



**CITY OF KIRKLAND**  
**PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**  
**123 FIFTH AVENUE, KIRKLAND, WA 98033 425.587.3600**  
[www.kirklandwa.gov](http://www.kirklandwa.gov)

---

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** June 9, 2016

**To:** Kurt Triplett, City Manager

**From:** Teresa Swan, Senior Planner  
Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP, Senior Planner  
Jeremy McMahan, Development Review Manager  
Paul Stewart, AICP, Deputy Director  
Eric Shields, AICP, Planning Director

**Subject:** Chapter 90 KZC Amendments (Critical Areas Ordinance/Wetlands, Streams, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas and Frequently Flooded Areas Regulations), Briefing # 2, File CAM15-01832, #4

### I. RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council (HCC) have been holding study sessions over the past several months on the proposed amendments to Chapter 90 of the Kirkland Zoning Code regarding critical areas (wetlands, streams, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and frequently flooded areas). In February, staff briefed the Council on this project. Staff recommends that the City Council receive a second briefing on the Chapter 90 KCZ amendments as reviewed by the Planning Commission and HCC. This briefing contains the Planning Commission's initial direction and preliminary comments from the HCC on key issues outlined in this memo that serve as the foundation for the draft revisions to Chapter 90.

The memo is organized by each topic as listed below on page 2. The Planning Commission's direction on each topic is provided in the memo. Staff recommends the Council review the Commission's direction and provide any comments as appropriate. Along with staff, the City's consultant, Sarah Sandstrom with The Watershed Company, will be available to respond to comments or questions at the study session.

The Planning Commission will review a draft of Chapter 90 at its June 23, 2016 meeting followed by a review with the HCC in July. It is anticipated that a joint public hearing will be held in August with a recommendation coming to the City Council in September.

This memo addresses the following key topics:

- Wetland Rating System and Buffer Width Standards
- Compensatory Mitigation Ratios for Wetland Modification
- Stream Classification and Buffer Width Standards
- Deviations from the Buffer Standards
  - Buffer Averaging for Wetlands and Streams
  - Buffers for Day lighted or Relocated Streams
  - Buffers Divided by Roads or Structures
- Measures to Minimize Impacts to Critical Areas
- Vegetative Buffer Standard
- Building Setback from a Critical Area Buffer
- Mitigation Sequencing for Wetland or Stream Modification
- Off-Site Mitigation
- Fish and Wildlife Conservation Habitat Areas
- Exempted Uses
- Permitted Uses with Standards
- Public Agency and Public Utility Exceptions
- Programmatic Permits
- Non-Conformances
- Reasonable Use Exception
- Maximum Development Potential
- Effect of Code Amendments on Prior Approvals and Pending Permits

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Introduction

On [February 16, 2016](#), the City Council held a study session to receive background information on the Critical Areas Update. Staff and The Watershed Company (TWC), the City's consultant on the project, gave a presentation on the following:

- City's regulations must be updated under GMA and be consistent with Best Available Science (BAS);
- Background information on wetlands, streams, rating system of the features, buffer widths, buffer reduction options, mitigation, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and frequently flooded areas;
- [BAS Report](#) (latest science on the protection of these sensitive area features and the condition of the city's sensitive area features) prepared by TWC; and
- [Gap Analysis](#) (general code amendments needed to meet BAS on wetlands and streams and Ecology's guidance on wetlands) prepared by TWC.

The City Council may find it helpful to review the background and technical information again in the staff memo for the [February 16, 2016](#), before reviewing this memo.

As the City Council reviews the key issues in this memo, the City's **Vision Statement** and goals, policies and actions in the **Environment Chapter** should be considered.

The **Vision Statement** along with the guiding principle of sustainable addresses preserving and enhancing our natural environment, including habitats, and creating a healthy environment.

Some of the goals and policies in the **Environment Chapter** applicable to wetlands and streams include:

- **Actions:** Restore our natural systems and critical areas including streams, wetlands, habitat areas and Lake Washington for maximum ecological value and functions.
- **Goal E-2:** Protect, enhance and restore trees and vegetation in the natural and built Environment.
  - **Policy E-1.2:** Manage activities affecting air, vegetation, water, and the land to maintain or improve environmental quality, to preserve fish and wildlife habitat, to prevent degradation or loss of natural features and functions, and to minimize risks to life and property.
  - **Policy E-1.3:** Manage the natural and built environments to achieve no net loss of the functions and values of each drainage basin; and proactively enhance and restore functions, values, and features.

## **B. Background**

As was stated at the [February 16, 2016](#) Council study session, the **current Chapter 90** KZC has not been amended since it was adopted in 2002. However, since then **BAS** on critical areas has progressed and evolved based on extensive studies on the impacts of urban areas on wetlands and streams, including work done by the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Department of Ecology (Ecology). Ecology has issued guidance documents on wetland buffers and other topics along with a 2004 **wetland rating system** based on BAS. Again in 2014, Ecology issued a new wetland rating system.

Also since adoption of Chapter 90 KZC, requirements were added to GMA for the protection of **Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas** that address threatened, endangered and sensitive species listed by federal and state agencies. Thus, Chapter 90 KZC is not consistent with the Growth Management Act's requirements for the use of current BAS, the WAC requirements for **stream typing** and Ecology's standards.

Follow this link to view the current [Chapter 90](#) KZC regulations.

The **State deadline** for updating Chapter 90 KZC is **June 30, 2016**. The City will not meet this deadline because of the considerable time and resources spent on the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update, which was also a requirement of the State. The Comprehensive Plan Update was adopted in December 2015, at which time the Planning staff began a full time effort on Chapter 90 KZC.

Our goal is to have a revised draft Chapter 90 KZC submitted by the deadline date to the State for their review. This will show the City's efforts and intent to complete the revised Chapter 90 KZC as soon as possible.

### **C. Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council Study Sessions to Date**

On [January 28, 2016](#), the Planning Commission and the Houghton Community Council held a joint study session to receive the same background information that the City Council received on February 16, 2016. Since then, the **Planning Commission** held three study sessions on [February 25, 2016](#), [March 24, 2016](#), and [April 28, 2016](#). This memo reflects the Planning Commission's discussions at these three study sessions along with consideration of public comment provided at the meetings and through emails, and its direction for preparation of the draft revised Chapter 90 KZC.

On [May 23, 2016](#), the **Houghton Community Council** held a study session to review the direction of the Planning Commission. The Houghton Community Council had a few comments that are highlighted in this memo in the corresponding topics below. The comments addressed the buffer width standard for seasonal stream containing no fish, some of the non-conformance provisions and the proposed front yard setback provision for sites containing critical areas.

### **D. Basis of Planning Commission's Direction**

The Planning Commission spent four meeting studying and discussing key issues, and considering public comments for the Chapter 90 KZC amendments. The Planning Commission's direction is based on the following:

- Be consistent with the GMA, Ecology guidance and BAS, and minimize likelihood of appeals from the state, individuals or other concerned parties;
- Implement the City's Vision Statement and Guiding Principles, and goals and policies of the Environment Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan to preserve and where possible enhance Kirkland's wetlands and streams;
- Find opportunities to provide flexibility for property owners to off-set the increase in buffer widths and other regulations through non-conformance provisions, off-site mitigation options and reasonable use exceptions;
- Have regulations that are comparable to other local jurisdictions; and
- Incorporate a list of suggested changes from staff dating back to 1999 that include clarifications, opportunities for more flexibility and streamlining processes.

## **III. WETLAND REGULATIONS**

*Attachment 1 contains a draft summary of the regulations for wetlands and their buffers.*

### **A. Wetland Rating System.**

### 1. Background:

The **wetlands** in Washington State differ widely in their functions and values. Some wetlands are part of a large drainage system, such as Yarrow Bay and Juanita Bay, while others are small isolated wetlands. Some are heavily disturbed while a few are still relatively undisturbed. All, however, provide some functions and resources that are valued. These may be ecological, economic, recreational, or aesthetic.

A **rating system** is needed to understand the functions and values of individual wetlands in order to protect them effectively. A rating system categorizes wetlands into categories based on their sensitivity to disturbance, their rarity, the ability to replace them, and the functions they provide. The categories are used as the basis for developing standards for protecting and managing the wetlands to reduce further loss of their value as a resource. Decisions that can be made based on the rating include the **width of buffers** needed to protect wetlands from adjacent uses, the **amount of mitigation** needed to compensate for impacts to the wetland, and **permitted uses** in wetlands.

The City's **existing rating system** is based on BAS of the mid 1990's. Since then, the understanding of wetlands and the impacts of adjacent development has expanded significantly such that the new rating system better reflects the range of characteristics and functions found in wetlands. Ecology adopted the *Washington State Wetland Rating Systems* in 2004 and then updated it again in [2014](#). The rating system is primarily intended for use with vegetated, freshwater wetlands using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's federal wetland delineation manual and applicable regional supplements (Chapter 173-22-035 WAC).

Other local jurisdictions have either been using the 2004 rating system and now will be adopting the 2014 rating system or have already adopted the new rating system. The City is two cycles behind on the State rating system. **The City must use the 2014 wetland rating system.**

### 2. Planning Commission Direction:

*Use the 2014 Washington State Wetland Rating System in the revised Chapter 90 KZC as required by Ecology and adopted by other local jurisdictions.*

## **B. Wetland Buffer Width Standards.**

### 1. Background:

As discussed at the February 16, 2016 study session, **buffers** (which are protective setbacks from the edge of the wetland) reduce impacts to wetlands from adjacent land uses and activities. A buffer filters out negative nutrients, sediments and pollutants going into the wetland. It moderates the temperature of the wetland and it protects and provides habitat for wildlife. The physical characteristics of the buffers (slope, soils, vegetation and width) determine how well buffers reduce the various adverse impacts of adjacent uses on wetland functions.

**Habitat scores** is the main defining factor for the required buffer widths (see table below). A habitat score of a wetland is determined using the Department of Ecology’s wetland rating form. A score is based on a total of nine questions divided into site potential, landscape potential, and value categories. The combination of the ranked categories (high, medium, or low) determines the score. Here is a link to the wetland rating form: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/parts/1406029part1.pdf>. Looking at the page in the link, the box on the right side of the first page shows how the different combinations of categories equate to scores.

**Ecology has issued standards** for urban wetland buffers based on BAS in both a guidance document and in a recommended model ordinance. The City’s **current wetland buffer standards in Chapter 90 must be increased in width** and be more in line with the wetland buffer standards in Chapter 83 KZC (covering lands 200 feet from the lake and entire wetlands connected to the lake) adopted as part of the City’s Shoreline Master Program update in 2010 and amended in 2011.

The standards based on Ecology guidance and BAS are reflected below. The width of the buffer standards assumes that the buffer is **well vegetated**, contains no lawn or fill material, and has little invasive or ornamental species. Ecology guidance for buffers that do not meet these vegetative standards are wider by one-third (1/3) in depth.

### Recommended Wetland Buffer Standards

Wetland Category and Type	Buffer width (in feet) based on habitat score (3-9)			
	3-4	5	6-7	8-9
<b>I: Bogs and wetlands of high conservation value</b>	190	190	190	225
<b>I: All others</b>	75	105	165	225
<b>II</b>	75	105	165	225
<b>III</b>	60	105	165	225
<b>IV</b>	40	40	40	40

(Note: it is unlikely that Kirkland has a Category I High Conservation value)

Staff looked at the codes of other local jurisdictions and did find some variation in buffer standards compared to Ecology’s buffer standards. Woodinville adopted the same wetland buffer standards shown above in March 2016. Redmond’s standards were adopted several years ago and are slighter smaller for the habitat 5 score but much larger for the 3-4 and 8-9 habitat scores. Renton’s standards are larger in one habitat score category and smaller in another category. Other local cities have not updated their rating systems to the new 2014 rating system yet so it is problematic to make an exact comparison (they do not use the habitat scoring system), but the buffer ranges are very similar. Thus, the **recommended buffer widths are comparable to other local jurisdictions**.

As a comparison, the table below shows existing wetland buffer standards in Chapter 90 KZC and Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline area):

**Chapter 90 KZC Current Wetland Buffer Width Standards**

Wetland type	Buffer width for wetlands in primary basin (feet)	Buffer width for wetlands in secondary basin (feet)
1	100	75
2	75	50
3	50	25

**Chapter 83 KZC Wetland Buffer Width Standards within Shoreline Jurisdiction**

Wetland Category and Type <sup>1</sup>	Buffer width (in feet) based on habitat score		
	Less than 20	20-28	29-36
<b>I: Bogs and wetlands of high conservation value</b>	215		
<b>I: All others</b>	125	150	215
<b>II</b>	100	125	200
<b>III</b>	75	125	NA
<b>IV</b>	50		

The Planning Commission discussed the wetland buffer standards over several study sessions and considered what other local jurisdictions require. They also were concerned about making many existing homes non-conforming with the increased buffer widths while recognizing the State requirement to increase the buffer width standards. The Planning Commission supports the new buffer width standards in conjunction with the recommended more **permissive approach to repair and maintenance, replacement and additions to nonconformances** compared to the current City code in Chapters 90 and 162 KZC. See Non-Conformances section below.

Four **case studies** have been prepared that look at four different wetlands in Kirkland with different categories and habitat scores to illustrate and analyze how the proposed regulations would impact redevelopment. The wetland areas studied are Juanita Bay, Forbes Lake, Totem Lake and one in the Totem Lake area. The case studies are scenarios and not actual development plans. The photos and aeriels help distinguish the visual differences of the four types of wetlands (see Attachment 12).

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Use the recommended Wetland Buffer Standards above in the revised Chapter 90 KZC. The standards are consistent with Ecology guidance and comparable to other jurisdictions and the City's Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations).*

3. **Houghton Community Council:**

*Even though the Houghton neighborhood has very few wetlands and thus the proposed regulations will have little impact to its community overall, the Council is still concerned about impact of wetland buffers on the rest of the city.*

**C. Compensatory Mitigation and Ratios for Wetland Modification.**

1. Background:

Compensatory mitigation standards are used to replace lost or impacted wetland and/or buffer functions. Compensatory mitigation is also required by state and federal agencies. The City’s shoreline regulations include the same compensatory mitigation standards. All other local jurisdictions have adopted the use of these same compensatory mitigation standards.

2. Wetland Mitigation Options in Order of Preference:

Mitigation for lost or diminished wetland or buffers requires wetland compensatory mitigation based on the following **order of preference**:

- 1) **Re-establishment or rehabilitation:** returning a degraded or past wetland into its former condition through such measures as removing fill or removing a dike that holds back water. This measure does not add new wetland.
- 2) **Creation/establishment:** developing a new wetland where no wetland existed. This would require a water source, a certain slope design and other factors.
- 3) **Enhancement:** adding native plantings. This mitigation results in loss of wetland area when a wetland is being modified.
- 4) **Preservation:** protecting a high functioning at-risk wetland elsewhere, usually in conjunction with one or more of the mitigations noted above. This mitigation results in loss of wetland area when a wetland is being modified.

3. Wetland Mitigation Ratios:

Mitigation ratios are intended to replace lost functions and values of wetlands and the associated buffer from proposed adjacent developments based on the category of wetland and the type of mitigation. Ecology BAS standards for mitigation ratios are shown in the table below. Even though wetland enhancement/planting (far right column below) does not replace lost wetland area, Ecology’s guidance does allow enhancement but at a much higher ratio to mitigate for wetland loss.

Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations) contains the same mitigation ratios. The ratio standards have also been adopted by other local jurisdictions and are the accepted state-wide approach to mitigation.

