

# Thurston County Board Briefing

**Briefing Date:** Wednesday, March 20, 2007, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

**Department & Staff Contact:** Development Services Department

Michael Welter, x 5553  
John Sonnen, x 3013  
Katie Knight, x 3005  
Celinda Adair, x 5477

**Subject and Purpose:** Rural Lands Project - Review the Planning Commission's recommendation for rural rezoning. Provide direction to staff for proceeding with the Rural Lands Project (rural rezoning, LAMIRDs and agricultural lands designation policies):

-- Scheduling a public hearing ; and

-- Whether to go to hearing only with the planning Commission's recommended rural rezoning proposal or the Planning Commission recommended and minority proposals.

**Overview of Surrounding Issues:**

1. **WWGMHB Decision:** The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB) ruled that Thurston County's comprehensive plan and development regulations were not compliant with the Growth Management Act (GMA):
  - The county's uniform rural density of 1 unit per 5 acres does not provide a "variety" of rural densities as required by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b);
  - Areas zoned at densities greater than 1 dwelling per 5 acres can be designated as "Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development"(LAMIRDs) if they meet certain criteria in RCW 36.70A.070(5), if not, they must be rezoned to a rural density;
  - Two policies pertaining to designation of Long-Term Agriculture lands must be revised consistent with the GMA; and
  - The urban growth areas (UGAs) appear to be larger than necessary to accommodate projected population growth and must be sized consistent with the GMA.

## **2. County Response to the WWGMHB Decision:**

- On August 1, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) placed a moratorium on residential subdivisions in the unincorporated county. The purpose of the moratorium is to keep all options open to enable the county to respond to the WWGMHB decision in the most appropriate way. The Board released specific areas from the moratorium as it became evident the land would not be affected by the county's response to the WWGMHB ruling.
- On September 12, 2005, the county appealed the WWGMHB decision to the Washington State Supreme Court. On September 6, 2006 the Supreme Court issued a decision to transfer the case to the Court of Appeals. On November 27, 2006 the Court of Appeals heard the case. It may take several months to get a decision from the Court of Appeals, and that decision may be appealed to the Supreme Court.
- In the event the county is not successful on the appeal, the Board directed staff and the Planning Commission to work with the public and affected cities and towns to formulate comprehensive plan and zoning amendments that respond to the WWGMHB decision.
- During December 2005 and January 2006, the county conducted two open houses and four workshops around the county to solicit public input as to what types of land were appropriate for rezoning to lower densities and to review and refine proposed LAMIRD designations. More than 800 workshop participants worked with their neighbors to identify the types of land they deemed suitable for rezoning or shared information pertaining to LAMIRDs. The workshop participant's priorities for the types of lands to rezone are identified in the rural rezoning binder, behind Tab 1, in Attachment 1 to the transmittal letter. Based on information gathered at these meetings, in April 2006 the Board established an area to be studied for possible rezoning to lower residential densities. During the spring of 2006, the Planning Commission formed proposed zoning districts within this study area, developed associated zoning regulations, and refined the preliminary LAMIRD designations.
- In June 2006, the county held a public forum, attended by about 200 people, and conducted an online "virtual forum" so the public could review and comment on these preliminary zoning proposals. The Planning Commission revised the draft proposals based on the comments they received at the forums. In formulating the proposal to provide a variety of rural densities, the Planning Commission carefully considered public input and the types of land that would provide public benefits if rezoned. Benefits of rezoning could include protection of drinking water supplies, avoidance of natural hazards, protection of lands that support family farms and forestry, preservation of "rural character" and visible open space, retention of wildlife habitat, and shellfish protection.

- On August 3, 2006 the Planning Commission held a public hearing regarding the proposed rural rezoning, LAMIRDs, and amended agricultural lands designation policies. More than two hundred people attended the hearing and sixty-two people expressed a variety of perspectives. Citizens also submitted 161 letters. A summary of the citizens' comments is contained in the project binders (see Tab 4 in the Rural Rezoning binder and Tab 6 in the LAMIRD binder).
- On September 20, 2006 the Board granted the Planning Commission's request for more time to devise and refine alternative rural rezoning proposals in light of public comments.
- A public hearing regarding proposed LAMIRD designations and agricultural designation criteria was scheduled for October 30, 2006; the Board cancelled that hearing and indicated that they would reconsider the public hearing schedule after the first of the year.
- On the January 24, 2007 the Planning Commission and staff briefed the Board regarding three rural rezoning proposals, none of which had majority support. On January 31, 2007 the Board remanded the proposals to the Planning Commission with the direction that they submit a majority proposal. After several worksessions, the Planning Commission decided to recommend to the Board a modified version of the original Option 3 rural rezoning proposal. The original Option 1 is forwarded as a minority proposal. The modifications to Option 3 consist of:
  - adding to the rezoning proposal land bordering long-term forestry, long-term agriculture, and designated mineral extraction areas. These areas currently zoned 1 dwelling per 5 acres are proposed to be rezoned to 1 dwelling per 10 acres; and
  - changing the proposed zoning on some land from 1 dwelling per 20 acres to 1 dwelling per 10 acres.The Planning Commission's new recommended zoning proposal is described in Attachment 1 (majority proposal).

