/4 of Section 9, Township 24, Range 10E, located in the north central portion of the Study Area.
-

The Q-M land use classification of those limited areas will enable the continued development of known deposits of minerals and materials, and will allow for the necessary processing of such minerals and materials.

Also, Q-M Classification of those clay deposits located generally along the south portion of Section 34, Township 22, Range 7E, and the northern portion of Section 3, Township 21, Range 7E, just west of the Kanaskat-Kangley Road, will support a distinctive community economic activity.

3. Community Business (B-C): Existing centers of community business activity have been proposed as B-C zoning in order to permit a full range of community services. Such centers exist at Friday Creek, Cumberland, Kanaskat, Kangley and Greenwater.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES AND
PROPOSED AREA ZONING GUIDELINES

Questionnaires returned following community meetings and displays were considered in Committee discussion of alternatives to the guidelines. On October 5, 1972, the Study Team considered community responses and advice from the staff in preparing Proposed Area Zoning Guidelines. Issues specifically considered were the following:

ISSUE A. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE AREA PROPOSED FOR THE
GENERAL CLASSIFICATION

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-B-5	Burlington Northern, Inc. 650 Central Building Seattle, WA 98104	F-R and Q-M
FW-B-6	Mr & Mrs. William Brown Box 171 Selleck, WA 98064	Agriculture
FW-B-8	Mrs. Mary Brown Box 171 Selleck, WA 98064	Agriculture or General
FW-D-2	Fred J. Davies P.O. Box 95 Selleck, WA 98064	Agriculture
FW-G-4	Mrs. Albert Gregovich P.O. Box 154 Selleck, WA 98064	General or S-R

FW-H-9	Harold Hobi & James W. Coutts P.O. Box 56 Cumberland, WA 98015	Residential
FW-Mc-2	Mr. & Mrs. Howard F. McKee P.O. Box 57 Cumberland, WA 98015	RA or S-R
FW-Z-1	Mr. & Mrs. Clark J. Zahn 19451 Lake Francis Road Maple Valley, WA 98038	S-E
FW-N/N-1	No Name Submitted	Residential/ Agriculture

CONCLUSION

The proposed General Classification on the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map should be retained as depicted.

Reasons

1. The General Classification on large tracts is less restrictive to agriculture than the Suburban Estate Classification on large tracts, and favor a continuation of agriculture while recognizing the long-range potential of the area for residential development.
2. Establishment of a Suburban-Residential Zone should be predicated on the availability of urban services. This requirement, described in the Comprehensive Plan Policy stated below, precludes the establishment of Suburban-Residential in the area as requested at the present time:

Policy D-24.

"Areas where the allowed average residential density is three housing units per gross acre or greater should include the following minimum improvements:

- a. paved streets, curbs, and sidewalks;*
- b. street lighting;*
- c. underground drainage lines except where surface storm drainage facilities are deemed to be adequate;*
- d. publicly approved water supply (normally publicly owned); and*
- e. sanitary sewers or suitable alternatives on temporary basis only."*

3. The staff and the Study Team assigned to this study Area re-examined the adjacent eastern portion of the Enumclaw Plateau Study Area. The Study Team recommended the proposed general zone boundary be revised to include the area shown on the Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Map and Enlargements.

4. F-R Zoning may conflict with the small land parcels easterly adjacent to the respondent's property in Section 12, Township 21, Range 7E, and may conflict with application of the General Classification in that area. Community consensus indicates a desire for minimal intrusion of the F-R Zone into the General classified corridor.

The requested F-R zoning along the Great Northern Railroad right-of-way would be an unreasonably small area to classify F-R, and would conflict with the surrounding lands classified General.