**Recommended Mitigation Ratios for Wetland Modifications**

Category of Wetland Impacted	Creation	Re-establishment-Rehabilitation Only	Creation and Rehabilitation	Creation and Enhancement	Enhancement Only
<b>Category IV</b>	1.5:1	3:1	1:1 C and 1:1 RH	1:1 C and 2:1 E	6:1
<b>Category III</b>	2:1	4:1	1:1 C and 2:1 RH	1:1 C and 4:1 E	8:1
<b>Category II</b>	3:1	6:1	1:1 C and 4:1 RH	1:1 C and 8:1 E	12:1

Category of Wetland Impacted	Creation	Re-establishment-Rehabilitation Only	Creation and Rehabilitation	Creation and Enhancement	Enhancement Only
<b>Category I: Forested</b>	6:1	12:1	1:1 C and 10:1 RH	1:1 C and 20:1 E	24:1
<b>Category I: Bog</b>	Not possible	6:1 RH of a bog	Not possible	Not possible	Case-by-case
<b>Category I: based on total functions</b>	4:1	8:1	1:1 C and 6:1 RH	1:1 C and 12:1 E	16:1 E
<b>Buffer</b>					1:1

Legend: C = Creation, RH = Rehabilitation, E = Enhancement

4. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Use the recommended compensatory mitigation and mitigation ratios for the revised Chapter 90. These ratios are consistent with Ecology guidance, Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations) and have been adopted by other local jurisdictions.*

**IV. STREAM REGULATIONS**

Attachment 2 contains a draft summary of the regulations for streams and their buffers.

**A. System Typing.**

1. **Background:**

Stream typing was established in 2005 in Washington State under [WAC 222-16-030](#). There are three stream types:

- Fish bearing streams that flow year round or part of the year
- Non fish bearing streams that flow year around
- Non-fish bearing steams that flow part of the year

The State stream typing system is provided in the table below. The standards are similar to the stream typing used in Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations) and used by other local jurisdictions. **The City must use this stream typing system.**

**Permanent Water Typing System (WAC 222-16-030)**

Permanent Water Typing	Brief Description	Full Description
<b>Type F</b>	Fish bearing stream (may be perennial or seasonal)	Segments of natural waters other than Type S Waters ( <i>streams of shoreline significance which Kirkland does not have</i> ), which are within the bankfull widths of defined channels and periodically inundated areas of their associated wetlands, or within lakes, ponds, or impoundments having a surface area of 0.5 acre or greater at seasonal low water and which in any case contain fish habitat or are

Permanent Water Typing	Brief Description	Full Description
		described by one of the following four categories: (a) Riverine ponds, wall-based channels, and other channel features that are used by fish for off-channel habitat. These areas are critical to the maintenance of optimum survival of fish. This habitat shall be identified based on the following criteria: (i) The site must be connected to a fish habitat stream and accessible during some period of the year; and (ii) The off-channel water must be accessible to fish.
<b>Type Np</b>	Non-fish bearing perennial stream	All segments of natural waters within the bankfull width of defined channels that are perennial nonfish habitat streams. Perennial streams are flowing waters that do not go dry any time of a year of normal rainfall and include the intermittent dry portions of the perennial channel below the uppermost point of perennial flow.
<b>Type Ns</b>	Non-fish bearing seasonal stream	All segments of natural waters within the bankfull width of the defined channels that are not Type F, or Np Waters. These are seasonal, nonfish habitat streams in which surface flow is not present for at least some portion of a year of normal rainfall and are not located downstream from any stream reach that is a Type Np Water. Ns Waters must be physically connected by an above-ground channel system to Type F, or Np Waters.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Use the stream typing above in the revised Chapter 90.*

**B. Stream Buffer Width Standards.**

1. **Background:**

As discussed under the wetland section, buffers reduce impacts to streams from adjacent land uses and activities. Similar to wetland buffers, stream buffers filter out negative nutrients, sediments and pollutants going into the wetland. It moderates the temperature of the stream and it protects and provides habitat for wildlife. The physical characteristics of the buffers (slope, soils, vegetation and width) determine how well buffers reduce the various adverse impacts of adjacent uses on stream functions.

As discussed at the January 28, 2016 meeting, the City’s **current stream buffer standards in Chapter 90 must be adjusted** to meet BAS and to be more in line with the stream buffer standards in Chapter 83 KZC (shorelines regulations) as those were adopted based on BAS in 2010.

The standards based on BAS are reflected below. The width of the buffer standards assumes that the buffer is **well vegetated**, contains no lawn and has little invasive or ornamental plants and fill:

**Recommended Stream Buffer Width Standard**

Stream Type	Buffer Width
<b>F (contain fish)</b>	<b>100 feet</b>
<b>Np (no fish: perennial)</b>	<b>50 feet</b>
<b>Ns (no fish seasonal)</b>	<b>50 feet</b>

For the F stream type, Bellevue, Bothell, Kenmore, and Federal Way all require 100 feet – same as above. Redmond, Sammamish, Woodinville and King County have wider F stream type buffers.

For the Np stream type (year round stream with no fish), Bellevue, Kenmore, Federal Way all require a 50 foot buffer – same as above. Six other local jurisdictions have wider buffers than above, including Redmond and Woodinville.

For the Ns stream type (seasonal stream with no fish), Woodinville, Sammamish and Bothell all require a 50 foot buffer – same as above. Six local jurisdictions have a narrower buffer width requirement.

As a comparison, the **current Chapter 90 KZC stream buffer standards** are as follows:

**Current Chapter 90 KZC Stream Class and Buffer Widths Standard**

Stream Class	Buffer width for streams in primary basin (feet)	Buffer width for streams in secondary basin (feet)
<b>A (contain fish)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>B (no fish: perennial)</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>C (no fish: seasonal)</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>

The **current Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline area) stream buffer standards** were adopted in 2010 as part of the Shoreline Master Program Update and are as follows:

**Current Chapter 83 KZC Stream Type and Buffer Widths Standard**

Stream Type	Buffer width for streams (feet)
<b>A (contain fish)</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>B (no fish: perennial and seasonal)</b>	<b>65</b>

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Use the recommended Stream Buffer Width Standards in the revised Chapter 90 KZC. The standards are generally consistent with BAS, and comparable to other jurisdictions and the City's Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations).*

3. Houghton Community Council comments:

*Concerns about 50 foot wide buffer for seasonal streams with no fish when some other cities have a narrower buffer width for that type of stream. Staff's response was that seasonal and perennial streams (also 50' width buffer) should have the same buffer width requirement. Also, many jurisdictions require a 50 feet buffer. Overall the proposed buffer widths for the three stream types are comparable with other local jurisdictions.*

## V. DEVIATIONS FROM THE BUFFER WIDTH STANDARDS

### A. Buffer Averaging for Wetlands and Streams.

#### 4. Background:

Under Ecology guidance and BAS, the width of buffers may be **averaged** if it will improve the protection of the wetland or stream functions or it is the only way to allow for reasonable use of the parcel (see Reasonable Use Exception discussion below). Averaging a buffer means to **reduce the buffer width in one location and enlarge the width in another location on the property, but the total buffer area after averaging is equal to the area required before averaging.** The narrowest point of the buffer width using averaging cannot be less than **75%** of the standard buffer width. The critical area functions are improved with averaging by increasing the width of the buffer next to a higher functioning portion of the critical area while decreasing it next to the lower functioning portion of the area. An **illustration** of this option is provided in Attachment 3.

Buffer averaging provides an applicant with **flexibility** in designing the site. Local jurisdictions allow for buffer averaging as well as Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations).

Note that BAS does not support an overall **reduction in buffer width** as illustrated in the graphic of Attachment 3 if the City uses the recommended (narrower) buffer standard. Most local cities allow for buffer averaging but not buffer reduction.

#### 5. Planning Commission Direction:

*Allow buffer averaging for wetland and stream buffers. The option is consistent with BAS, and other jurisdictions and the City's shoreline regulations permit the option.*

### B. Buffers for Daylighting or Changing Course of Streams.

#### 1. Background:

The City encourages daylighting of streams that are in culverts to improve fish habitat. Also, in some cases an applicant may want to shift a stream course to stop erosion when no other option is available. However, in many cases the stream buffer cannot be provided along the entire new stream course because of lack of space on-site and/or the buffer would extend onto adjacent properties imposing new or increased buffers on that adjacent property.

The current regulations in both Chapter 90 KZC and Chapter 83 KZC may have an unintended consequence of discouraging or preventing the daylighting or changing the course because of lack of area for a buffer on-site or impacts on adjacent property. The current regulations say that if creation or expansion of a stream or its buffer affects another property, the other property owner must agree to it in writing. Since no one wants a new buffer or increased buffer on their property, the agreements never get signed.

Planning staff contacted WDFW about these examples. Keith Folkerts, division head for SMA/GMA at WDFW responded that, for this type of restoration action, the buffer can “be determined at the site scale with room for agreeing upon what is a reasonable buffer under the circumstances.”

The Planning Commission recognizes that there will be limited situations where the buffer standards should be modified, such as daylighting of a stream or reducing erosion by changing the course of stream because the buffer standard cannot be met given existing improvements. Vegetation in the buffer should be increased as mitigation when a buffer is reduced under these circumstances.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Allow buffers to be determined on a case by case basis for daylighting a stream or changing a course of a stream provided if certain criteria are met, such as the action improves the overall function of the stream or reduces erosion. This provides flexibility for the applicant and can improve the function and values of a stream. Also, surrounding properties should be exempt from increased buffer requirement due to the daylighting or other stream modifications on the subject property.*

**C. Buffers Divided by Roads or Structures**

1. Background:

There are some situations in the city where an existing public or private road, or a large structure, divides an existing wetland or stream buffer and makes one part of the buffer no longer ecologically connected to the critical area. Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations) has a provision that a determination can be made to waive the buffer requirement for the portion of the buffer not hydrologically connected to the critical area if certain criteria are met.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Allow a waiver to the buffer standards to the portion of a buffer that is divided by a road or large structure and that portion is not ecologically connected to the critical area and when certain criteria are met.*

**VI. VEGETATIVE BUFFER STANDARDS**

**A. Background Information.**

The Planning Commission decided that a vegetative buffer standard for wetlands and stream buffers is needed to clarify what is a “well-functioning” buffer and to give applicants clear expectations of what the buffer must contain. The City’s shoreline regulations have a specific required vegetative standard for the shoreline vegetative buffer next to the lake (Section 83.400 KZC). The standard has worked well with ease in administration and setting clear expectations for applicants.

The standard below reflects common riparian buffer performance standards with latitude to account for a range of potential existing vegetated conditions. An option for an applicant to propose an **alternative vegetation plan** would be available for unique site conditions meeting certain criteria based on a critical areas report that makes a case for the alternative planting plan.

### **Recommended Vegetation Standard**

- Native cover of at least 80% on average throughout the buffer area with 2 out of 3 of the following strata of native plant species composing at least 20% of areal cover:
  - Multi-age forest canopy (combination of existing and new vegetation)
  - Shrubs
  - Woody groundcover (such as kinickinick, salal and sword fern) or unmowed herbaceous groundcover
- Less than 10% noxious weeds cover using King County weed list (but require removal of knotweed which is very invasive)
- At least three native species each making up a minimum of 10% cover (for diversity)
- Removal of lawn (source of fertilizers, fecal coliform from pets and herbicides detrimental to wetlands and streams)

Other local cities require that buffers be vegetated with native plants. For example, Redmond requires that buffers be undisturbed areas of native vegetation and that degraded buffers be planted with native vegetation pursuant to an approved planting plan (Redmond Zoning Code 21.64.010.Q.1).

#### **B. Planning Commission Direction:**

*Require the buffer vegetation standard above for wetland and stream buffers. This would provide applicants and the City with clear expectations and ensure that the buffers are well functioning.*

## **VII. STRUCTURE SETBACK FROM WETLAND AND STREAM BUFFERS**

### **A. Background.**

The purpose of the **structure setback** from a wetland or stream buffer is to allow access for maintenance and repair of the primary structure without disturbing the actual buffer. The buffer setback provides protection to the buffer from development activities, use, and routine maintenance occurring adjacent to the buffer (e.g. staging area for building construction, window washing, painting and other repair and maintenance activities). Therefore, buildings and other above ground structures need to be set back from the wetland or stream buffer.

Buffer setback and minor improvements are currently defined as:

- Buffer Setback: The existing regulations require a setback distance of **10 feet** from a designated or modified wetland or stream buffer within which no buildings or other above-ground structures may be constructed, except as provided in [KZC 90.45\(2\)](#) and [90.90\(2\)](#). The buffer setback serves to protect the wetland or stream buffer during development activities, use, and routine maintenance occurring adjacent to these resources.
- Minor Improvements: Walkways, pedestrian bridges, benches, and similar features, as determined by the Planning Official, pursuant to KZC [90.45\(5\)](#) and [90.90\(5\)](#).

#### Width of the Setback from the Wetland or Stream Buffer:

As noted above, Chapter 90 KZC currently requires a 10' setback from the buffer. Some local cities require a 20' setback, but most require 10'. TWC recommendations and BAS both support continuing with the 10' setback. This width is sufficient for maintenance of the primary structure while allowing minor improvements (see below) into the 10' setback.

#### Decisional Criteria and Allowed Minor Improvements in Buffer Setback:

Under the current code, the Planning Official may approve minor improvements in the 10 foot wide setback area *"which would clearly have no adverse effect during their construction, installation, use, or maintenance, on fish, wildlife, or their habitat or any vegetation in the buffer or adjacent wetland or steam."*

In addition to facilitating maintenance of structures, current Chapter 90 KZC decisional criteria require that the buffer setback also **protect fish, wildlife and their habitat**. However, this is not the intent of the buffer setback and is more restrictive than needed under BAS.

Based on this distinction, TWC supports allowing the following minor improvements outright in the buffer setback that can be maintained without disturbing the wetland and stream buffer areas. These are also the same minor improvements that the planners have been permitting as a matter of practice.

- Ground level decks, patios and railings
- Chimneys, bay windows, greenhouse windows, eaves, cornices, awnings and canopies
- Flag poles
- Benches, paths and pedestrian bridges
- Rockeries, retaining walls, maximum 4' high

- Driveways and parking areas
- Garden sculpture, light fixtures, trellises, and similar decorative structures,
- Non- native landscaping
- Stormwater conveyance that results in sheet flow such as rain gardens, and similar techniques

The following **more general list of minor improvements** would also be appropriate in the buffer setback because they can be maintained without impacting the buffer. These are minor improvements that are similarly permitted in **KZC 115.115, Required Yards**, to extend into the required front/rear/side yards. Some of the improvements below also include those listed above:

- Extending no more than **18 inches** into buffer setback - chimneys, bay windows, greenhouse windows, eaves, cornices, awnings and canopies, and decks above the ground floor.
- Extending no more than **5 feet** into buffer setback – minor improvements not more than 18 inches above finished grade, except those noted below.
- Extending no more than **9 feet** into the buffer setback – minor improvements not more than 4 inches above finished grade, benches, paths and pedestrian bridges; garden sculpture, light fixtures, trellises, and similar decorative structures; landscaping; flag poles; stormwater conveyance that results in sheet flow such as rain gardens, and similar techniques; and rockeries and retaining walls not exceeding 4 feet above finished grade.

Other local jurisdictions currently allow these types of improvements in the buffer setback.

**B. Planning Commission Direction:**

*Allow the listed improvements to encroach the recommended distances into the buffer setbacks and in addition allow play structures, since they too, can be maintained without impacting the buffer. Revise the definition of minor improvements.*

**VIII. MEASURES TO MINIMIZE IMPACTS ON WETLAND AND STREAMS**

**A. Background Information.**

Ecology’s guidance and BAS indicate a need to require the measures listed below to minimize impacts to critical areas. Vegetation within buffers alone does not mitigate all of the impacts of urban use and activities on critical areas. Other local jurisdictions require these same measures to be implemented.