**3. Schedule.** The WWGMHB has given the county until May 30, 2007 to adopt rural rezoning, LAMIRD designations, and Long-Term Agricultural lands designation criteria. They gave the county until August 28, 2007 to evaluate and, if necessary, resize the UGAs. At this point, due the remand of the Planning Commission's original rural rezoning recommendations, it does not appear possible to meet either deadline.

**4. Components of the Rural Lands Project:** The following section briefly describes each component of the Rural Lands project.

Variety of Rural Densities/Rural Rezoning: As previously noted, the Planning Commission devised a recommended rural rezoning proposal and a minority proposal for the Board's consideration. These alternative rural rezoning proposals are described in Attachment 1.

LAMIRDs: The WWGMHB ruled that rural zoning that allows more than

1 dwelling per 5 acres does not comply with GMA. In 1997, the State legislature amended the GMA to require that areas of higher density zoning were only allowed in rural areas if they qualify as LAMIRDs. The most notable criteria for designating LAMIRDs is that the area had to be predominately developed by 1990, the year that the GMA was adopted. This can, for example, include buildings and water lines that existed in 1990. Areas that qualify as a LAMIRD can retain their current zoning. If not, they will need to be rezoned to an appropriate rural density of not less than 1 dwelling per 5 acres.

Thurston County has 59 areas that allow residential development at densities greater than 1 dwelling per 5 acres (e.g., RR 1/2, RR 1/1, RR 2/1, MDR 1-6/1, and SR 4/1 districts). County staff and the Planning Commission evaluated all 59 areas against state criteria. Approximately half of the 22,000 acres in these districts appear to qualify as LAMIRDS and are proposed to be designated as one of the following proposed new LAMIRD zoning districts. (The draft districts are behind Tab 4 of the attached LAMIRD binder):

- Residential LAMIRD 1 unit per acre (RL 1/1);
- Residential LAMIRD 1 unit per two acres (RL 1/2); and
- Residential LAMIRD 2 units per acre (RL 2/1).

The areas of existing higher density rural zoning that do not meet LAMIRD criteria are proposed to be rezoned to rural densities, consistent with the neighboring property.

Long- Term Agriculture Lands: Proposed amendments pertaining to agricultural lands are behind Tab 2 of the LAMIRD binder. The GMA (RCW 36.70A.170(a)) requires jurisdictions to designate "agricultural lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of food or other agricultural products." The WWGMHB decision upheld Thurston County's basic classification system for agricultural lands, but called for the County to revise two of its designation criteria. The Planning Commission, with the advice of the Agriculture Committee, developed revisions to Long-Term Agricultural Lands designation criteria to comply with the WWGMHB ruling. The proposed amendments remove requirements for a predominate parcel size of 20-acres or more and add language to acknowledge historic use and soil types as criteria for identifying lands capable of being used for agriculture.

**Documents Attached:**

- Attachment 1: Differences and similarities between the recommended rezoning proposal and the minority proposal.
- Attachment 2: Summary of rural zoning in other counties.
- LAMIRDs and Agricultural Designation Criteria Binder: A binder containing the Planning Commission's letter of recommendation to the Board, copies of the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, zoning code and zoning map, and a summary of the public

hearing comments. An index at the front of the binder will direct you to the materials found in Tabs 1 through 7.

- Rural Rezoning Binder. The rural rezoning binder has been updated to contain the new Planning Commission majority proposal and the original Option 1, which is now the Planning Commission minority proposal.