ISSUES B. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE SUBURBAN ESTATE
ZONE NEAR THE WEST BOUNDARY OF THE STUDY AREA
(VICINITY: SECTION 28 - TOWNSHIP 22-RANGE 7E-EWM)

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-A-3	Gaile E. Anderson Route 1, Box 142-A Ravensdale, WA 98051	General
FW-B-3	Mr&Mrs. Varen Bratcher P.O. Box 21 Ravensdale, WA 98051	S-E

and attached Petition signed
by the following persons:

Mr. and Mrs. Gene Hintz	S-E
Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Reedy	
Mr. and Mrs. James Brimmage	
Mr. and Mrs. Freddie L. Yarbrough	
Mr. and Mrs. Jerry A. McLellan	
Mr. and Mrs. Marc Deveraux	
Mr. and Mrs. Gene Yountz	
Mr. and Mrs. John H. Yankey, Sr.	
Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Brisendine	
Mr. and Mrs. Everett G. Cox	
Mr. and Mrs. John Pinkley	
Mr. and Mrs. Joel A. Pound	
Mr. and Mrs. John Ford	
Mr. and Mrs. F.W. Elban	

CONCLUSION

The S-E Classification, as shown for this area on the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map should be retained.

Reasons

1. The S-E Classification for the subject area represents a consensus of the residents affected and recognizes the existing plat of Evergreen Acreage.
2. This application of the S-E Classification is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

Policy D-8a:

"A maximum density of one housing unit per gross acre may be employed: in those areas of the County where a neighborhood character of estate-type uses and interests is already established or is proposed.

Policy D-9:

*"A maximum density of two housing units per gross acre may be employed in the following types of areas:
a. where a substantial majority of lots are already developed to a density not greater than two housing units per gross acre and permanent protection in order to maintain community identity is desirable.
b. in areas proposed for development at this density where permanent protection of lot size is desired."*

ISSUE C. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE FORESTRY AND RECREATION ZONE IN THE VICINITY OF SECTIONS 24 and 25. TOWNSHIP 26, RANGE 10, EWM

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-I-2	Ideal Cement Company Denver National Building Denver, Colorado 80202	Q-M

This Q-M request geographically overlaps both this Study Area and the adjacent Upper Skykomish Valley Study Area. The following list of persons commenting on that request have been extracted from the Land Use Committee Report on Upper Skykomish Valley and Stevens Pass.

T-1	Robert W. Taylor 11025 Eighth Avenue South Seattle, WA 98168	Q-M
A-3	John Accetturo Lot 57 Timberlane Village Skykomish, WA 98288	Oppose to Q-M
B-1	Marylin P. Ballingi 419 Sixth South Edmonds, WA 98020	Oppose to Q-M
B-2	Robert O. Bennett, Sr. Address Unknown	Same
C-1	Mrs. Annabelle Crow 348 Sunset Edmonds, WA 98020	Same
C-2	Terry M. Crump 18902 - 94th West Edmonds, WA 98020	Same
C-3	Patrick A. Casey 615 - 18th East Seattle, WA 98102	Same
C-4	Johnul Crump 18902 - 94th West Edmonds, WA 98020	Same
D-1	Douglas L. Drugge 1610 California Ave. S.W. Seattle, WA 98116	Same
D-2	G. H. Drumheller, M.D. 1515 Pacific Ave. Everett, WA 98201	Same
E-1	Alfred I. Easten Address Unknown	Same
F-1	J.E. Flynn Address Unknown	Same
F-2	William J. Franklin Address Unknown	Same
H-1	Henry W. Haigh 18982 Marine View Drive SW Seattle, WA 98166	Same

K-1	William A. Kelly, M.D. 17840 - 49th Place N.E. Seattle, WA 98155	Same
K-2	John T. Killingsworth 311 - 137th Street S.W. Everett, WA 98204	Same
K-3	A. N. Korslund Box 328 Skykomish, WA 98288	Same
K-4	Richard A. Klein 4741 Somerset Drive S.E. Bellevue, WA 98006	Oppose to Q-M
M-1	Mr. & Mrs. Lewis E. Moldenhour 7038 Dibble Avenue N.W. Seattle, WA 98117	Same
M-2	Mrs. Lester R. Murphy 3230 Bau Lake Drive Seattle, WA 98188	Same
M-6	Max D. Moore 8030 - 215th S.W. Edmonds, WA 98020	Same
N-1	Walter E. Nightingale Address Unknown	Same
N-2	McDowell Norwood Address Unknown	Same
N-4	Katheryn C. Wilson 208 Carlson Building Bellevue, WA 98004	Same
O-2	Donald A. Olson 16209 N.W. Third Street Bellevue, WA 98008	Same
O-3	Felix A. Ortman Address Unknown	Same
P-1	James B. Page 3832 N.E. 87th Seattle, WA 98115	Same