**Measures to Minimize Impacts to Wetlands for Reduced Buffer Width**

Disturbance	Required Measures to Minimize Impacts
<b>Lights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct lights away from wetland</li> </ul>
<b>Noise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locate outdoor activity that generates noise away from wetland</li> <li>• If warranted, enhance existing buffer with native vegetation plantings adjacent to noise source</li> </ul>
<b>Toxic runoff</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route all new, untreated runoff away from wetland while ensuring wetland is not dewatered</li> </ul>

Disturbance	Required Measures to Minimize Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish covenants limiting use of pesticides within 150 feet of wetland</li> <li>• Apply integrated pest management</li> </ul>
<b>Stormwater runoff</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retrofit stormwater detention and treatment for roads and existing development adjacent to the site</li> <li>• Prevent channelized flow from lawns that directly enters the buffer</li> <li>• Use Low Intensity Development techniques (per Puget Sound Action Team publication on Low Impact Development techniques)</li> </ul>
<b>Change in water regime</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infiltrate or treat, detain, and disperse into buffer new runoff from impervious surfaces and new lawns</li> </ul>
<b>Pets and human disturbance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use fencing OR plant dense vegetation to delineate buffer edge and to discourage disturbance using vegetation appropriate for the ecoregion</li> <li>• Place wetland and its buffer in a separate tract or protect with a conservation easement</li> </ul>
<b>Dust</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use best management practices to control dust</li> </ul>
<b>Disruption of corridors or connections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain connections to offsite areas that are undisturbed</li> <li>• Restore corridors or connections to offsite habitats by replanting</li> </ul>

The Planning Commission raised a question about measures to minimize **noise** impact for residential and use of a back yard facing a critical area. Staff has looked at some other local regulations and spoken with Ecology on the intent of the noise impact measure and will expand on the specifics of the noise measure with the draft revisions to Chapter 90 KZC. The intent is not to infringe on homeowners’ use of their yard facing the critical area, but to address noise through site design and vegetative buffers.

**B. Planning Commission Direction.**

*Include the nine mitigating measures in the revised Chapter 90, but with further details on implementing measures for noise. This approach is consistent with Ecology guidance, BAS, and is used by other local jurisdictions.*

**IX. MITIGATION SEQUENCING FOR WETLANDS AND STREAMS**

**A. Background Information**

Under BAS, when a critical area and its buffer are proposed to be modified, most proposals must first be reviewed through a series of steps known as **mitigation sequencing** to reduce the severity of impacts from adjacent uses and activities.

This approach is used by state and federal agencies and local jurisdictions to analyze proposed impacts to wetlands. The same mitigation sequencing is also required in Chapter 83 KZC (shoreline regulations).

Mitigation sequencing steps in the **order of preference** are as follows:

- (1) **Avoiding the impact** altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- (2) **Minimizing impacts** by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce impacts;
- (3) **Rectifying the impact** by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- (4) **Reducing or eliminating the impact** over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;
- (5) **Compensating for the impact** by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources or environments; and/or
- (6) **Monitoring the impact** and taking appropriate corrective measures.

In most cases, before a modification to a wetland, stream or buffer can be approved an applicant would need to provide an analysis of these steps to explain why the impact is necessary and is the only viable option based on the proposal. These steps are used to consider ways to reduce impacts on the wetlands and streams.

Avoiding an impact does not require that a proposal be denied or required to be located on another site, but rather that an analysis be done to see if there is a design or other measures that could avoid an impact. For example, if an applicant proposes to build a home on a lot, the City could not ask the applicant to simply build on another lot to avoid the impact. The same rationale applies to a transportation project where avoidance is not intended to preempt needed system improvements.

#### **B. Planning Commission Direction.**

*Include mitigation sequencing in the revised Chapter 90 KZC. This approach is consistent with BAS, the City's shoreline regulations, and is used by federal, state and other local jurisdictions.*

### **X. OFF-SITE MITIGATION FOR WETLAND OR STREAM MODIFICATIONS**

#### **A. Background.**

The current Chapter 90 KZC requires that mitigation to off-set impacts to a wetland, such as fill, draining or reducing a wetland or culverting a minor stream, must occur **on the project site or in the same city drainage basin** as the project. Currently many sites are covered in wetlands or streams and/or buffers such that there is no space to do the mitigation on site. Thus, on-site compensatory mitigation to mitigate for wetlands, streams and their buffer area loss is often not feasible, and alternative off-site locations are seldom available within the drainage basin where the proposal is located.

Since adoption of the City's Chapter 90 KZC regulations, several options for meeting wetland and stream mitigation have been accepted by Ecology and adopted by other local

jurisdictions. The options are either mitigation in the City's greater drainage basin (the Cedar River/Sammamish River Watershed) or mitigation done in advance in the City.

1. Off-Site in Kirkland's Greater Watershed

- **The King County In-lieu fee (ILF) program** has been in effect since 2011. Administered by King County, it allows participation by both public and private projects. The permit applicant makes a single payment into the ILF program fund, which pools money for watershed-based projects. Funds are collected by the sponsoring agency or jurisdiction, which is responsible from that point forward for the completion and success of the mitigation, including ensuring that implementation takes place within three growing seasons of receiving funds. The applicant's fee is based directly on the project impact and includes all costs for the mitigation, including design, land acquisition, materials, construction, administration, monitoring, and stewardship. After paying the fee, the applicant has no further responsibility.
- **Wetland Banking** programs are administered by private parties or non-profits with oversight by Ecology, the Army Corps and other agencies. It has become more common, but Kirkland is outside the service area of any current banking programs. A new mitigation bank site, located in Redmond, (Keller Farm Mitigation Bank) is going through review by the Ecology and the Corps and its service area is expected to include Kirkland. Wetland banks are similar to ILF, except that wetland bank projects are generally improved in advance of impacts at established sites, while with ILF, the project is implemented after enough credits are pooled to purchase a mitigation site. Therefore ILF may result in more lag time between project and compensatory mitigation.

Both King County's ILF program and the Wetland Banking option are **mitigation alternatives** for applications where on-site mitigation is not feasible. The benefits to Kirkland of allowing permittees to use ILF include:

- Providing predictability and consistency to the permitting process;
- Reducing the need for applicants to design and implement mitigation;
- Compensating for impacts by addressing the ecological needs of the watershed;
- Targeting larger, more ecologically viable and sustainable projects than allowed by traditional mitigation; and
- Providing a prioritization strategy for watershed-wide restoration sites and projects; and ensuring that mitigation projects function as intended in perpetuity.

Kirkland in particular could benefit from these options, as opportunities for worthwhile and meaningful on-site, and in the same basin area mitigation dwindle in the developing landscape.

2. Off-site Advance Mitigation done in the City

Another option is for Chapter 90 KZC regulations to allow the City to **use or purchase property** that can be utilized as a repository for future required mitigation as a result of City parks, streets and utilities projects. This is termed **advanced mitigation**. The City owned Forbes Creek or Juanita Bay wetlands may be candidate locations where restoration, creation or enhancement mitigation projects could be considered.

Although similar to mitigation banking, advance mitigation is different in several ways. Most important, advance mitigation cannot be bought and sold by a third party. The applicant seeking mitigation debits must be the same entity that created the advance mitigation credits.

The advance mitigation program is set up similar to a mitigation bank or ILF program but has less regulatory requirements that must be met to be certified by the interagency review team (Ecology, the Corps and other agencies). It is a simpler and less time intensive process to meet the regulatory standards for approval. The City could act on its own or through a third party to construct, maintain and monitor the mitigation but the **City is ultimately responsible for site performance**, unlike the in lieu fee or mitigation banking options. The mitigation must be implemented **prior to the completion** of the project being mitigated - otherwise it is considered concurrent mitigation rather than advanced mitigation. Advanced Mitigation may result in reduced mitigation ratios because it reduces the risk of temporal loss. The advantage to the City would be that they could mitigate more impacts in a smaller area.

The most challenging aspects are to develop and present a clear approach on **how mitigation will be calculated and accounted for over time**. There are two approaches to measure appropriate amount of mitigation – credit/ debit or mitigation ratios. Ecology guidance would be used as a guide to develop such a program. Ecology and the Army Corp of Engineers regulate and track advance mitigation associated with direct impact to wetlands. Therefore those agencies could administer the tracking and accounting for success for such projects. For projects only affecting buffers, on the other hand, the City would be responsible for tracking and accounting success. The main potential **drawback is the additional administration** associated with tracking of credits and debits.

The **advantage** to the City of Advanced Mitigation over other off-site programs is that if the City owns a mitigation site, it avoids the ever increasing cost of land that is factored into the fee charged for in-lieu fee or mitigation banking programs. The **challenge** to the City is to allocate the funding for the mitigation project design, permitting and construction in advance of the need.

The Planning Commission decided that for now only the City should be allowed to do Advanced Mitigation for both wetlands and the buffers and not private individuals or other non-city public agencies until the approach and management requirements are better understood.

Since the April Planning Commission meeting, staff has received feedback from both the Public Works and Parks departments requesting flexibility to allow other public agencies to participate in advance mitigation projects on city owned property that would benefit the City. An example is when the city does not have resources of its own to enhance a disturbed critical area or buffer in a public park or open space, and would benefit from an outside agency stepping in and doing so. The outside agency would benefit by securing property within the watershed to meet required compensatory mitigation for their own critical area alteration projects off-site.

The option would be set up to allow the City to make a policy decision on whether to allow other entities to complete off-site mitigation under appropriate circumstances and conditions. The goal would be to not give away the City's own mitigation options, and in an attempt to accomplish that, not preclude the opportunity of getting important projects or work done by other entities, when such projects or work would not be done by the City, even as a mitigation strategy. Staff will therefore ask the Planning Commission to consider making this option available to other public agencies subject to City discretion at their next meeting.

### 3. Other - Preference for Location of Mitigation

The Planning Commission also discussed whether to have a statement in Chapter 90 KZC that addresses the preferred location of mitigation.

Based on Ecology guidance, compensating for lost or degraded wetlands on-site is not always the best option. Preference should be given to a site that provides the highest ecological benefits, whether on-site, off-site, in-kind, or out of kind. Compensatory mitigation projects that contribute to the functioning of a larger landscape are preferable to simply replacing acreage at the site of impact.

**In-kind means that the same functions that are lost are replaced.** For example, if a wetland serves a storm water detention function, the mitigation site should also serve a storm water detention function. If a wetland serves a habitat function, the replacement mitigation should be designed to also serve that habitat function.

According to The Watershed Company, off-site mitigation should be allowed dependent on the wetland type and rating. It is not as important to mitigate for degraded wetlands on-site as it is for highly functioning wetlands. Wetlands that serve high value habitat and hydrology functions should be mitigated for on-site or at least within our city limits because otherwise these functions could be permanently lost. Small urban wetlands provide significant water quality functions and may be particularly important for controlling flooding in highly urbanized environments, such as in Kirkland. Urban wetlands also may provide recreational and educational opportunities and aesthetic values. Prioritization recognizes that once these functions are gone they will be difficult to replace because of the high price of land in Kirkland.

Therefore compensatory mitigation should be prioritized as follows:

1. On-site in-kind
2. Off-site in City in-kind
3. Off-site within watershed in-kind

Other local jurisdictions have similar preference statements in their wetland regulations.

**B. Planning Commission Direction.**

- *Allow the use of off-site mitigation through the in-lieu fee or mitigation banking programs respectively.*
- *Allow off-site Advanced Mitigation for City projects as an interim step before making it available to other applicants, in order to understand the complexity of administering this option.*
- *Prioritize other mitigation in the following order:*
  1. *On-site in kind*
  2. *Off-site in City in-kind*
  3. *Off-site within watershed in-kind*

## **XI. FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION HABITAT AREAS**

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas are found in stream and wetland habitat areas for:

- **Federally endangered, threatened or sensitive species** as determined by U.S Fish and Wildlife Services (USFW) and National Marine Fisheries. These are fish and wildlife that are in danger of extinction or threatened to become endangered.
- **State designed endangered, threated and sensitive species** as identified by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). These are fish and wildlife species native to Washington that are in danger of extinction or threatened to become endangered, vulnerable or declining in a significant portion of their range in the state.
- **Habitat and Species of Local Importance** as identified by a local jurisdiction or nominated by an individual or group and then accepted and adopted by that jurisdiction. These are habitat and species of importance due to their population status or sensitivity to habitat manipulation and need protection. These may include State Priority Habitats and Species identified for conservation and management as determined by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). A priority habitat may have unique vegetation type of dominate plant species.

**A. Endangered, Threatened or Sensitive Species.**

1. Background:

Under [GMA](#), jurisdictions must have regulations that protect [fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas](#) and their buffers for endangered, threatened or sensitive species. Required buffer widths must reflect the sensitivity of the habitat and the type and intensity

of human activity proposed to occur nearby consistent with the management plans issued by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, United States Fish and Wildlife and National Marine Fisheries. These **management plans** vary by species and include a buffer zone, preservation of vegetation and/or habitat features, limit access to the habitat area including fencing, seasonal restrictions of construction activities, periodic review of mitigation activities and requirement of a performance bond to ensure completion and success of mitigation.

Kirkland has two fish species that are endangered: **Chinook salmon** and **Steelhead** both listed as “threatened” under the federal listing as “candidate under state listing. Kirkland has one wildlife species: the **Bald eagle** is listed as “sensitive” under the state listing and as a “species of concern” under the federal listing (see [Best Available Science Report](#)). However, staff has been told by WDFW recently that even bald eagles will be de-listed as “sensitive” because their population has continued to increase.

The Watershed Company has a correction for the BAS report, which is that the **pileated woodpecker** is not classified as a “sensitive species” but as a “candidate species” so it is not on the endangered, threatened or sensitive listing.

Local jurisdictions all have similar regulations that address endangered, threatened or sensitive species and that reference USFW and WDFW management plans. The jurisdictions require that a management plan be prepared as part of the **critical area report** or as a separate plan using WDFW and USDFW standards. They also require further mitigation beyond the local buffers if it is demonstrated that the buffer is insufficient to prevent habit degradation.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Regulate habitat for endangered, threatened and sensitive species with a reference to state and federal management plans. This would be consistent with GMA and other local jurisdictions.*

**B. Habitat Associated with Species of Local Importance.**

1. Background:

Under GMA, the City should have a listing of species of local importance or at least a nomination process. Implications of the list would mean that management plans for these species would need to be addressed in the critical area report and implemented, referencing WDFW management plans.

Redmond (Great Blue Heron), Bellevue (23 fish and wildlife species), Woodinville (20 fish and wildlife species) all have a **listing of local species of importance**. Kenmore specifically regulates blue heron rookeries and bald eagles. Kent also regulates blue heron habitat.

Redmond, Bellevue and Woodinville all have **nomination processes** using the Code Amendment process and having nomination criteria. In Bellevue and Woodinville, an individual or group can make a nomination. In Redmond, the City Council can nominate a species. All have criteria to ensure that the nominations have merit based on scientific documentation and are not used as a means to possibly stop or delay a development by filing a frivolous nomination.