**Recap:**

In response to the WWGMHB decision, staff and the Planning Commission analyzed the portions of the Comprehensive Plan and code ruled out of compliance with GMA. In formulating responses to the WWGMHB decision, the county performed an extensive public outreach effort involving open houses, public workshops, a web site, and a forum. The Planning Commission held a well attended public hearing on August 3, 2006 regarding draft amendments to the comprehensive plan, development regulations, and zoning map. Based on public input, they formulated three alternative rural rezoning proposals (none of which had majority support), proposed LAMIRD designations, and amendments to the Long-Term Agriculture Lands designation criteria. At the direction of the Board, the Planning Commission formulated a new majority rural rezoning proposal. The original Option 1 rezoning proposal was forwarded as a minority proposal.

Final adoption of LAMIRD designations, Long-Term Agriculture lands designation criteria, and related comprehensive plan and zoning code amendments is required by May 30, 2007. Evaluation of the UGAs and possible resizing is underway and is required to be completed by August 28, 2007. At this point, it is unlikely that the county will be able to meet either deadline.

**Options with Pros & Cons:**

1. Proceed to hearing with the entire Rural Lands Project (rural rezoning, LAMIRDs and Long-Term Agriculture Lands designation policies).
  - (a) Conduct an open house to give people an opportunity to become familiar with the new rural rezoning proposal.
  - (b) Conduct a public hearing regarding the rural rezoning proposal recommended by a majority of the Planning Commission members, proposed LAMIRDs designations, and amendments to the Long-Term Agriculture Lands designation policies.
  - (c) Refine the proposals based on public input and proceed to adoption.

Pros: This approach would allow the project to be completed in the shortest period of time (late June).

Cons: All of the GMA projects are controversial and may generate appeals. Legal staff has indicated that it could be troublesome to respond to appeals on rural rezoning or LAMIRDs while the WWGMHB ruling under appeal.

2. Same as 1 above, with the addition of the Planning Commission's minority proposal.

Pros: The county has received correspondence in support of the original Option 1, which is now the Planning Commission minority recommendation. Some members of the public will likely urge the Board to adopt that proposal instead of the Planning Commission majority proposal.

Cons: Holding a hearing with more than one proposal may be confusing for the public.

3. Proceed to public hearing with only the LAMIRDs and Long-Term Agriculture Lands designation policies.

Pros: This would demonstrate that the county is making progress on its response to the WWGMHB decision.

Cons:

- The LAMIRD and rural rezoning proposal are integrally related. The portion of the existing higher density zones that do not qualify as LAMIRDs must be rezoned under the rural rezoning project. So separating the projects would require affected people to attend two hearings.
- Delaying rural rezoning will necessarily delay work on evaluating and resizing the UGAs. It will also keep affected properties under the moratorium for a longer period of time.
- This option would require more staff time and the Longrange Planning Section has a significant staffing shortfall at present. Consequently, final adoption would be delayed under this option.

4. Proceed with all proposed amendments but conduct separate hearings on the rural rezoning and LAMIRDs proposals.

Pros: Would allow for testimony focused on each the proposals, and shorten the length of the individual hearings.

Cons:

- The LAMIRD and rural rezoning proposal are integrally related. The portion of the existing higher density zones that do not qualify as LAMIRDs must be rezoned under the rural rezoning project. So

separating the projects would require affected people to attend two hearings.

- This option would require more staff time and the Long range Planning Section has a significant staffing shortfall at present. Consequently, final adoption would be delayed under this option.

**Staff**  
**Recommendation(s):**

**Option 2.** Proceed to an open house and public hearing regarding the Planning Commission’s majority and minority rural rezoning proposals, proposed LAMIRDS designations, and amendments to the Long-Term Agriculture Lands designation criteria.

**Board**  
**Recommendation(s):**

**Next**  
**Steps/Timeframe:**

**Conclusion:**

## ATTACHMENT 1

# PROPOSED RURAL REZONING

### DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE RECOMMENDED REZONING PROPOSAL AND THE MINORITY PROPOSAL

Table 1 lists the types of lands included in the Planning Commission’s recommended rural rezoning proposal and the minority rezoning proposal. The text following the table explains the land use categories along with the reasoning for the different treatment in the options. A brief description of both options follows.