P-2	Eric Phillips 1029 N.E. 96th Seattle, WA	Same
P-3	Frank Pasquale 6416 N.E. 181st Seattle, WA 98155	Same
R-1	D.M. Rodney 4351 - 150th S.E. Bellevue, WA 98006	Same
S-3	Melvin Smithson 1610 California Ave. S.W. Seattle, WA 98116	Same
S-4	Paul C. Sorenson Address Unknown	Opposed to Q-M
S-5	Elvis T. Swisher Route 3, Box 353-F Moses Lake, WA 98837	Same
S-7	Claradell G. Shedd 16429 N.E. 18th Bellevue, WA 98008	Same
S-8	H. L. Shedd 75815 N.E. 123rd Skykomish, WA 98288	Same
S-9	Paul H. Spencer 2970 S.W. Avalon Seattle, WA 98126	Same
T-2	Mrs. Doris Temple P.O. Box 322 Grotto, WA 98254	Same
W-1	Robert E. Wright 10054 N.E. 33rd Bellevue, WA 98804	Same
W-6	A.W. Walsh P.O. Box 127 Baring, WA 98224	Same
W-7	William Webber 9416 California Ave. S.W. Seattle, WA 98136	Same

CONCLUSION

Areas either previously mined or currently in operation and adjacent land known to have mineral deposits located in Section 24 and 25, Township 26, Range 10, EWM, be classified Forestry-Recreation (Potential Quarrying-Mining).

Statement: The consensus of the several Study Teams is that the form or contour of the land has a degree of intrinsic public value; further that the landscape in which a parcel of land is located constitutes an integral part of its value. The implications are so broad however, that the members are not prepared to offer policy recommendations on the concept at this time.

The Study Teams recognize the apprehension felt by residents of areas in which mineral resources are located; they are understandably concerned over the environmental impact of quarrying, mining, and processing operations and the alteration of natural land forms.

However, in the judgement of the Study Teams there is limited basis for denying utilization of such natural resources. On the contrary, the INTERIM STATEMENT OF POLICY ON MINERAL RESOURCES, adopted by the King County Council upon recommendation of the E.D.C., Item No. 2 states: "...recognize the irreplaceable nature of mineral resources, their value to the public, as consumers, the desire of land owners to utilize mineral deposits; and economic contribution of the extractive industries."

Reason

Q-M Zoning has been applied in the County on land known to have large deposits of mineral resources.

Comment: The use of Q-M Zoning accomplishes two goals: (a) It recognizes a long-term use as opposed to the short-term uses allowed under the Unclassified Use Permit. (b) It identifies the probable locations of quarrying and mining operations to future residents of an area.

The Potential Q-M Zone proposed by the Study Team provides an additional safeguard not ordinarily part of the Q-M Classification. That is, the developers are required to submit their Q-M request as a Planned Unit Development. Through the P.U.D. hearing process, any approval can be based on detailed plans of the applicants, and additional conditions and restrictions on the proposed use can be imposed by the Hearing Examiner and King County Council.

ISSUE D. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE FORESTRY-RECREATION
ZONE FOR CERTAIN INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY SITES

The areas considered in this re-examination are located in the general vicinity of northwest 1/4 of Section 28, and the northwest 1/4 of the northeast 1/4 of Section 33, Township 20, Range 7E, and in the general vicinity of Section 11, Township 20, Range 9E, adjacent to the Lester Road.