For Kirkland, [Best Available Science Report](#) dated January 2016 identifies the following **Priority Fish and Wildlife Species** in the city:

Fish in Kirkland based on The Watershed Company's documentation:

- ✓ Coho salmon (federal species of concern)
- ✓ Sockeye/kokanee salmon (state concern status)
- ✓ Cutthroat trout (priority species, but no other state or federal status)

Priority Species in Kirkland mapped by WDFW:

- ✓ Pileated Woodpecker (candidate for priority species)
- ✓ Great Blue Heron (monitor for priority species)
  - Purple Martin (candidate for priority species)
  - Trumpeter Swan (no state or federal status)

Since it appears that the **Bald eagle** will be de-listed as a sensitive listing by the end of the year based on information from WDFW, the eagle should be listed as a species of local importance.

The Watershed Company recommends that the **Pileated Woodpecker** and the **Great Blue Heron**, along with the five fish, also be listed as species of local importance. The Pileated Woodpecker habitat is located within Finn Hill on properties already under the Holmes Point Overlay (which limits tree removal and grading) and in some of the City parks. The Great Blue Heron habitat is located in the city's Yarrow Bay Park. WDFW has established management plans for these two species which would be referenced in the critical area report for any development proposal that would occur within these habitat areas. In all cases, the required stream buffers will provide sufficient habitat for the three fish listed above and thus no increase to the buffer would be required.

These species are found on either or both of Bellevue and Redmond's local priority species lists.

TWC does not recommend the **Purple Martin** or the **Trumpeter Swan** be on the list since the Purple Martin has only one mapped occurrence (so it is unusual) and both species are only found in Juanita Bay, which is regulated under shoreline jurisdiction and not Chapter 90 KZC.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

- *List the three priority fish and the three wildlife species, including the bald eagle, discussed above as species of local importance. This would show the City's support of*

*protecting these species by requiring the WDFW management plans be implemented for the species.*

- *Provide a nomination process with criteria for possible future local listing using a Process IV: Code Amendments. Chapter 90 would be amended if the nomination was approved. Use similar criteria adopted by other local cities to ensure that the nominations have merit based on scientific documentation and is not used as a means to possibly stop or delay a development by filing a frivolous nomination.*

## **XII. EXEMPTED USES AND ACTIVITIES**

### **A. Background.**

Current Chapter 90 KZC cites certain activities in critical areas or their buffers that are exempt from a permit, and called General Exceptions. Pursuant to Ecology guidance, exemptions are intended to be activities in wetlands or streams or their buffers that have little or no environmental effect on critical area conditions and functions (including its water, soil, or vegetation), are temporary, or are an emergency that threatens public health or safety.

Although a critical area permit is not required to perform these activities, prior authorization from the Planning Official is accomplished during the review of the underlying development permit, except for emergency actions. While these exempted activities would not be subject to mitigation sequencing, the exemptions should not be interpreted as permission to degrade a critical area or ignore risks from natural hazards.

Ecology and TWC recommend that regulations should be clear on what activities are exempt from needing a permit, but still must comply with the Code and City-approved best management practices (BMP's) to minimize temporary impacts (e.g. erosion control and water quality protection). Current regulations do not reflect Ecology guidance.

While some exemptions do contain standards to limit their impact on the critical area, they do not necessarily reflect current best management practices or current guidance from Ecology.

The nearby cities of Renton, Bothell, and Bellevue note that the exempted activity is subject to administrative authorization, while Woodinville and Redmond do not specify an authorization process. All except Redmond provide BMP guidance.

### **B. Planning Commission Direction.**

*The Planning Commission was generally in agreement with the staff recommendations on those activities that should be exempt from critical area permit, with the exception of a request to clarify that yard maintenance and the addition of heat pumps in previously disturbed areas should be exempt.*

- *Add purpose section clarifying the exemptions are for activities that have little or no environmental impact, are temporary in nature, or emergencies.*
- *Clarify that the exemptions are subject to prior authorization by the Planning Official, except for emergency actions, and exempt activities are subject to BMPs. (see C. below)*
- *Clarify what constitutes maintenance and repair.*
- *Clarify that existing facilities and new facilities may not expand into undisturbed areas.*
- *Establish a timeframe for restoration.*
- *Allow repair and maintenance of existing private driveways.*
- *Clarify that foundation replacement is considered under the nonconformance section, not as an exception to sensitive area permit.*
- *Require retroactive mitigation for emergencies.*
- *Consider new exemptions for maintenance of non-motorized Park trails, new non-motorized Park trails, and trails connecting to the Cross Kirkland Corridor and Eastside Rail Corridor.*
- *Consider new exemptions for other utility lines connecting to existing lines.*

*This approach is consistent with Ecology guidance and other local jurisdictions.*

### **C. Follow-up from Planning Commission meeting of April 28, 2016.**

Since the Planning Commission meeting in March, staff has done further research and recommends a three tier approach to regulated activities as noted below and has added additional types of permitted activities and exemptions. Both Ecology BAS and TWC support the three-tier approach:

1. The first tier is **activities and uses allowed outright** as long as they meet the listed criteria and best management practices. These will be called **exemptions**. While they are subject to restoration of any soil or vegetation disturbance as a result of the activity, they are not subject to mitigation sequencing or compensatory mitigation. The only exception is for emergency work that must mitigate after the fact to compensate for lost functions and values. The draft list of exemptions is provided below.
2. The second tier of **activities and uses that may be permitted are subject to administrative approval by the Planning Official**. These will be called **Permitted Activities Subject to Development Standards**. (See Section XIII. below for further explanation.)
3. The third tier of **activities and uses that may be permitted are subject to Planning Director Process I approval**. These are solely for Public Utilities and Public Agency initiated activities that go beyond those thresholds established for Permitted Activities Subject to Development Standards. These will be called **Public Agency and Public Utility Exceptions** (See Section XIV. below for further explanation.)

## Exemptions

1. **Structures** - Repair and maintenance of existing structures. Examples include painting, replacing siding, windows and roofing.
2. **Public Streets** - Within existing improved rights-of-way, repair and maintenance and reconstruction of existing public streets, associated appurtenances, roads, bike lanes, sidewalks, and public access easements.
3. **Public Utilities** - Within existing improved rights-of-way or existing improved utility corridors, repair and maintenance, reconstruction and new public utility structures and utility systems and their associated facilities, lines, pipes, mains, equipment and appurtenances, both above and below ground, excluding replacement and new electric facilities exceeding 55 KV and substations and excluding replacement of hazardous liquid pipelines that increase capacity.
4. Repair and maintenance of existing non-motorized **public Park trails**.
5. Routine **landscape maintenance** of legally established lawns and gardens; including mowing, pruning, weeding, and planting; provided that such activities do not expand the area of permanent disturbance.
6. Addition of **HVAC equipment**, provided that there is no feasible alternative location available, it does not expand the area of permanent disturbance, it is as far as possible from the critical area, and that such equipment does not exceed nine (9) square feet.
7. **Site investigative work** and studies necessary for land use applications, including soils tests, water quality studies, wildlife studies, and critical area investigations; provided that any disturbance of the critical area or its buffer shall be the minimum necessary to carry out the work or studies and disturbed areas shall be immediately restored. Use of any mechanized equipment requires prior approval of the Planning Official.
8. **Educational activities**, scientific research, and passive outdoor recreational activities such as bird watching, fishing, and hiking, not including trail building or clearing.
9. **Emergency activities** necessary to prevent an immediate threat to public health, safety, or welfare. Alterations shall be reported to the City within seven days to provide evidence of threat or imminent danger. The impacted critical area and its buffer shall be fully restored in accordance with a critical area report and mitigation/maintenance plan.
10. **Restoration of a critical area and its buffer through the removal of non-native invasive plant species** listed in Kirkland's [Prohibited Plant List](#). Selected removal of invasive plant species shall be restricted to hand removal. All removed plant material shall be taken away from the site and appropriately disposed. Plants that appear on the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board list must be handled and disposed according to a noxious weed control plan appropriate to that species. Revegetation with appropriate

Exemptions
native species at natural densities is allowed in conjunction with removal of invasive plant species.

### **XIII. PERMITTED USES SUBJECT TO STANDARDS**

#### **A. Background.**

The second tier of uses and activities are **Permitted Uses Subject to Standards**. These uses and activities are subject to Planning Official review and approval to evaluate if they meet the requirements of mitigation sequencing. These activities are subject to restoration and/or mitigation requirements to replace lost functions and values. Some activities are limited to critical area buffers while others may also be allowed in the critical area.

The Planning Official may require information to make an informed decision such as a wetland determination report classifying the critical area and providing a wetland delineation and survey, and a critical area report analyzing mitigation sequencing and identifying required restoration/mitigation, as appropriate. Applicant funded peer review of the required submittal information by the City's wetland consultant is required.

If a request is approved, a critical area authorization would be issued by the Planning Official. If the request is denied, the applicant may propose a wetland or stream modification which requires Director Approval through a Process I permit. However, there are a few activities that would not qualify for modification.

<b>Permitted Activities Subject to Development Standards</b>	
<b>Use/Activity:</b>	<b>Standards:</b>
<p><b>Private passive recreation structures:</b>                      non-motorized trails,                      Stream crossings                      Benches                      Wildlife-viewing structures</p>	<p>Located in outer 25% of buffer, except at stream or lake access.</p> <p>No more than 3’ wide, pervious</p> <p>Stream crossings not allowed in Type F streams</p> <p>If located in fish habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>
<b>Government facility or Public Utility</b>	
<p><b>1. Parks:</b>                      Non-motorized public Park trails                      Stream crossings                      Benches                      Wildlife-viewing structures</p>	<p>Located in outer 25% of buffer, except at stream or lake access and stream crossings.</p> <p>No more than 5’ wide, pervious</p> <p>Stream crossings not allowed in Type F streams</p> <p>If located in fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>
<p><b>2. Public Streets:</b>                      Widening of existing public streets</p>	<p>Located in outer 25% of buffer</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p> <p>located to avoid removal of significant trees</p>
<p><b>3. Public Utilities:</b>                      a. <b>New Sewer and Water Lines</b></p>	<p>Located in Category III and IV wetland buffers and Type NP and NS stream buffers</p>

Permitted Activities Subject to Development Standards	
	<p>Required for gravity flow</p> <p>Located as far as possible from critical area edge.</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>
<p><b>b. New Sewer and Water lines to connect to existing lines in buffers</b></p>	<p>Located in Category III and IV wetland buffers and Type NP and NS stream buffers</p> <p>No feasible alternative location</p> <p>No degradation to functions or values</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>
<p><b>c. Drilling for utilities under critical area</b></p>	<p>Prohibited in Category I wetlands</p> <p>Entrance/exit portals completely outside of buffer.</p> <p>No interruption of groundwater or surface water to wetland.</p>
<p><b>d. Surface water management</b></p> <p>Runoff treatment or flow control best management practices</p>	<p>No grading or maintenance required</p> <p>Vegetation compatible with buffer vegetation standards</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>

Permitted Activities Subject to Development Standards	
Stormwater outfalls	<p>Located in Category III and IV wetland buffers and Type NP and NS stream buffers when discharge outside buffer infeasible or causes erosion or slope instability</p> <p>Located in Category I and II wetland buffers and Type F stream buffers only if adjacent to slopes greater than 30%</p> <p>No degradation to functions or values</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>
<b>e. Other public utilities</b> (water, telephone, cable television, gas, electric power, etc.)	<p>Located in the outer 25% of the buffer area</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p> <p>Located to avoid removal of significant trees</p> <p>Hazardous liquid pipelines not allowed</p> <p>No degradation to functions or values</p>
<b>f. Cross Kirkland Corridor and Eastside Rail Corridors</b>	<p>No expansion of existing permanent disturbance area</p>
Construction of new public nonmotorized trails	<p>Pervious or other low-impact materials</p> <p>If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.</p>
Construction of new public nonmotorized trails connecting to either corridor	<p>No more than 5' wide</p> <p>Pervious</p>

Permitted Activities Subject to Development Standards	
	If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.
Minor replacement or modification of existing facilities by a <a href="#">public utility</a> in either corridor	No expansion of existing permanent disturbance area  If located in fish or wildlife habitat conservation areas must implement approved habitat management plan requirements.

- B. **Planning Commission Direction:** *The Planning Commission has not seen the complete draft list of permitted uses or the list of exemptions, but will be reviewing them at its next study session. The list continues to evolve and will be finally determined before the hearing.*

**XIV. PUBLIC AGENCY AND PUBLIC UTILITY EXCEPTIONS**

A. **Background.**

The third tier of uses and activities are **Public Agency and Public Utility Exceptions**. This is a mechanism that would allow a development proposal by a public agency or public utility to apply for a permit that otherwise is not allowed in a critical area or critical area buffer. It will be reviewed as a Process I permit pursuant to KZC Chapter 145. The Planning Director will review and approve these activities subject to mitigation sequencing and restoration and/or mitigation requirements to replace lost functions and values. Approval criteria include analysis of whether strict application of the Critical Areas regulations would restrict or prohibit the public services provided by the utility or public agency.

Possible examples may be a public street expansion, a new sidewalk, or a new utility pole that extends further into the critical area buffer than the permitted outer 25% encroachment allowed with Permitted Activities with Development Standards.

Other jurisdictions have taken a similar three-tier approach in their codes.

- B. **Planning Commission Direction:** *The Planning Commission has not seen the proposed Public Agency and Public Utility Exception, but will be reviewing them at their next study session.*

**XV. PUBLIC PROGRAMMATIC PERMITS**

Another topic that the Planning Commission has not considered but that staff is recommending is allowing **programmatic permits for ongoing and repeated public agency and utility maintenance activities**. King County currently allows them, and staff is investigating their use in Kirkland. A single programmatic permit covering a repetitive maintenance program would alleviate the need to obtain separate permit approval for activities that have the same or similar identifiable impacts each time the activity is repeated at all the sites covered by the programmatic permit. An example of a candidate activity is ongoing culvert cleanouts in critical areas. The same impacts, restoration and or mitigation, and the same best management practices would apply, regardless of the site or the year, so it makes sense to consider allowing a programmatic permit to be used in these situations.

The Planning Commission has not seen the proposed Programmatic Permit information, but will be reviewing it at its next study session.

## **XVI. SINGLE FAMILY NONCONFORMANCES**

To meet current BAS, buffer widths for most wetlands and many streams will need to be increased. While there are already many nonconforming structures in Kirkland because of current buffer and buffer setback requirements, the buffer increases will cause additional structures or portions of structures to become nonconforming.

When considering how to address such nonconformances, the Planning Commission considered the actions, goals and policies for critical areas adopted in the new [Environment Chapter](#) of the Comprehensive Plan listed at the beginning of the memo.

The challenge is to ensure implementation of these important goals and policies while not overly restricting existing, legal use of properties. It should be noted that nonconformance regulations address those activities that can be conducted without a request for buffer modification or averaging or through reasonable use provisions. Activities beyond what is allowed by nonconformance regulations may still be pursued through those other processes.

The City’s current nonconformance provisions relating to wetlands and streams are found in KZC Chapter 90 (Drainage Basins) and in KZC Chapter 162 (Nonconformance). KZC Chapter 162 addresses nonconformance citywide unless a section in another chapter supersedes it, such as certain nonconforming provisions in Chapter 90. Staff intends to consolidate all regulations related to critical area nonconformances into either Chapter 90 or 162.

The table below is an overview of the different issues for nonconforming structures and the current applicable code section that are further discussed in the following sections.