**TABLE 1**

COMPONENT	MAJORITY PROPOSAL	MINORITY PROPOSAL
<b>Water Quality Protection Areas:</b> - Vulnerable aquifer recharge areas - Wellhead protection areas - Areas with elevated nitrate and chloride levels	√ (1 dwelling: 10 acres; 1 dwelling: 20 acres if also overlying an “at risk” geographic area)**	√ (1 dwelling : 10 acres)
<b>“At Risk” Geographic Areas:</b> - Areas with severe constraints to development: Portions of Salmon Creek Basin, Black River Corridor, and Nisqually Bluff	√ (1 dwelling : 10 acres; 1 dwelling : 20 acres if also overlying water quality protection areas)**	√ (1 dwelling : 20 acres, Nisqually Bluff 1 dwelling : 10 acres)
<b>Parcels Contributing to Rural Character:</b> - Parcels enrolled in the open space-farm conservation or current agriculture tax programs - Parcels enrolled in the open space-timber or designated timber tax programs - Community supported farms - Sites of historical importance	Incidentally - (1 dwelling : 10 acres for some areas)*	√ (1 dwelling : 20 acres; 1 dwelling: 10 acres for some areas)*
<b>Parcels Bordering Resource Lands:</b> - Parcels within a ½ mile of resource lands	√ (1 dwelling : 10 acres)*	√ (1 dwelling : 20 acres)*
<b>Urban Reserve</b>	—	√ (1 dwelling : 20 acres)
<b>“Unbuildable” Lands</b>	—	√ (1 dwelling : 10 acres)

\*Excluding parcels less than 20 acres in size and isolated groups of parcels less than 40 acres in size

\*\*Zoning is (1 dwelling per 20 acres) if parcels fit into multiple land categories.

## I. AREAS OF AGREEMENT

Both proposals forwarded by the Planning Commission call for:

- A. Rezoning to Protect Water Quality:** Rezoning vulnerable aquifer recharge areas, wellhead protection areas, and areas with elevated nitrate and chloride levels (saltwater intrusion) to preserve Thurston County's drinking water quality.

*Reasoning:* Rezoning such area would result in fewer septic systems over vulnerable aquifers which county residents depend upon for drinking water.

- B. Rezoning to Protect Particular "At Risk" Geographic Areas:** Rezoning areas with severe constraints for development: Salmon Creek Basin; Nisqually Bluff; and the Black River Corridor.

*Reasoning:* Rezoning the Salmon Creek Basin would result in fewer homes being built in an area at risk of flooding from surfacing groundwater. Rezoning lands along the Nisqually Bluff would reduce the potential number of dwellings put at risk due to possible slope failure in that area. This reduction in allowed dwelling units coupled with the proposed reductions in maximum impervious surface allowances, would likely result in less stormwater generation and reduce the risk of slope failure. The Black River Corridor contains multiple wetlands and riparian areas that support wildlife; rezoning will help preserve this area.

- C. Buffering of resource lands.** Both proposals would rezone parcels bordering resource lands (i.e., Long-Term Agriculture, Nisqually Agriculture, Long-Term Forestry, designated mineral resource lands).

*Reasoning:* Reducing the number of dwellings in close proximity to designated resource lands will minimize land use conflicts and nuisance complaints and enhance the continuing operation of these resource lands consistent with their intended use.

- D. Excluding Isolated and Small Parcels from the Rezone:** The majority and minority proposals call for the exclusion of parcels less than 20 acres in size, and isolated groups of parcels less than 40 acres in size from lands bordering natural resource lands.

*Reasoning:* Many of the people who spoke at the public hearing about the detrimental effect of the rezone on their retirement plans and plans to build houses on their land for their family members had small lots -- under twenty acres. And, the Planning Commission was of the opinion that rezoning small isolated patches of land did not have much impact on rural character, nor undermined the rationale for rezoning lands bordering resource lands.

## II. Areas of Disagreement.

- A. Rural character:** The minority proposal would predominately rezone land to a density of 1 dwelling per 20 acres specifically to help maintain rural character and to provide wildlife habitat. The rural character rezone areas, when mapped according to the following criteria, significantly overlapped the wildlife habitat map. As a result, in developing the minority proposal, the wildlife habitat category, which was sixth in priority for rezoning from the public workshops, was subsumed in the rural character mapping. While rural character is not a category of land specifically mapped by the County, the following lands, which can be mapped, were used to quantify rural character:

1. Parcels enrolled as open space-farm conservation lands or in current agriculture tax programs;
2. Community supported farms;
3. Parcels enrolled in the designated timber tax program or the parcels enrolled in the open space/timber tax program; and
4. Parcels containing historic sites.