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-W-5	Weyerhaeuser Company Tacoma, WA 98401	"Industrial" to permit existing timber related activities.

CONCLUSION

The subject areas should remain classified F-R.

Reason

The uses intended by the affected property owner, such as the operation of sawmills and chippers and similar activities, are permitted as outright uses within the F-R Zone.

ISSUE E. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE FORESTRY RECREATION
ZONE FOR GENERAL ZONING OF CERTAIN AREAS

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-G-2	Emmett J. Gleason P.O. Box 85 Cumberland, WA 98105	G
	and	
	Mr. & Mrs. Francis B. Brown P.O. Box 47 Cumberland, WA 98105	
	and	G
	William S. Klontz 8815 South 116th Place Seattle, WA 98178	
	and	
	Mr. & Mrs. Lawrence G. Ward Route 1, Box 218 Enumclaw, WA 98022	G

CONCLUSION

Retain the F-R Classification as depicted on the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map.

Reasons

1. The Preliminary Proposed Zoning Guideline Map, as presented to the community on June 28, 1972, at Tahoma Senior High School, received general community support for the westerly G (General) classified corridor with no broad support for eastward expansion of the G Zone.
2. The G zoned corridor meets the general needs of the community while also providing adequate F-R lands to the east to provide continuing protection of an important economic base to the immediate community and to King County.
3. The F-R Classification is more consistent with the large corporate ownership pattern lying east and southeast of the G zoned corridor.

ISSUE F. RE-EXAMINATION OF FORESTRY-RECREATION ZONE
IN THE FRIDAY CREEK VICINITY.

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-D-1	H. Dumpis P.O. Box 35 Lester, WA 98035	B-C
FW-D-5	Chester L. Dugan P.O. Box 64 Palmer, WA 98043	General
FW-M-1	Margaret Manicke P.O. Box 133 Lester, WA 98035	Residential
FW-M-5	Russell D. Mayhew L. E. Jones L. E. Thomas Virginia Thomas Lester, WA 98035	B-C and Residential
FW-M-7	Thomas Murphy Lester, WA 98035	Residential
FW-N-1	Joe Nuziem Box 21 Lester, WA 98035	B-C and
FW-P-1	Lyle E. Preston Mr. & Mrs. Robert Maurer David H. Goble Lester, WA 98035	Opposed to F-R

CONCLUSIONS

1. The eastern half of lot 15 and lots 16, 17, 18, and 21 of Block B should be classified B-C, as depicted in the Friday Creek Enlargement of the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map.

2. Blocks A, B, C, and D of Friday Creek should be classified G, except for those lots specified in Conclusion 1 above.

Reasons

1. Those lots recommended for B-C represent the existing business center of the Friday Creek community, and should be recognized as such.

2. Establishment of a G Classification on the remaining Friday Creek properties recognizes the residential platting which exists, while maintaining compatibility with the F-R Classification of surrounding lands.

3. The recommended classifications are similar to those previously accepted in the westerly communities in the Study Area, such as Cumberland, Selleck, and Kanaskat.

ISSUE G. RE-EXAMINATION OF FORESTRY-RECREATION ZONE IN THE VICINITY OF LESTER

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-B-2	Basil W. Buck, Jr. P.O. Box 135 Lester, WA 98035	Residential
FW-G-3	Mr. & Mrs. Finis Garris P.O. Box 145 Lester, WA 98107	Residential
FW-H-4	Fred W. Hoefler 1106 - 35th N.E. Seattle, WA 98007	General
FW-J-2	William J. Johnson Lester, WA 98035	Residential
FW-M-4	Mrs. Thomas Murphy Lester, WA 98035	Same

FW-P-1	Mr. & Mrs. Lyle E. Preston Mr. & Mrs. Robert Maurer Mr. David Goble Lester, WA 98035	Same
FW-M-5	Russell Mayhew Lester, WA 98035	Residential
FW-W-2	Mr. & Mrs. Clifford D. White Address Unknown	Residential
FW-W-3	A. T. Wilson Lester School Lester, WA 98504	Same

CONCLUSION

Blocks A, B, C, D, and the parcel adjacent to Block B containing two residents and the school, as shown on the Lester Enlargement of the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map, should be classified G (General).