### **Issues for Nonconforming Single Family Structures**

<b>Section Below</b>	<b>Action (in order of least impacting)</b>	<b>Current Regulations</b>
<b>A.</b>	Maintenance and repair	Section 90.20.6 KZC <b>does</b> allow it

<p><b>B.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconstruction as part of maintenance of repair project</li> <li>• Reconstruction due to fire or acts of nature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 162.35.13.a <b>does not</b> allow it</li> <li>• Section 162.30.1 <b>does not</b> allow if cost of work exceeds 50% of assessed value of improvement. Shoreline regulations do allow complete rebuild/restoration</li> </ul>
<p><b>C.</b></p>	<p>Expansion of nonconforming structure that <b>does not increase</b> the degree of nonconformance</p>	<p>Section 90.20.6 <b>does</b> allow expansion of nonconforming structure if it does not increase nonconformance</p>
<p><b>D.</b></p>	<p>Expansion of nonconforming structure that <b>increases the degree of nonconformance</b></p>	<p>Section 162.45 <b>does not</b> allow</p>

**A. Maintenance and Repair of Nonconforming Structures.**

1. Background:

Maintenance and repair to a nonconforming structure is allowed as an exemption under Section 90.20.6 KZC. All other **local jurisdictions** surveyed allow maintenance and repair of nonconforming structures.

See illustration for Nonconformance – Maintenance and Repair on page 36.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Continue to allow maintenance and repair as an exemption under Chapter 90 KZC for all structures and clarify definition.*

**B. Reconstruction of Nonconforming Structures.**

1. Background:

Maintenance and repair of nonconforming structures is currently limited to that which is “normal and routine”. Reconstruction is not currently permitted in Chapter 90 KZC and Chapter 162 KZC. The City’s existing regulations on structures damaged due to fire or nature are found in Section 162.30.1 KZC as follows:

*Special Provision for Damaged Improvements: If a nonconforming improvement is damaged by sudden accidental cause and the damage does not exceed 50 percent of the assessed or appraised value of that improvement, whichever is greater, the applicant may reconstruct that improvement. The reconstructed improvement may not be more nonconforming than it was immediately prior to the damage. A*

*building permit to rebuild the nonconforming improvement must be applied for within six (6) months or the nonconformance shall be considered to be terminated and shall not be resumed.*

Thus, a structure must be brought into conformance if over 50% of the structure must be replaced or restored due to the casualty damage.

However, Section 83.550.4 for nonconformances under the shoreline regulations allow damaged structures to be completely replaced, provided that:

- a. The permit process is commenced within 24 months of the date of such damage; and*
- b. The reconstruction does not expand, enlarge, or otherwise increase the nonconformity, except as provided for in this section; and*
- c. The reconstruction locates the structure in the same place where it was, or alternatively if moved, then the least environmentally damaging location relative to the shoreline and any critical areas;*

The 24 month timeline was established to allow for time to process insurance claims, get financing, design rebuild, and apply for building permit.

Most **local jurisdictions** appear to allow reconstruction of nonconforming structures subject to limitations, including no expansion of the existing footprint. Bellevue, Bothell and Woodinville also only allow reconstruction above the foundation (no replacement of the foundation itself). This limitation makes sense because if the foundation is being removed, the development could be subject to mitigation sequencing to consider other less impactful locations.

See illustration for Rebuild on page 36.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**


*Allow reconstruction of primary structures, including garages provided there is **no expansion of the existing footprint** and the **reconstruction is built on the existing foundation** (no replacement of the foundation itself). Treat structures damaged by fire and natural causes in the same manner but require permits within 24 months consistent with City shoreline rules.*

*Not included for replacement are accessory structures (such as sheds, play structures, gazebos,) in the buffer, or buffer setback. Accessory structures are not essential to the use of property and should be relocated out of the critical area, buffer and buffer setback.*

3. Houghton Community Council comments:

*Allow foundation to be replaced in same location for reconstruction of the structure. Foundations sometimes need to be replacement after casualty damage to a structure. (Staff response was that they will be allowed to be replaced but as far as possible from*

*the critical area or its buffer. If a foundation is damaged to the point that it needs to be replaced, it is the opportune time to relocate the structure as far from the wetland or stream as possible taking into consideration the location of existing improvements and site constraints.)*



**C. Expansion of a Nonconforming Structure that Does Not Increase the Degree of Nonconformance.**

1. Background:

Currently, Section 90.20.6 allows the expansion of a nonconforming structure if the addition is outside of the buffer and buffer setback, and the expansion does not increase the degree of nonconformance.

*Section 90.20.6 KZC: General Exceptions: Normal and routine maintenance or repair of structures; provided that such activities do not increase the previously approved structure footprint within a sensitive area or its buffer. Increases in structure footprint outside of such areas shall be allowed, even if all or a portion of the previously approved footprint is within such areas.*

Many **other jurisdictions** simply allow expansions similar to Kirkland’s existing regulations. A number of other jurisdictions (cities of Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way) limit the exception by floor area or valuation.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Retain existing provision that allows the expansion of a nonconforming structure if the **addition is outside of the buffer and buffer setback**, and the expansion does not increase the degree of nonconformance in any way.*

**D. Expansion a Nonconforming Structure that Does Increase the Degree of Nonconformance.**

1. Background:

The City’s current Section 162.45 KZC **does not permit a structure to be enlarged, altered or changed in any way that would increase the nonconformance.**

*Section 162.45 Prohibition on Increasing Nonconformances: No nonconformance may in any way be enlarged, expanded, increased, intensified, compounded or in any other way made greater, except as permitted in this chapter.*

Thus, the City’s current regulations do not allow a structure located in a buffer or buffer setback to be expanded in any direction into the buffer or buffer setback (see illustration on page 43).

Staff has discussed BAS options with the Department of Ecology. In general, **BAS would suggest that structures not be expanded into the buffer**, even if the existing structure is in the buffer. However, recognizing the constraints on existing nonconforming structures and the creation of additional nonconforming structures, the Department of Ecology has indicated that expanding a nonconforming structure further into the buffer is **acceptable if the expansion occurs on the side opposite or furthest away from the wetland or stream and if the expansion is limited**. They also recognize that it is a policy decision for each jurisdiction based on its goals and policies the extent of urban condition. The policy variability is evident in the range of approaches other jurisdictions have taken on this issue.

2. Other local jurisdictions:

The table included as Attachment 4 is a list of the regulations for local jurisdictions concerning expansion of nonconforming structures. As reflected in Attachment 4,

jurisdictions vary between those that allow expansion of existing nonconformances and those that do not. Six of the jurisdictions surveyed do not allow expansions of the footprint. Five jurisdictions allow some limited expansion but no closer than the existing structure.

The more permissive regulations allow footprint expansions of up to 1,000 square feet. For Kirkland, that could result in homes that exceed what Kirkland would consider permissible under current reasonable use (typical 3,000 square foot maximum site disturbance). Bellevue has a more moderate approach for expansion of nonconformances that follows a mitigation sequencing rationale by requiring consideration of options with less impact (away from the critical area). For example, if the objective is to expand the kitchen and there is no feasible means to do this away from the critical area side of the home, then the expansion into the buffer could be approved. However, if the objective is to add a bedroom and this addition can be achieved on the side of the house opposite from the critical area, then that would be the preferred location for the expansion.

3. Discussion:

One approach to analyzing the different types of changes that would increase the degree of nonconformance is to assess them pursuant to the following four categories. This is most similar to Bellevue’s approach:

- a. **No impact:** No new permanent impacts to critical area, buffer or buffer setback
- b. **Low impact:** New impacts to buffer or buffer setback located on the opposite side of the existing home from the critical area
- c. **Moderate impact:** New impacts to buffer or buffer setback located no closer to critical area than existing home
- d. **High impact:** New impacts to buffer or buffer setback located closer to critical area than existing home

Each of these types of impacts is assessed in the tables and diagrams below on pages 41-43.

<p><b>a. No impact improvements that increase the degree of nonconformance of the existing structure</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes within the existing footprint (fill the donut hole, add second story)</li> <li>• Expansion of existing footprint or additions outside the buffer or buffer setback</li> <li>• Minimal additions (bay window, eaves, etc.)</li> </ul>

These improvements would have no new permanent impact on the functions and values of the critical area or its buffer.

<p><b>b. Low impact improvements that increase the degree of nonconformance of the existing structure</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand footprint of structure into the building setback or buffer that is on the opposite side of the structure from the wetland or stream</li> </ul>

These improvements would have relatively low permanent impact on the critical areas because the function of the buffer that is separated by the existing structure is of lesser value compared to the buffer between the structure and the wetland or stream.

**c. Moderate impact improvements that increase the degree of nonconformance of the existing structure**

- Expand structure into the building setback or buffer that is on the same side of as the wetland or stream

These improvements would have a permanent impact to the critical area since it additional encroachment into the buffer that is protecting the wetland or stream. Prohibiting encroachment of improvements and closer to the critical area than the existing home would constitute relatively moderate impacts. Construction disturbance and future maintenance and repair of the expansion would further increase the impact to the critical area.

**d. High impact improvements that increase the degree of nonconformance of the existing structure**

- Expand structure into the building setback or buffer that is on the same side of as the wetland or stream

These improvements would have a high permanent impact to the critical areas since they reduce the buffer that is protecting the wetland or stream. Construction disturbance and future maintenance and repair of the expansion would further expand the impact to the critical area.

As a comparison to other local jurisdictions, a few jurisdictions allow greater encroachment into the critical area buffer for additions than is proposed below. Some allow the same encroachments that the Planning Commission supports and some do not allow any encroachment (see Attachment 4). BAS does not support encroachments into buffers without showing necessity and mitigation. The Department of Ecology recognizes the desire of homeowners to be able to expand nonconforming structures and thus accept expansions into a buffer if it is on the side of the house opposite of the critical area. Ecology has not challenged jurisdictions that allow additions facing the wetlands or on the two sides of the house facing the wetlands, but if the encroachments are to be allowed, they should be modest in size. The Planning Commission's direction below is to take a modest approach to additions allowed in the critical area buffer and that are comparable to several other jurisdictions, including Bellevue.

4. **Planning Commission Direction:** (see pages 41-43 for illustrations)

- a. *Allow outright **No impact** modifications to an existing nonconforming structure.*
- *Require native revegetation of disturbed area if the buffer is disturbed for construction of these improvements.*
  - *Require the application to address any surface water issues*

- b. *Allow, subject to review, **Low impact** modifications to an existing nonconforming structure.*
- *Only allow for those structures that have not received prior buffer modifications or reasonable use exceptions*
  - *Limit to maximum footprint expansion to **1,000 square feet but not to exceed 50% of the assessed valuation of the structure***
  - *Require 1:1 compensatory mitigation of remaining buffer area*
  - *Require native revegetation of disturbed area if the buffer is disturbed for construction of these improvements*
- c. *Allow, subject to review, **Moderate impact** modifications to an existing nonconforming structure*
- *Only allow for those structures that have not received prior buffer modifications or reasonable use exceptions*
  - *Limit to maximum footprint expansion to **500 square feet but not to exceed 50% of the assessed valuation of the structure***
  - *Require 1:1 compensatory mitigation of remaining buffer area*
  - *Require native revegetation of disturbed area if the buffer is disturbed for construction of these improvements*
- d. *Allow, subject to review, **High impact** modifications to an existing nonconforming structure*
- *Only allow for those structures that have not received prior buffer modifications or reasonable use exceptions*
  - *Limit to maximum footprint expansion to **250 square feet but not to exceed 50% of the assessed valuation of the structure***
  - *Require minimum 1:1 compensatory mitigation of remaining buffer area. The 1:1 ratio may be appropriate if the expansion is into an existing disturbed area, but a higher ratio is appropriate if the expansion would disturb a forested buffer*
  - *Require native revegetation of disturbed area if the buffer is disturbed for construction of these improvements*

*For b., c. and d. above, **mitigation sequencing** is required as diagrammed (see Illustrations on pages 41-43) below to ensure that less impactful alternatives are considered and that temporary and permanent impacts are mitigated.*

*For d. – high impact above, establish a **minimum buffer width** to avoid impact at or near the edge of a stream of wetland.*


Below are examples of the various approaches described above.

5. Houghton Community Council comments:

*Support overall non-conformance provisions that provide flexibility, but:*

- *Question requiring a locational analysis for an addition in a critical area buffer to justify why an addition needs to be located in a certain location. The existing floor plan and improvements on the site will be the determining factor.  
Based on this comment staff has subsequently changed direction and will recommend to the Planning Commission that the requirement be eliminated. Most homeowners will place addition where it is needed to function with the existing floor plan. This memo reflects the change in approach.*
  
- *Question why not allow a footprint of 1,000 square feet anywhere in the critical area buffer as does King County. Staff response was that encroachments into buffers do not meet BAS and Ecology does not support encroachments unless they are on the opposite side of the house from the critical area. Planning Commission's direction is to allow 250 sq. ft. to 1,000 sq. ft. encroachment, dependent on the location of the addition in the critical area buffer as do several other jurisdictions. Also, some jurisdictions do not allow any encroachments. Thus it is important to take a moderate position on the encroachments. Also the proposal is based on the footprint of a house. Adding a second or even third floor above the footprint could result in an addition of up to 3,000 square feet.*

Nonconformance Example – Buffer Setback




Order of preference when structure is located in Buffer Setback:

- 1. House expanded outside of buffer setback and buffer
- 2. House expanded into buffer setback only if objective of expansion cannot be accomplished with 1. No further than existing encroachment
- 3. House expanded into buffer setback only if objective of expansion cannot be accomplished with 1. or 2.

Note – 250 s.f. maximum footprint expansion is recommended in case 3. Above the limit should be subject to mitigation sequencing and/or reasonable use

### Nonconformance Example – Partial Buffer




**Order of preference when structure is partially located in Buffer:**

1. House expanded outside of buffer setback and buffer
2. House expanded into buffer setback only if objective of expansion cannot be accomplished with 1. (500 s.f. max)
3. House expanded into buffer only if objective of expansion cannot be accomplished with 1. or 2. No closer to critical area than existing encroachment (500 s.f. max).
4. House expanded into buffer only if objective of expansion cannot be accomplished with 1., 2., or 3. (250 s.f. max)

**Note – maximum footprint expansion and mitigation recommended for 2., 3., and 4.**

Nonconformance Example – Full Buffer



**XVII. MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

Current regulations establish a formula for Maximum Development Potential (MDP). MDP is a calculation to establish the **maximum potential number of dwelling units that may be developed** on a site that contains a wetland, stream, or their buffers.

The calculation is as follows:

- Portion of site with no buffer, wetland or stream: counted at full density
- Portion of site containing a buffer: counted at a percentage of density based on a sliding scale
- Portion of site containing a wetland or stream: not counted for density

Based on a sliding scale, the more of a site that is encumbered by a critical area buffer, the greater the dwelling unit reduction. The dwelling units must be placed on the buildable area of the site and not in the buffer or critical area.

The MDP calculation was originally created in 1998 in response to several developments that transferred 100% of development potential of the gross area of a site to the buildable portion of a site – resulting in very small lots that were considered to be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. An example of this is Trillium Court, a PUD developed prior to 1998, shown below in an aerial photo from the City's GIS mapping. The surrounding lots are zoned RS 7.2 and developed under current provisions for calculating MDP.



Trillium  
Court

Once the base dwelling unit count is calculated with the MDP formula, existing Subdivision and Zoning regulations may still allow the number of units to be increased. Various subdivision flexibility standards in the Kirkland Municipal Code (KMC 22.28) may be applied to increase the potential number of lots. These include size, small lot single-family, and low impact development (LID). Cottage development regulations (KZC 113) also allow increased number of lots. All of these options would be reviewed concurrently with the subdivision process. These ways to increase density will continue to be available under the revised Chapter 90 KZC regulations.

The Gap Analysis Report and staff identified several issues associated with Maximum Development Potential to consider with revisions to Chapter 90 KZC.