*Reasoning in support of rural character rezone:* The county is undergoing intense development pressure. Rezoning the lands listed above would reduce the potential for development in the remaining rural open spaces, and thereby help to preserve rural character. Lands contributing to rural character were rated the second highest priority for rezoning by the attendees at the public workshops in January 2006. Wildlife habitat, which would also be protected to by rezoning of these lands, was the sixth highest public priority for rezoning.

*Reasoning in opposition to rural character rezone:* Including lands in the rezoning only to protect rural character and wildlife habitat significantly increases the magnitude of the proposed rezoning. Some Planning Commissioners are of the opinion that rezoning this type of land is ambiguous as “rural character” cannot be definitively measured by objective data, the criteria set out above may not be the appropriate criteria for measuring “rural character,” and “rural character” does not provide as much public benefit as rezoning to protect vulnerable aquifer recharge areas and those areas most sensitive to the cumulative impact of development (the Salmon Creek Basic, the Black River Corridor and the Nisqually Bluff).

(Note: While the majority proposal does not specifically target rural character lands, it does propose rezoning such lands at 1 dwelling per 10 acres if these lands overlap vulnerable aquifer recharge areas, “at risk” geographic areas (portions of the Salmon Creek Basin, the Black River Corridor, or the Nisqually Bluff,) or parcels bordering resource lands.

- B. Urban reserves.** The minority proposal includes urban reserves. The urban reserve zoning designation would apply to areas bordering Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) that appear to be physically suitable for eventually accommodating urban development when the need arises to expand the UGAs. Under that proposal, specified lands along the fringe of the UGAs would be zoned to a density of 1 dwelling per 20 acres. The proposed designation would establish development options and permitted uses that would not interfere with future redevelopment of the land at urban densities (e.g., low density residential uses, agriculture, forestry, conservation and associated uses appropriate for a low density rural area).

*Reasoning in support of urban reserve:* Those supporting rezoning to set aside lands for future UGA expansion note that urban reserves would:

1. Direct expansion of UGAs into areas apparently suitable to accommodate urban growth;
2. Provide for large lot sizes and rural land uses near existing UGAs in a development pattern that will enable orderly and efficient provision of infrastructure and conversion to urban density development;
3. Allowing 5 or 10 acres parcels could impede development at urban densities as it could result in more development on the ground, odd shaped lots that could stymie redevelopment, and more owners who do not want to further develop their property;
4. Retain large undeveloped tracts that could accommodate schools and parks, in addition to development at urban densities;

5. Minimize the need for further UGA expansion, as the large urban reserve parcels could be efficiently developed at a higher density; and
6. Coincide with the interests of several of the cities and towns, which support urban reserves to facilitate UGA expansion when the need arises.

*Reasoning in opposition to urban reserves:* Those opposed to rezoning for the purpose of setting aside lands for future UGA expansion voice the following reasons:

1. The purpose of this project is to provide a variety of rural densities and urban reserves would only temporarily contribute to a variety of rural densities, as they will be the first areas added to the UGAs;
2. Development may leapfrog the urban reserve, thus increasing development in the rural areas, increasing the potential for sprawl in the rural parts of the county, particularly those adjacent to the urban reserves;
3. Historically, in most instances, the current zoning of one dwelling per five acres has not impeded UGA expansion;
4. Since the WWGMHB stated that the current UGAs are oversized, this designation should not be needed any time soon;
5. The primary beneficiary of this proposed designation would be the eventual developer (who may pay less for the land since it will have fewer dwellings on it and the infrastructure could be developed at lower costs) rather than the general public; and
6. The urban reserve would preserve the land for the larger developer as opposed to the family or small developer, who would primarily be developing at a lower density in these currently rural areas adjacent to the UGAs.

- C. “Unbuildable” lands.** The minority proposal calls for rezoning unbuildable lands. For purposes of this project, unbuildable lands are defined as parcels encumbered by a public or non-profit conservation easement, parcels that are covered 75% or more by wetlands, landslide hazard areas, steep slopes or associated buffers, and parcels that include any portion of a 100-year floodplain.

*Reasoning in support of rezoning unbuildable lands:*

1. Participants at the workshops in January 2006 identified unbuildable lands as the top priority for rezoning. The participants’ recommendation was based on the assumption that this would place the least overall burden on property owners since these lands generally cannot be built upon anyway;
2. Rezoning such lands would minimize the amount of new development in areas with hazards or severe constraints to development; and
3. Parcels encumbered by a public or non-profit conservation easements cannot be built upon anyway, so we should take credit for them.