Reasons

1. Establishment of a G Classification for these properties will recognize the existing residential and other land uses in the Lester community, while maintaining compatibility with nearby F-R Classified property.
2. The Scott Paper operation to the east of Lester proper is a permitted use within the F-R Zone, and thus is not included in the proposed G Zone.
3. The G Classification is similar to that used in the western portion of the Study Area which is also adjacent to extensive F-R Classified lands.

ISSUE H. EXAMINATION OF A REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A FORESTRY AND WATERSHED CLASSIFICATION, TO BE APPLIED TO MUNICIPAL WATER SOURCES FOR THE PURPOSE OF RESTRICTING ACCESS AND LIMITING RESIDENTIAL USE.

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-T-1	City of Tacoma Public Utilities P.O. Box 11007 Tacoma, WA 98411	Forestry- Watershed- Classification

CONCLUSION

This request exceeds the scope, purpose, and legislative jurisdiction of the Area Study Program.

Reason

Creation of a Forestry and Watershed Zone, as outlined by the City of Tacoma, would exceed the jurisdictional responsibility of an Area Zoning Study as established by King County Ordinance No. 00263, and would exceed the operational assumptions accepted by the Study Team. (Page 4, No. 2 of this report.)

ISSUE I. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE PROPOSED FORESTRY-RECREATION ZONE AS A COMMUNITY BUSINESS CENTER IN THE VICINITY OF GREENWATER LOCATED IN SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 19N, RANGE 9 EWM.

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-R-3	Resource Corporation Route 1, Box 396-A Poulsbo, WA 98370	Business

CONCLUSION

The following described property be zoned B-C. Beginning at the intersection of the north-south centerline of Section 4 Twp 19 Rg 9E and the south margin of U.S. 410, thence south along said centerline 140', thence east 200' thence north and parallel to said centerline to the south margin of said U.S. 410, thence southwesterly along said margin to the point of beginning. Less the west 10' thereof for road easement. Less County roads and State roads. (311-70-ZA). The remaining area retain F-R zoning as shown on the Greenwater Enlargement of the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map.

Reasons

1. Those parcels described in the above conclusions represent an existing business zone or business of the Greenwater Community and should be recognized as such.
2. The need to provide a retail business center for the Greenwater Community in the southeast area of King County has already been recognized by the Zoning and Subdivision Examiner and the King County Council by prior action zoning the property B-1 under Ordinance No. 00763 (ref. file 311-70-ZA, Division of Land Use Management).

ISSUE J. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE FOREST-RECREATION
ZONE IN THE VICINITY OF SECTIONS 29,30,31,
TWP 23N, R9E.

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-C-2	Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company Real Estate, Economic & Resource Development Department 6649 White Building Seattle, WA 98101 .	Q-M

CONCLUSION

The proposed area zoning guideline map should be modified to show F-R(Potential Q-M) for the westerly half of the petitioner's total request as determined by the length of the property running east and west.

Reasons

1. Due to the rather vast amounts of linear acreage which are not susceptible to immediate excavation activities, recognition of the entire site requested, within the forum of an area zoning process, would be premature at this time.
2. The easterly portions of this request are situated within the valley corridor of Interstate 90. Outright designation of this portion of the petitioner's request without investigating the potential aesthetic and environmental repercussions upon this immediate area would not be in the public interest.
3. The reclassification from a Potential Q-M Zone to an actual Q-M Zone would require a public hearing which would provide a forum from which (1) public input might be gained and (2) the County could attain sufficient operational safeguards to assure that the aesthetic and environmental integrity of the I-90 corridor, relevant to this gravel site, could be adequately analyzed and protected in the event the existing pit operation is substantially expanded in area as well as scope.