**A. Clarify that existing subdivision and zoning provisions can be used to increase potential number of lots after calculating maximum development potential.**

1. **Background:** Clarify that **subdivision flexibility standards and cottage housing and LID zoning regulations** may be used to increase residential density. These

techniques are available for all subdivision proposals, regardless of whether the subject property contains a sensitive area or buffer.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Clarify that the subdivision and zoning provisions can be used after calculation of the Maximum Development Potential to add to the base density.*

**B. Option to Reduce Dimensional Standards.**

1. **Background:** In recognition of the greater buffer widths required with this update, some reductions of dimensional standards similar to those allowed with Low Impact Development (LID) were considered for development with critical areas to offset the loss of development potential.

Option to Reduction in Dimensional Standards:

- a. Minimum **required yards**
  - zero lot line for interior lot lines to achieve clustering between units
  - front – 10 feet
  - Side and rear - 5 feet
- b. Minimum **parking pad** dimensions
  - width - 8.5 feet per required stall
  - depth - 18.5 feet per required stall
- c. **Tandem parking** where stalls are shared by the same dwelling unit

Some **jurisdictions** allow reductions in dimensional standards while others do not.

2. **Planning Commission Direction:**

*Allow the reduced dimensions noted above.*

3. **Houghton Community Council comment:**

*Concern about residential character with proposal to allow reduction in front yard setback from 20' to 10' for all sites to provide flexibility in site design. Staff response was that reduction in front yard is currently allowed for reasonable use exceptions and will help offset site constraint of critical areas.*

**XVIII. REASONABLE USE EXECEPTIONS**

**A. Background.**

Reasonable use is a legal concept that has been articulated by federal and state courts in regulatory takings cases. In a takings case, the decision maker must balance the public benefit against the owner's interests by considering the nature of the harm the regulation is intended to prevent, the availability and effectiveness of alternative measures, and the economic loss

borne by the owner. Public benefit factors considered are the seriousness of the harm of the impacts, the extent to which the land involved contributes to the harm, the degree to which the regulation solves the problem, and the feasibility of less oppressive solutions.

The City's existing Reasonable Use Exception (RUE) addresses the takings issues by allowing use of the land when strict application of KZC Chapter 90 would **deny all economically viable use of the property**. An application is eligible after it can demonstrate that even after proposing to reduce or alter the wetland or stream and its buffer to the maximum extent allowable under Chapter 90 KZC.

Under the City's RUE regulations, one **single family home** can be proposed in a **residential zone** and an **office building** can be proposed in a **commercial or industrial** zone. Development is limited to the following area of disturbance based on the total lot area of the property:

<b>Lot Size</b>	<b>Area of Disturbance</b>
Less than 6,000 sq. ft. lot	50% of the lot area can be disturbed
Between 6,000 and 30,000 sq. ft. lot	3,000 sq. ft. area can be disturbed
Larger than 30,000 sq. ft. lot	Between 3,000 sq. ft. area and 10% of the lot area can be disturbed, determined on a case by case basis.

RUE developments must meet all mitigation, maintenance and monitoring requirements of Chapter 90 KZC. Compensatory mitigation to achieve no net loss (creation or restoration and enhancement of the wetland or wetland or stream buffer) must be provided on site or within the city's drainage basin in which the property is located at the same compensatory ratios established for non-reasonable use proposals.

As previously discussed, compensatory mitigation for wetland fill is often impossible to achieve on-site since there is no remaining area beyond the allowed disturbed area and the wetlands, streams and/or the buffer area to add mitigation, particularly at the required compensatory ratios (see section above).

## **B. Issues.**

### 1. Allow Reasonable Use Exceptions in Office and Institutional Zones:

Like the rest of Chapter 90, the RUE section was adopted based on BAS information in the mid 1990's. Chapter 90 allows RUE's only in **Commercial, Industrial and Residential** Zones. Current BAS has found that urban uses have a similar range of impacts to wetlands and streams so there is no justification to limit RUE's to certain zones. The same wetland and stream area functions and values are present regardless of the zone and functioning buffers and other mitigating measures can protect these features. As Kirkland continues to infill, there is more pressure to maximize development regardless of zoning classification.

Other local jurisdictions allow RUEs in a variety of zones.

2. Allow Limited Retail Use in Commercial zones and in Certain Office Zones:

RUE provisions only allow **office uses in Commercial and Industrial zones**. At the time that the Chapter 90 KZC regulations were adopted, it was thought that an office use had significantly less impact than a commercial use on a wetland, stream or its buffer. Current BAS indicates that urban uses have a similar range of impacts on a wetland, stream or its buffer.

The City has had a request to allow retail uses eligible for Reasonable Use Exceptions, but they are not eligible. Wayne Seminoff has submitted a letter (see Attachments 5 and 6) requesting to be able to apply for a RUE for a retail use in a commercial zone.

BAS identifies and requires measures that minimize impacts to wetlands and streams areas resulting from high intensity land uses whether they may be office or retail use (see Section VII above). Presumably, similar impacts resulting from either type of use would be minimized by requiring the same measures. The stormwater and toxic runoff from either use would impact the wetland or stream area similarly and measures to reduce these impacts would also be similar. However, certain types of retail uses, such as uses with drive through facilities or outdoor activities, would have greater impacts on wetlands than other types of retail uses.

Other local jurisdictions do not limit uses in RUE eligible zones.

**C. Planning Commission Direction.**

- *Allow RUE's in Office and Institutional Zones so that they are allowed in all zones.*
- *Allow limited retail to be eligible for RUE's in Commercial zones and in those Office zones where retail uses are allowed along with criteria on the types of retail eligible for RUE's.*

**XIX. EFFECT ON CODE AMENDMENTS ON PRIOR APPROVAL AND PENDING PERMITS**

Attachment 7 is a memo from Eric Shields, Director of Planning and Building Department, providing guidance on the effect of the upcoming code amendments on prior approvals and pending permits. The memo provides guidance relative to existing KZC provisions related to projects that have **approved** land use permits and references state statutes related to vesting of certain types of applications and pending **subdivisions** that have applications that have been **determined to be complete**. Needless to say, vesting is a very complicated and contentious issue and the City is limited in terms of providing legal advice to applicants. The clearest path to vesting under state law is a **complete building permit** application and staff is advising applicants accordingly. As evidenced by the current KZC section 90.165 discussed in the memo, the City may adopt local provisions that vest specific applications.

The Planning Commission, Houghton Community Council, and City Council should discuss the effective date of the new regulations for purposes of staff implementation and development predictability.

## **XX. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Here are staff's responses to three of the comment letters.

### **A. Seminoff Letter** (Attachments 5 and 6)

Mr. Seminoff requests that retail uses be eligible for a reasonable use exception. Currently they are not. The Planning Commission's direction is to make limited retail uses (excluding uses that include outdoor activities such as a drive thru component and gas stations) eligible for a reasonable use exception. See discussion on pages 46-47 of this memo.

### **B. Raedeke Associated Letter** (Attachment 9)

Raedeke Associates submitted a letter addressing stream buffer widths at the Planning Commission meeting on March 24, 2016 meeting. The letter addresses the concept of variable width buffers for streams determined on a case by case basis. Staff has the following response to some of the comments made in the letter:

Variable buffer widths are supported by scientific literature as noted in the Best Available Science (BAS) report prepared for the City. However, they are rarely used for several reasons and not commonly used by other local jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions do have an escalator clauses if a steep slope is located in a buffer so this would make the buffer variable under these circumstances.

For an applicant and the City, variable buffer widths can be costly to determine, sometimes contentious to agree upon, and unwieldy to administer. And for the applicant, they are unpredictable since the final buffer requirement is not known until after the lengthy, complex and costly process. Island County developed a site-specific approach to regulating wetlands, which incorporated the slope of the site, but they found it to be challenging to administer, and they are presently in the midst of a revision. Similarly, San Juan County developed a site-specific buffer approach to wetlands, but never implemented it as they defaulted to a more standard buffer width in their most recent code update.

Instead of having a variable buffer width at a site specific level, another option is at the basin level, such as by maintaining a similar approach to the existing Chapter 90 primary and secondary basins. The City is currently divided into seven primary basins and six secondary basins for determining buffer widths. The primary basins generally contain fish bearing streams while the secondary basins do not. A variable width by basin approach would add significant complexity to code development and interpretation, but would seem more manageable than a site-specific approach. This approach would take more time, research and coordination to come up with a varied buffer standard.

One goal of the new Chapter 90 is to simplify the regulations by moving away from the micro regulations by basin and use a city wide one basin approach based on just stream typing (fish bearing and non-fish bearing year round or seasonal). Another goal is to have consistency between Chapter 90 KZC and Chapter 83 KZC (the shoreline regulations) as much as possible. Chapter 83 uses the stream typing standard for the entire shoreline and does not break the shoreline down by basins.

## **XXI. NEXT STEP**

On June 23, 2016, the Planning Commission will begin review of a preliminary draft of Chapter 90 KZC based on its direction on the key issues. The review will probably take two meetings. At that time staff will transmit the comments of the Houghton Community Council from its May 23, 2016 meeting to the Planning Commission so that the Commission can consider the comments when reviewing the draft Chapter 90 KZC. In July, the Houghton Community Council will hold a study session on the preliminary draft.

The Planning Commission and the Houghton Community Council will hold a joint public hearing probably in August on the draft Chapter 90 KZC.

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Summary table of the draft Chapter 90 KZC wetland regulations
2. Summary table of the draft Chapter 90 KZC stream regulations
3. Illustration of Buffer Averaging
4. List of the regulations for local jurisdictions concerning expansion of nonconforming structures
5. Wayne Seminoff comment letter dated January 8, 2016, concerning reasonable use exception for retail uses
6. Wayne Seminoff comment letter dated February 12, 2016, concerning reasonable use exception for retail uses
7. Vesting memo: Effect of Code Amendments on Prior Approval and Pending Permits
8. Save Our Trail comment letter dated February 16, 2016
9. Raedeke Associates comment letter dated April 22, 2016
10. Brent Carson comment letter dated April 22, 2016
11. Stephen Haugen comment letter dated April 24, 2016
12. Four case studies showing effect of proposed regulations on different wetland types using development scenarios

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT****Wetlands and Associated Buffer Standards**

<b>Wetland Determination and Delineation</b>	In accordance with the approved federal delineation manual and applicable regional supplements described in WAC 173-22-035. The Planning Official makes final determination.																																							
<b>Wetland Rating</b>	2014 Department of Ecology Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, as revised.																																							
<b>Wetland Buffer Width Standard</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5"><b>Wetland Buffer Widths</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2"><b>Wetland Category</b></th> <th colspan="4">Buffer width based on habitat points</th> </tr> <tr> <th>3-4 habitat pts.</th> <th>5 habitat pts.</th> <th>6-7 habitat pts.</th> <th>8-9 habitat pts.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Category I: Bogs and High Conservation Areas</td> <td>190 feet</td> <td>190 feet</td> <td>190 feet</td> <td>225 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Category I: Others</td> <td>75 feet</td> <td>105 feet</td> <td>165 feet</td> <td>225 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Category II</td> <td>75 feet</td> <td>105 feet</td> <td>165 feet</td> <td>225 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Category III</td> <td>60 feet</td> <td>105 feet</td> <td>165 feet</td> <td>225 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Category IV</td> <td colspan="4">40 feet</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Wetland Buffer Widths</b>					<b>Wetland Category</b>	Buffer width based on habitat points				3-4 habitat pts.	5 habitat pts.	6-7 habitat pts.	8-9 habitat pts.	Category I: Bogs and High Conservation Areas	190 feet	190 feet	190 feet	225 feet	Category I: Others	75 feet	105 feet	165 feet	225 feet	Category II	75 feet	105 feet	165 feet	225 feet	Category III	60 feet	105 feet	165 feet	225 feet	Category IV	40 feet			
<b>Wetland Buffer Widths</b>																																								
<b>Wetland Category</b>	Buffer width based on habitat points																																							
	3-4 habitat pts.	5 habitat pts.	6-7 habitat pts.	8-9 habitat pts.																																				
Category I: Bogs and High Conservation Areas	190 feet	190 feet	190 feet	225 feet																																				
Category I: Others	75 feet	105 feet	165 feet	225 feet																																				
Category II	75 feet	105 feet	165 feet	225 feet																																				
Category III	60 feet	105 feet	165 feet	225 feet																																				
Category IV	40 feet																																							
<b>Structure Setback from Buffer</b>	10 foot wide structure setback is required from upland edge of the entire buffer. Certain improvements listed in KZC 90. [redacted] are permitted in the setback.																																							
<b>Other Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased buffer width may be required if wetland or its buffer contains or is adjacent geologically hazardous area, habitat of certain species or frequently flooded area based on critical area report. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>Buffer must meet the vegetative buffer standards. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>Nine measures to minimize impact must be implemented. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>Buffer averaging is permitted if criteria are met. See KZC 90. [redacted]. The Planning Official makes decision. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>Fencing and signage are required along the entire upland edge of buffer both during construction and upon completion of the project. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>Wetlands and buffers shall be placed in recorded critical area easements or tracts for perpetual protection. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>For mandatory restoration as a result of enforcement action, see KZC 90. [redacted]. For voluntary conservation or restoration, see KZC 90. [redacted] and [redacted].</li> </ul>																																							
<b>Alternative Buffer Standard</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant can choose to not meet the vegetative buffer standards and the nine mitigating measures by increasing the required buffer width by 33%. Buffer averaging is permitted. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> </ul>																																							
<b>Exempted and Permitted Uses and Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities and uses shall be prohibited within wetlands and associated buffers, except those exempted or permitted in KZC 90. [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted], or those approved under a City review process in this chapter.</li> </ul>																																							
<b>Modification to Wetlands and Related Impacts to Buffers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modification to a wetland requires a critical area permit pursuant to a Process I, Chapter 145 KZC, critical area report, mitigation sequencing, and compensatory mitigation plan. See KZC 90. [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted].</li> <li>Buffer standard may not be modified or reduced, except as part of a wetland modification pursuant to a Process I, Chapter 145 KZC; or through buffer averaging or a waiver for a divided buffer approved by the Planning Official. See KZC 90. [redacted] and [redacted].</li> </ul>																																							