*Reasoning in opposition to rezoning unbuildable lands:*

1. These lands will be largely protected through the critical area regulations;
2. This approach could result in some large parcels being rezoned that have ample area to accommodate development (e.g., 10 acres of buildable area on a 40-acre parcel); and
3. Affecting these parcels by both the restrictions in the critical area regulations and rezoning would be a “double hit” on these property owners.

**D. Extent of the rezoning.** The magnitude of the proposed rezoning and the proportion of land proposed to be rezoned to 1 dwelling per 10 acres and 1 dwelling per 20 acres vary significantly between the proposals, as shown in Table 2 below. Staffs’ research shows that other Western Washington counties have designated between 16.3% and 93% of their rural lands to densities of less than 1 unit per five acres. (See Attachment 2).

**TABLE 2**

<b>PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT</b>	<b>MAJORITY PROPOSAL</b>	<b>MINORITY PROPOSAL</b>
Rural 1 dwelling :10 acres	59, 392 acres (28 %)	16,780 acres (7 % of rural lands )
Rural 1 dwelling : 20 acres	1,117 acres (0.05 %)	68,717 acres (32 % of rural lands )
Urban Reserve 1 dwelling : 20 acres	0 acres	1,646 acres (0.66 % of rural lands)
Proportion of rural lands proposed to be rezoned	<b>28.05 %</b>	<b>39.66%</b>

### **III. DESCRIPTION OF EACH PROPOSAL**

#### **MAJORITY PROPOSAL.**

Key Characteristics:

1. The majority proposal rezones:

- a. Those lands that overlie vulnerable aquifers, wellhead protection areas, and areas with elevated nitrate or chloride levels;
- b. Those lands for which the cumulative impacts of development create severe hazards or endanger a particularly sensitive wildlife habitat, i.e., Salmon Creek Basin, Black River Corridor, and Nisqually Bluff;

*Rationale:* Creates a variety of rural densities by rezoning lands in categories 1. (a) or (b) to 1 dwelling per 10 acres and lands which have both categories 1. (a) and (b) to 1 dwelling per 20 acres. This reduces the impact of rezoning on rural land owners while still creating a variety of rural densities.

- c. Parcels within ½ mile of resource lands of long-term significance would be rezoned to 1 dwelling per 10 acres.
- d. Rural character lands would be omitted, except when included due to overlap with sensitive aquifer areas, “at risk” geographic areas (portions of Salmon Creek Basing, Black River Corridor, or Nisqually Bluff), or parcels bordering resource lands.

*Rationale:* “Preservation of rural character” alone is not enough of a public benefit to justify rezoning property. While some other counties have used rural character as a basis for rural rezoning, it is not mandatory.

2. This proposal would rezone the least land (28.05 % of rural lands compared to 39.66 % under the minority proposal).
3. The majority proposal differs from the minority proposal in three key areas:
  - a. It does not contain urban reserve zoning;
  - b. It does not rezone unbuildable lands; and
  - c. It does not rezone rural character and wildlife habitat lands if those lands do not have:
    - Vulnerable aquifers, wellhead protection areas, & areas of elevated nitrate or chloride levels;
    - “At risk” geographic areas: portions of Salmon Creek Basin, Black River Corridor, or Nisqually Bluff, and
    - Parcels Bordering Resource Lands.

## **MINORITY PROPOSAL**

### Key Characteristics:

1. This proposal would rezone lands consistent with the top priorities of the participants at four workshops in January 2006 regarding the types of land to be rezoned.

*Rationale:* This proposal honors the public process by not making wholesale changes to the draft shared with the public; instead it incorporates only small refinements to the public hearing draft.
2. This proposal calls for an urban reserve around the cities and towns.

*Rationale:* The reasoning in support of urban reserves is explained on page 10, under section: II. C, Urban Reserves.
3. This proposal would rezone “unbuildable” lands.

*Rationale:* The reasoning in support is explained on page 11, under section: II. D., “Unbuildable” lands.
4. Rural character and wildlife habitat lands would be rezoned to 1 dwelling per 20 acres.

*Rationale:* 1 dwelling per 20-acre zoning would be best for preserving rural character and wildlife habitat.
5. Lands adjacent to resource lands would be rezoned to 1 dwelling per 20 acres.

*Rationale:* To enhance the use of the resource lands for their intended purpose, while reducing the development of incompatible residential uses and nuisance complaints.