

## Specific CP and Code Comments

### Miscellaneous

**(For use at 10/3 meeting)**

Comment	Page	Response
Define acronyms used in CP in an appendix	p. 181	Appendix A in the current Comprehensive Plan provides a list and explanation of acronyms and definitions of terms. A similar appendix will be included in the revised Comprehensive Plan upon final publication.
14.04.020 Definition of 'Lot, corner' should be clarified regarding side and rear lot lines.	p. 1581	Amendments to the definition are recommended to clarify all lot line descriptions for corner lots (see Attachment 1).
14.06.150 Amendments to notice requirements are not easily understood.	p. 1581	Clarification of the proposed language is recommended for ease of understanding (see Attachment 2).
14.08.020(6)(c)(ii) Language requiring combination of lots should be clarified to recognize minimum lot sizes.	p. 1581	Additional language to incorporate the recently adopted lot certification requirements is recommended (which address standards for the combination of lots in each zone).
14.18.200(2)(c) Language regarding required property tax payments for final long subdivisions are not consistent with the RCWs.	N/A	RCW 58.08.040 requires taxes for the current year and <u>the entire next year</u> be paid prior to final long subdivision approval. Current code only requires current year and the first half of the next year. Amended language is suggested to correct the inconsistency (see Attachment 4).
14.12.210 New language indicating no SEPA appeals are available on legislative actions is not desirable.	p. 1577	<p>SEPA (RCW 43.21C) provides that an agency may decide whether or not to offer administrative appeals of SEPA decisions. A "major purpose" of SEPA "is to combine environmental considerations with public decisions..." (RCW 43.21C.075). The County proposes only to exercise this option for administrative appeals of threshold determinations on legislative actions only, not for project actions.</p> <p>The intent of this proposed amendment is not to disallow SEPA appeals, but to combine appeals of both procedural <u>and</u> substantive SEPA decisions* with the appeal of the underlying legislative action. In this way, the adequacy of SEPA review is more closely linked with the legislative action taken by the County. The proposed amendment relates only to <u>administrative</u>, not judicial, appeals of SEPA procedural decisions.</p> <p>*Note: <i>Procedural</i> decisions include threshold determinations (DNS – Determination of Non-significance, DS – Determination of Significance, and a</p>

Comment	Page	Response
		<p>final EIS). <i>Substantive</i> decisions relate to an agency's use of (or failure to use) SEPA to deny or condition a proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Recommended Revision:</u></b> Clarify existing proposal as shown on Attachment 5.</p>
<p>14.18.700 New BLA amendments regarding newly created split-zoned lots are problematic.</p>	<p>p. 1581</p>	<p>These issues were raised during the initial drafting of the provisions and edits addressing many of the comments were made. Certain others of the issues are inconsistent with Department practices and cannot be implemented as suggested. The creation of new, split-zoned lots is not desirable. The proposed amendments do not prohibit the creation of such lots if no other alternative exists and merely provides guidance for the development of the new lots in accordance with current Department practices.</p>