## Preliminary Draft

### Streams and Associated Buffer Standards


<b>Stream Classification</b>	In accordance with WAC 222-16-030, as amended. The Planning Official makes final determination.								
<b>Stream Buffer Width Standard</b>	<b>Stream Buffer Widths</b>								
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Stream Type</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Buffer Width</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F (Fish bearing)</td> <td>100 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Np (Perennial non-fish bearing)</td> <td>50 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ns (Seasonal non-fish bearing)</td> <td>50 feet</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Stream Type	Buffer Width	F (Fish bearing)	100 feet	Np (Perennial non-fish bearing)	50 feet	Ns (Seasonal non-fish bearing)	50 feet
Stream Type	Buffer Width								
F (Fish bearing)	100 feet								
Np (Perennial non-fish bearing)	50 feet								
Ns (Seasonal non-fish bearing)	50 feet								
<b>Structure Setback from Buffer</b>	10 foot wide structure setback is required from upland edge of the entire buffer. Certain minor improvements listed in KZC 90. [redacted] are permitted within the setback.								
<b>Other Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased buffer width may be required if the stream or its buffer contains or is adjacent geologically hazardous area, habitat of certain species or frequently flooded area based on critical area report. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>• Buffer must meet vegetative buffer standards. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>• Nine measures that minimize impacts must be implemented. See KZC 90 [redacted].</li> <li>• Buffer averaging is permitted if criteria are met. See KZC 90. [redacted]. The Planning Official makes decision.</li> <li>• Fencing and signage are required along the entire upland edge of buffer both during construction and upon completion of a project. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>• For mandatory restoration as a result of enforcement action, see KZC 90. [redacted]. Voluntary restoration or conservation of streams and buffers, see KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>• Streams and buffers shall be placed in recorded critical area easements or tracts for perpetual protection. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> </ul>								
<b>Alternative Buffer Standard</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant can choose to not meet the vegetative buffer standards and the nine mitigating measures by increasing the standard buffer width by 33%. Buffer averaging is permitted if criteria found in KZC 90. [redacted] are met and approved by the Planning Official.</li> </ul>								
<b>Exempted and Permitted Uses and Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities and uses shall be prohibited within streams and associated buffers, except those exempted or as permitted with standards as found in KZC 90. [redacted] and [redacted], or those approved under a City review process in this chapter.</li> </ul>								
<b>Modifications to Stream and Related Impacts to Buffer</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modifications to stream and related impacts to buffers require a critical area permit pursuant to Process I, Chapter 145 KZC, a critical area report, mitigation sequencing and mitigation plan described in KZC 90. [redacted] and [redacted], and if criteria in KZC 90. [redacted] are met. Stream modifications include stream crossings, culvertings, relocation, channel stabilizations and changing the meandering course of streams.</li> <li>• Daylighting of streams is encouraged. The Planning Official makes decision unless part of a critical area permit under a Process I. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> <li>• Buffer standards may not be modified or reduced, except as part of a stream modification in KZC 90. [redacted], pursuant to a Process I, or through buffer averaging, daylighting a stream and a waiver to a divided buffer all approved by the Planning Official. See KZC 90. [redacted].</li> </ul>								

ILLUSTRATIONS OF BUFFER WIDTH AVERAGING AND BUFFER WIDTH REDUCTION


# WETLAND BUFFER IMPACT ANALYSIS




CURRENT BUFFER



PROPOSED BUFFER



BUFFER REDUCTION



BUFFER AVERAGING

### Expansion of Nonconforming Single Family Structures into Buffers

Jurisdiction	Single Family	Standards if any
<b>Kirkland Chapter 162</b>	No nonconformance may be enlarged, expanded, increased and intensified in any away made greater.	
<b>Bellevue</b>	Expansion maximum of <b>500 square foot footprint</b> (over the life of the structure) only if no other feasible location based on functional use of the expansion.	Permit and mitigation. Preference diagrammed & criteria established to assess alternatives and minimize impact
<b>Bothell</b>	Cannot further alter or increase the adverse impact	
<b>Burien</b>	Cannot enlarge footprint	
<b>Federal Way</b>	Cannot enlarge footprint	
<b>Kenmore</b>	Expansion of <b>500 square foot footprint</b> for structures that existed before 1990. No closer to the critical area than existing structure.	
<b>Kent</b>	Cannot enlarge footprint	Exceptions require a variance
<b>King County</b>	Expansion of <b>1,000 square foot footprint</b> . No closer to the critical area than existing structure. Location has least impact.	Mitigation required. Reasonable use and buffer average structure not eligible
<b>Lake Forest Park</b>	10% or <b>250</b> square feet, whichever is less. No closer to the critical area than existing structure.	
<b>Newcastle</b>	Expansion of <b>1,000 square foot footprint</b> . No closer to the critical area than existing structure	
<b>Redmond</b>	Cannot enlarge footprint	
<b>Renton</b>	Cannot enlarge footprint	
<b>Sammamish</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion of <b>1,000 square foot footprint</b> (one time only)</li> <li>If intervening home or ADU between the wetland and the interviewing structures, may add, replace or modify but no closer than 50' of wetland or stream</li> </ul>	Required critical area study showing net improvement through enhancement
<b>Woodinville</b>	Expansion of <b>1,000 square foot footprint</b> . No closer to the critical area than existing structure. Expansion cannot exceed 50% of the assessed valuation of the structure.	Mitigation required

**Teresa Swan**

---

**From:** Wayne Seminoff <wayne@isomedia.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 08, 2016 11:49 AM  
**To:** Teresa Swan  
**Cc:** Eric Shields  
**Subject:** how can I help zone change?

Hi Theresa,

Eric Shields said that I might be able to help in some way to influence the proposed zoning change on the property I just purchased across from Costco, the Nienaber wetland and property and house on 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE.

The change proposed is to allow a reasonable use exception to allow for retail use on that site. It currently only allows for office use even though the parcel is zoned full commercial like the Rose Hill shopping center.

Please put me on any notice list so I can keep up with the process.

Thanks,

Wayne

Wayne Seminoff  
P.O. Box 956  
Kirkland, WA 98083

Teresa Swan  
City of Kirkland  
123 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Kirkland, WA 98033

RE: Code Change Request

February 12, 2016

Dear Teresa,

I am writing to you to request a code change to the City of Kirkland's Drainage Basin Chapter (KZC 90) that affects parcel number 1238500100 located at the address 8734 1120<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast in the City of Kirkland, Washington. There is a glitch in the current code that prohibits any kind of retail use to be located within a retail zone under the Reasonable Use Exception pertaining to wetlands properties.

The information published by the City of Kirkland about this property on the King County Department of Assessment's website is shown in the Drainage Basin Chapter. The site describes the current land zoning code to be RH 1B and the current property zoning code to be "C", both of which indicate this parcel being a retail zoned property. Some corrections are needed on the department website that state that no delineation study has been completed to date although a study took place in 2014. Also, the percentage deemed "unusable" is zero percent.

I recently purchased this property with the understanding that I could conduct a retail business on property that was zoned accordingly. If the minor change in the Reasonable Use Exception is not corrected, this will be a tremendous hardship for me and my family.

It appears that the retail-use was inadvertently left off when someone wrote this exception for the reasonable use for wetland properties only.

Please consider changing the reasonable use portion of the code affecting parcel number 12385001000 so that I may run a retail business on this property as the property is zoned for retail use by the City of Kirkland.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

  
Wayne Seminoff



**CITY OF KIRKLAND**  
**PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**  
**123 FIFTH AVENUE, KIRKLAND, WA 98033**  
**425.587.3225 - [www.kirklandwa.gov](http://www.kirklandwa.gov)**

---

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE: FEBRUARY 18, 2016**

**TO: INTERESTED PARTIES**

**FROM: ERIC SHIELDS, AICP  
DIRECTOR, PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**SUBJECT: DIRECTOR GUIDANCE – CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS AND PRIOR APPROVALS**

The City of Kirkland is currently working on updates to Kirkland Zoning Code (KZC) Chapter 90, which includes City regulations for streams and wetlands. The amendments are required by the Growth Management Act and must be based on "best available science" (BAS). Because Kirkland's regulations have not been substantially updated since 1999, we know that our current buffering standards for streams and wetlands generally are not consistent with BAS and will need to be increased. The City anticipates adoption of new regulations sometime after August 1, 2016.

Applicants have requested guidance on how the Planning and Building Department will process applications that are pending or approved prior to adoption of the new regulations. The guidance provided in this memo is primarily based on existing City regulations. Vesting ("grandfathering") provisions from State statutes are also noted.

### Applicable City Regulations

KZC Chapter 90 currently contains the following provision:

#### 90.165 Setbacks and Buffers Required by Prior Approvals

If, subsequent to October 2, 1982, the City approved a variance, planned unit development, rezone, or zoning permit through Processes I, II, IIA, or IIB, as described in Chapters 120, 125, 130, 145, 150, and 152 KZC, respectively, and/or a subdivision or short subdivision for the subject property with established setbacks or buffers on the subject property from a stream or wetland, those setbacks or buffers shall apply to the original construction on the subject property. All of the provisions of this chapter which do not directly conflict with the previously imposed setback or buffer requirements shall fully apply to the subject property.

### Guidance on Frequently Asked Questions

Based on KZC 90.165, the Department provides the following guidance to current and potential applicants:

**1. What if I have an application that is currently approved or will be approved prior to adoption of the update?**

For any of the application types noted in KZC 90.165 that are approved prior to adoption of the updates, the approved buffers (either those that meet the buffer standards in effect at the time of approval or have been approved at a width less than the standard buffer) apply to original construction. Note that all permit approval types noted in KZC 90.165 have specific lapse of approval dates and KZC 90.165 does not apply to lapsed (expired) approvals. Any permit that has lapsed would be reviewed pursuant to the regulations in effect at the time of a new application.

**2. What does "original construction" mean?**

"Original construction" refers to construction of the specific development/construction that was approved by the land use permit. It also means that the approved buffer only applies to that specific construction and not to future additions, modifications, expansions, etc. For approved subdivisions where specific homes were not part of the approval, "original construction" refers to construction of a home (or homes) on the lots that were approved subject to the buffers that were approved. After original construction has been completed, any future construction would be subject to regulations in effect at the time of that future construction.

**3. Will the City approve my land use application prior to the effective date of the new regulations?**

If you intend to apply for one of the land use applications noted in 90.165, please be aware of the following timeframes.

- A presubmittal meeting is required prior to submittal of a land use application. Presubmittal meetings are scheduled at least two weeks out from the date of application.
- The KZC provides that the City has 28 days after submittal to determine whether an application is complete.
- After being determined to be complete, most land use applications take at least four months to receive an approval.
- While staff does not currently know specifically when the KZC update will be finished or what the effective date will be, we can say that the earliest effective date would be early August 2016.

If you have a pending application with the City, please discuss the project timing with your assigned planner. You may wish to submit a complete building permit application (see reference to State laws below) even if your land use permit is not approved.

**4. What if I don't have an approved land use application prior to the effective date of the new regulations?**

KZC 90.165 only pertains to approved applications. Additional rules related to vested rights may be found in State law. While City staff is not in a position to provide you with legal advice, we can direct you to the relevant Washington State statutes that specifically address vesting with respect to complete building permit applications and complete subdivision applications:

- RCW 19.27.095 **provides that** “A valid and fully complete building permit application for a structure, that is permitted under the zoning or other land use control ordinances in effect on the date of the application shall be considered under the building permit ordinance in effect at the time of application, and the zoning or other land use control ordinances in effect on the date of application.” **Please reference the complete statute to understand the requirements contained therein.**
- RCW 58.17.033 **provides that** “A proposed division of land, as defined in RCW 58.17.020, shall be considered under the subdivision or short subdivision ordinance, and zoning or other land use control ordinances, in effect on the land at the time a fully completed application for preliminary plat approval of the subdivision, or short plat approval of the short subdivision, has been submitted to the appropriate county, city, or town official.” **Please reference the complete statute to understand the requirements contained therein.**

Beyond this direction, you may wish to discuss your situation with private legal counsel.

**5. If my application is not approved prior to the effective date, can the City adopt updated regulations that contain similar provisions to the current KZC 90.165?**

The City could adopt provisions similar to KZC 90.165 with the updates to KZC Chapter 90. If you are interested or concerned about an application, you are encouraged to participate in the process to let the Planning Commission and City Council understand your interests.

### **Conclusion**

Existing City regulation KZC 90.165 provides some certainty around how approved applications will be treated. Additional guidance is found in State statutes that address complete building permit and complete subdivision applications. If your application does not fall into one of these areas prior to adoption of the updated regulations, **the City’s position is that** the application would not be vested and would be subject to the updated regulations. If you need additional advice, we encourage applicants to consult with their legal counsel.

Please get involved in the process to update the regulations by visiting the project webpage and signing up for E-mail alerts at:

[www.kirklandwa.gov/depart/planning/Code\\_Updates/Projects/Wetlands\\_and\\_Streams\\_Code\\_Amendments.htm](http://www.kirklandwa.gov/depart/planning/Code_Updates/Projects/Wetlands_and_Streams_Code_Amendments.htm)

Date: February 16, 2016



SaveOurTrail.org

For Distribution to: City of Kirkland Council Members

With Copies to: City Manager, Kurt Triplett  
Public Works Director, Kathy Brown  
Planning & Building Director, Eric Shields  
Parks & Community Service Director, Jennifer Schroder

We are presenting you with a letter this evening to document environmental issues associated with your proposed transit development on the Cross Kirkland Corridor Trail (the Trail).

In response to recent wetland notices and environmentally sensitive area signage along the Trail, we were prompted to look into these issues further.

What we found was eye opening and disturbing.

Based on the City GIS maps, a July 2013 study by Widener & Associates and a January 2016 report by the Watershed Company, both commissioned by the City, it was found that many wetlands, salmon-bearing streams and other wildlife habitats exist within, near, or under the Trail. The last report even identified fish species that are considered 'threatened' and 'species of concern' under the Federal Status.

On January 20, 2016, a letter was sent to the Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council from members of the City's Planning and Building Department saying that per Chapter 90 KZC Amendments, which are regulations for Critical Area Ordinance/Wetlands, Streams and Frequently Flooded Areas, the City must comply with new WA Department of Ecology guidance. The new guidance resulted in wider required critical area buffers and more restrictive buffer reduction allowances. The City now has until this June to update its wetland regulations and rating system to comply with DOE's current guidance.

The current KZC 90 clearly preserves environmentally sensitive areas like we have along the Trail and restricts incompatible land uses. It further states that construction of public, non-motorized trails is exempt from preservation of the trail whereas construction of a motorized trail is not exempt and CANNOT be built in a wetland or its buffer zone. Based on the updated guidance, large areas of the Trail could not even be touched.

Modifications are allowed ONLY if there is no feasible alternative. However, in this case a clear alternative does exist and that is E-02, BRT on I-405. This not only parallels the Trail, but also crosses it at 116<sup>th</sup> Street and includes a stop in Totem Lake. Based on the current and updated regulations, the building of motorized transit on the Trail would clearly be outside the spirit and intent of the law.

Save our Trail has always been about preserving the precious natural environment that exists along the Cross Kirkland Corridor Trail. It's now clear that the City's own existing and updated regulations enforce this preservation. We look forward to hearing the City's approach to the updated guidance rules later this evening.

In light of this information presented by the City's own staff, we urge you, the City Council, to reconsider your support for mass transit on the Trail.

Thank you, Save Our Trail Organization

(Note: This letter will be distributed to over forty jurisdictions, organizations and individuals that we believe should be made aware of our concerns.)

## Documented Wetlands, Streams and Wildlife in the Cross Kirkland Corridor

February 16, 2016

Save our Trail, Kirkland WA

*This letter was prepared by the Save Our Trail citizen group in Kirkland to ensure all parties are aware of environmental obstacles that may hinder the construction of the proposed E-03a (Light Rail) and E-06 (Bus Rapid Transit) Sound Transit 3 projects as designed on the Cross Kirkland Corridor (CKC) Trail. It is not intended to be a comprehensive examination of the full gamut of environmental challenges, but rather a compendium of concerns identified to date.*

### Summary

- 3<sup>rd</sup> party wetland, stream and wildlife inventory studies commissioned by the City of Kirkland, and published as recently as January 2016, have documented many wetlands, jurisdictional drainage, salmon-bearing streams and other wildlife habitats within the CKC.
- Current and planned updates (due by June 30, 2016) to Kirkland's wetland and stream protection regulations indicate that substantial portions of the CKC are incompatible with any type of motorized transit development. In fact, there are multiple locations where wetlands surround both sides of the trail, creating buffers that are in excess of the 100-foot wide corridor.
- Mandatory mitigation sequencing regulations specifically state that avoidance of modifications of wetlands and streams is the primary guiding principle, and not allowed if a "practicable or feasible alternative" is available, such as Sound Transit's E-02 Bus Rapid Transit on I-405 proposal.

### Introduction

Along the CKC, many signs are posted that indicate Environmentally Sensitive Areas. As residents of Kirkland and regular users of the CKC, we wanted to understand the implication of these signs.