ISSUE K. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE GENERAL ZONE
IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO THE TOWNSITE
OF CUMBERLAND

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-G-12	Pat Gleason 31212 S.E. 345th St. Enumclaw, WA 98022	M-L

CONCLUSION

The Proposed Zoning Guideline Map for the S.W. 1/4 of the N.W. 1/4 of Section 28-TWP 21-R7 be modified to show (Light Manufacturing) within that parcel of land proposed by the petitioner which lies between the Veazie-Cumberland Rd. and the Northern Pacific Railroad right-of-way.

Reasons

1. There is a small concentration of light manufacturing type uses within this immediate vicinity.
2. The linear strip of land between the Veazie-Cumberland Road and the Northern Pacific Railroad right-of-way is a logical location to permit light manufacturing type land uses. These two transportation routes would adequately buffer this immediate area from adjacent residential properties to the east and west.

ISSUE L. RE-EXAMINATION OF THE GENERAL ZONE
WITHIN THE TOWNSITE OF CUMBERLAND

<u>File Code</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Request</u>
FW-G-8	Emmett J. Gleason 35331-Cumberland-Veazie Rd. Enumclaw, WA 98022	B-C
FW-W-8	Richard C. Weiks 35317 - 314th Way S.E. Enumclaw, WA 98015	B-C

CONCLUSIONS

The Proposed Zoning Guideline Map within the townsite of Cumberland should be modified to illustrate B-C (Community Business) as requested for Block 6, Lots 27 through 30 and Block 2, Lot 11.

Reasons

1. Community Business zoning within the townsite of Cumberland has been recognized within the Proposed Zoning Guideline Map. Page 10, Zoning Issue No. 3, of the E.D.C. report for the Selleck, Kangley, Kanaskat, Palmer, Cumberland, Lester, Friday Creek, and adjacent wilderness study areas, dated October 1972, expounds the following concept:

"Community Business (B-C): Existing centers of community business activity have been proposed as B-C zoning in order to permit a full range of community services. Such centers exist at Friday Creek, Cumberland, Kanaskat, Kangley and Greenwater."

3. Although portions of these requests are undeveloped at this time, the granting of these petitions will establish a more cohesive community business center to meet present and future growth within the area.

4. Approval of these requests would be a reasonable filling-in between the now proposed B-C zoning and would solidify the ownerships of each petitioner under one zone classification.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In the course of area rezones in eastern portions of King County, special problems became increasingly apparent; therefore, it is recommended that the following studies be undertaken when staff resources and time permit.

1. Wilderness and Mountain Pass Study - A comprehensive study of land use policies in wilderness and mountain pass areas should be undertaken, preferably in conjunction with representatives of adjacent counties, federal and state agencies, and the private sector having interest in these areas.

2. Highway Use Classification - Consideration should be given to the need for highway-user services and facilities on state and interstate highways. Present land use classifications and Comprehensive Plan policies which include such highway oriented uses also permit a wide range of activities not necessarily needed or desirable along such transportation Corridors.

3. Land Uses in Forestry-Recreation Classification - The Forest-Recreation Classification is essentially a forest industry land use zone. Other uses have been permitted on the assumption that they were compatible with the primary use and with adjacent land use zones. Recent trends have demonstrated such uses are not inherently compatible; therefore, study should be given to all such uses and techniques such as the Planned Unit Development including campgrounds (membership and rental, lease, et al), resorts, hunting and shooting clubs, 'cabins,' and similar recreational uses as well as the diverse industrial uses appropriate to a timber production classification.

4. Combined Business and Residential Use of Land - Resident-business owners in the small eastern communities demonstrated a need for further consideration of land use classifications which permit caretaker residences within various business zones.

5. Future Freeway Interchanges - A comprehensive study should be initiated to review and discuss the appropriateness of business zoning at interchanges in the mountain pass areas. The timing of this study should be determined when the interchanges are firmly located, designed and needed rights-of-way acquired.