We observed bodies of water, including wetlands and streams, surrounding the trail and crossing under it. We also heard from people living near the trail, where many properties have recorded documents identifying wetlands and streams with property title restrictions to perpetually protect and preserve these sensitive areas. Those restrictive covenants were imposed on past, current, and future owners in perpetuity with no provisions for termination.

We then reviewed the City of Kirkland GIS maps (Attachment A). This map clearly shows that the stretch of the CKC slated for development as a bus or rail route is encumbered by several wetlands and streams. Some of the streams are identified in red, signifying their importance as fish bearing streams.

We were then made aware of a wetland and stream inventory developed in July 2013 for the City of Kirkland Public Works Department by Widener & Associates ("Wetland Investigation and Delineation Report Cross Kirkland Corridor Project" - Attachment B). The report was part of the trail building project when the BNSF rails were removed and a soft surface trail was constructed. It lists most of the wetlands and streams shown on the City GIS map (Attachment A), plus additional wetlands and streams not documented on the map. This report concluded that the majority of the wetlands and streams were determined to be "jurisdictional," and therefore subject to the Clean Water Act. It also documented multiple palustrine forested wetlands. While they were not rated, these would likely rate as Category II wetlands and would require a 50' or 75' buffer.

In 2015, as part of the City of Kirkland's process to adopt amendments to its Critical Areas Ordinance by the state deadline of June 30, 2016 (Wetlands, Streams and Frequently Flooded

Areas, known as KZC 90 - Kirkland Zoning Code Chapter 90), the City employed the services of the Watershed Company, a wetlands consulting company. The January 2016 report ("City of Kirkland Critical Areas Regulations Technical Report"), along with the City memorandum explaining the need to update the regulations, is included as Attachment C.

This report further identifies multiple wetlands and streams within, near, or under the CKC, as well as fish species in streams that cross the CKC that are considered "Threatened" and "Species of Concern" under Federal Status.

### **How Do the Current and Future Kirkland Zoning Codes Apply to the CKC?**

Given all the 3<sup>rd</sup> party information, we looked into how the KZC 90 applied to the CKC.

The current KZC 90 clearly forbids development in wetlands, streams, lakes, and their buffers and in frequently flooded areas. These regulations were adopted by the City of Kirkland in compliance with the Clean Water Act, the Department Of Ecology, the Growth Management Act, and other local, state, and federal laws.

**It is important to note that these regulations are 14 years old and must be updated by the City of Kirkland by June 30, 2016.** As the Watershed Report states about the original regulations, *"Since then Ecology adopted a new wetland rating system in 2004 and then updated it again in 2014. Wetland buffers under the new Ecology guidance are greater than the City's current buffer widths and the rating system is more detailed and uses different criteria. The City must now bring its wetland regulations and rating system in line with Ecology's guidance to be consistent with GMA."* It is important to note that, as the Watershed Company report states, *"Most if not all jurisdictions in King County have revised their regulations to comply with these requirements."* The new regulations, as described on the City of Kirkland web page, will:

- Increase buffer widths required next to wetlands and streams where new development cannot occur;
- Use mitigation sequencing: first avoid, then minimize before buffer reduction can be proposed;
- Impose smaller percent of buffer reduction; and
- Require greater ratio of required mitigation to area disturbed.

Even the current regulations clearly state the need for protecting wetlands, streams, lakes and frequently flooded areas:

#### **90.10 PURPOSE**

**THESE REGULATIONS WERE PREPARED TO COMPLY WITH THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT, CHAPTER 36.70A RCW. THE PURPOSE OF THESE REGULATIONS IS TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, HUMAN LIFE, AND PROPERTY. THIS PURPOSE WILL BE ACHIEVED BY PRESERVING THE IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS OF WETLANDS, STREAMS, LAKES, AND FREQUENTLY FLOODED AREAS. THE DESIGNATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF THESE SENSITIVE AREAS IS INTENDED TO ASSURE THEIR PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION FROM LOSS OR DEGRADATION, AND TO RESTRICT INCOMPATIBLE LAND USES.**

**SENSITIVE AREAS PERFORM A VARIETY OF VALUABLE BIOLOGICAL, CHEMICAL, AND PHYSICAL FUNCTIONS THAT BENEFIT THE CITY AND ITS RESIDENTS.**

There are certain activities that are exempt from this chapter. However, a motorized trail is not one of those activities:

#### **90.20 GENERAL EXCEPTIONS**

**THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES OR CONDITIONS SHALL BE EXEMPT FROM THIS CHAPTER:**

**5. CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC NON-MOTORIZED TRAILS WITHIN THE CROSS KIRKLAND CORRIDOR AND EASTSIDE RAIL CORRIDOR; PROVIDED, THAT (1) THE TRAIL IS LOCATED IN A MANNER THAT, TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE, AVOIDS AND MINIMIZES IMPACTS TO SENSITIVE AREAS AND BUFFERS SUCH AS PLACEMENT ON PREVIOUSLY DISTURBED AREAS, (2) THE TRAIL PROJECT INCLUDES ON-SITE OR OFF-SITE MITIGATION OF NEW IMPACTS TO AFFECTED SENSITIVE AREAS AND BUFFERS, AND (3) PERVIOUS OR OTHER LOW-IMPACT MATERIALS ARE USED WHERE PRACTICAL.**

The zoning regulation clearly states that wetlands and streams are to be preserved and protected with significant buffers. It is fair to assume that these buffers will increase based on the updated regulations from surrounding King County cities.

**90.45 WETLAND BUFFERS AND SETBACKS**

**1. NO LAND SURFACE MODIFICATION OR TREE REMOVAL SHALL OCCUR AND NO IMPROVEMENT MAY BE LOCATED IN A WETLAND OR ITS BUFFER, EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION THROUGH KZC 90.70. SEE ALSO KZC 95.23(5)(D)(2), TREES IN CRITICAL AREAS OR CRITICAL AREA BUFFERS; AND KZC 95.50(11), INSTALLATION STANDARDS FOR REQUIRED PLANTINGS – MITIGATION AND RESTORATION PLANTINGS IN CRITICAL AREAS AND CRITICAL AREA BUFFERS. REQUIRED, OR STANDARD, BUFFERS FOR WETLANDS ARE AS FOLLOWS:**

WETLAND TYPE	PRIMARY BASIN	SECONDARY BASIN
1	100 FEET	75 FEET
2	75 FEET	50 FEET
3	50 FEET	25 FEET

The current regulations state that modification of a wetland (stream) is allowed only if no feasible alternative is available (Similar language is used for stream protection, buffer size, modification of streams and modification of stream buffers. Please see KZC 90.90, 90.95, 90.100):

**90.55 WETLAND MODIFICATION**

**J. THERE IS NO PRACTICABLE OR FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL THAT RESULTS IN LESS IMPACT TO THE TYPE 1 WETLAND AND ITS BUFFER.**

**90.60 WETLAND BUFFER MODIFICATION**

**9) THERE IS NO PRACTICABLE OR FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL THAT RESULTS IN LESS IMPACT TO THE BUFFER.**

In this case, there is a documented Sound Transit alternative with E-02 (Bus Rapid Transit on I-405), which not only parallels the CKC, but also crosses it at 116<sup>th</sup> Street and includes a stop in the same location (Totem Lake). This alternative was identified by the City of Kirkland in the letter of January 20, 2016 to Sound Transit.

In Attachment D (“Wetland and Stream Buffers on the CKC Map”) we tested the application of the following parameters on the trail:

- 1) The CKC right of way is at its optimal width of 100 feet;
- 2) There is only one stream on one side of the trail;
- 3) The stream is assumed to have the lowest classification, and thus the lowest buffer width of 25 feet.

Using these parameters, Attachment D clearly demonstrates that the CKC's useable width would be reduced from 100 feet to less than 25 feet. By applying the same parameters to other segments of the CKC where wetlands and streams exist on both sides, and where the classifications of both bodies of water are higher, it becomes clear that, in many cases *the entire width of the CKC is encumbered by buffers.*

Furthermore, if one applies the new regulations' increased buffer width requirements, then even more of the CKC becomes incompatible with the ST3 E-03a and E-06 proposals.

Conclusion:

Save Our Trail believes that, based on 3<sup>rd</sup> party evaluations (City GIS, City codes, and studies commissioned by the City of Kirkland) of the wetlands, streams, and wildlife habitats on the CKC, it would clearly be outside the spirit and intent of the law to build motorized transit on the CKC as described in E-03a and E-06. Furthermore, given the clearly documented alternative of E-02 (BRT on 405), mitigation is not an alternative.

SIGNED BY SAVE OUR TRAIL COMMITTEE on February 16, 2016

Signature

Printed Name

Santos Contreras

Santos Contreras

Shawn Etchevers

Shawn Etchevers

Lucy R. Toussaint

LUCY R. TOUSSAINT

DAVID GRESCHLER

DAVID GRESCHLER

Jan Young

Jan Young

Rose M. Dennis

Rose M. DENNIS

F.L. Dennis

F.L. DENNIS

Rich Jones

Rich Jones

Sue Contreras

Sue Contreras

Neil Ichiki

Neil Ichiki

Sharon Riddle

Sharon Riddle

**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

March 24, 2016

To:	City of Kirkland Planning Commission
From:	William J. Taylor M.S., Aquatic Scientist Christopher Wright, Soil and Wetland Scientist Raedeke Associates, Inc.
RE:	Kirkland Stream Buffer Code Update Recommendations Current Science on Stream Buffer Policy

The following technical assessment of stream buffer best available science is intended to support a code modification that would recognize more appropriate stream buffer designations in highly urbanized environments to better attain the environmental goals of such environmental protection policies.

**Buffer Widths for Urban Stream Buffers: The challenges and policy alternatives for urban environments****The Challenge in the Use of Fixed Width Buffers within Highly Urbanized Basins**

Riparian buffer have been used as an environmental policy measure to protect stream shorelines, their receiving waters, and associated aquatic organisms for many decades. Stream buffers provide ecologically beneficial functions to mitigate land use impacts through filtering of land surface runoff to improve water quality, providing infiltration to support local ground water levels, providing shade for temperature control, and contributing organic inputs to the food web (Polyakov et al. 2005). However these benefits have been documented principally for large scale areas where the extended continuity of buffers both laterally and longitudinally provide continuous buffers that will have a landscape-scale cumulative and even synergistic effect on stream benefits, such as in large agricultural or silvicultural settings.

However, in highly developed urban settings the degree of impact to streams becomes acute and extensive through conversion of permeable soil surface to impervious surfaces (asphalt, concrete, and roofs). These land surface conversions not only collect

City of Kirkland Planning Commission

March 24, 2016

Page 2

contaminated storm drainage and deliver it directly to stream channels resulting in channel erosion and incision and exposure to pollutants, but vegetative buffers are either eliminated where the stream is fully piped or greatly reduced where channels do remain. The combined effects of hydrologic change, runoff of toxic substances, and the loss of riparian cover among other urban environment impacts all become a compounded and even synergistic set of impacts to urban streams resulting in what is now called the “urban stream syndrome” (Walsh et al. 2005).

In an attempt to reverse these impacts, stream buffers can be applied as one element of a stream recovery or protection measure in a multifaceted prescription across the basin (along with other commonly used measures such as green stormwater management practices, channel bed control, culvert daylighting, and eliminating sources of toxic substance). However, the overall success of these combined prescriptions must also be on a scale “that match the scale of the problem” to be successful (Hughes et al. 2014a). Even with potential extensive application on a basin-wide scale, the implementation of such broad scale measures can become economically untenable (Polyakov et al. 2005).

Within heavily urbanized stream basins, then, application of standardized uniform stream buffer widths become a fragmented attempt to apply the known benefits of buffers to small localized conditions where the added benefits pale in comparison to the cumulative combination of multiple impacts continuing from upstream. Wahl et al. (2013) conclude from their findings in Western Washington that patchy riparian forests did not improve stream conditions in heavily degraded streams, and:

“These patterns are consistent with results from other studies where stream community composition was best predicted by land use at larger spatial scales and add to the growing literature suggesting that small-scale riparian restoration can be inadequate to improve biotic conditions in heavily impacted streams.”

### **Effectiveness of Fixed Buffer Widths versus Variable Buffer Widths**

The intended beneficial feature of riparian buffers is to allow upland surface water runoff to pass through a vegetated and permeable soil surface before reaching the stream channel, thereby using the processes of filtration and infiltration to better control instream flow regimes, and reduce contaminated runoff entering the channel. The use of buffers to mitigate water quantity and quality impacts of runoff to stream habitats is highly variable due to the common concentration of flow that short circuits and bypasses the filtering and infiltrating processes of riparian soils (Polyakov et al. 2005).

City of Kirkland Planning Commission

March 24, 2016

Page 3

The process of bypassing riparian buffers can predictably be more acute in urban environments where various small scale impervious areas (e.g. lawns, driveways, and roof downspouts) are isolated from each other yet discharge more or less directly to a stream, resulting in such localized concentrated flows. Much of these localized impervious flows are directed to storm drainage systems in the first place, which are in fact designed to bypass intervening ground surfaces and deliver the flows directly to the stream. The result can easily be very little of local runoff effectively being treated by riparian buffers.

As an alternative to the use of increased buffer widths that may not function effectively as a result of localized concentrated flows, green stormwater treatment designs for urban development purposefully directs localized stormwater runoff from residential and commercial development to dispersed infiltration features to facilitate infiltration and reduced runoff volumes. Municipalities in the Puget Sound Basin are now required to implement such stormwater management techniques for new and redevelopment, resulting in a more direct mitigation of this primary source of impact to urban streams. Essentially, direct reduction of the source of flows through infiltration, retention and detention is more effective than depending on flows to be uniformly passed through buffers.

As yet another riparian buffer policy approach, “precision conservation” takes into account “spatial and temporal variability across landscapes” when prescribing conservation measures such as buffers, and take into account local landscape and hydrologic conditions that would be served by wider or narrower buffer widths (Berry et al. 2003). This approach would prescribe variable buffer widths that are targeted to protect areas where the buffers would have greater effect on the resulting local and downstream environments of biological significance, bringing to bear information using remote sensing and GIS tools.

The Watershed Company (2016) report on best available science to the City of Kirkland recognize much of the best available science comes from non-urbanized environments, and consequently, the importance of local municipal conditions when applying best available science:

“The review of science acknowledges several limitations of applying the results of primary scientific literature to policy decisions. In particular, it is important to recognize the setting of scientific investigations, as management recommendations differ between undeveloped forested environments and highly developed urban areas. For example, in urban areas, it is important to account for the presence of engineering and public works projects, such as surface water detention facilities that may alter hydraulic conditions and sediment transport, or stormwater routing,

City of Kirkland Planning Commission

March 24, 2016

Page 4

which may cause runoff to bypass riparian areas altogether. Another consideration when evaluating primary literature is that scientific references commonly evaluate the effects of a single set of conditions, or in some cases several specific conditions. Depending on the specific conditions and function tested, outcomes may vary. Thus, although stream and riparian conservation measures should be based in BAS, some level of policy interpretation must be made by each local jurisdiction based on local conditions.”

Washington State Department of Ecology (2013) has also recognized the need for variable buffer widths as related to wetland guidance rather than stream buffers, but the principals behind the need for variable buffers remain the same:

“Fixed-width buffers may not adequately address the issues of habitat fragmentation and population dynamics. Several researchers have recommended a more flexible approach that allows buffer widths to be varied depending on site-specific conditions.

Update: A request for a more flexible approach is a common theme among recent articles (42, 62, 67, 95). The research reinforces the fact that buffers and fragmentation are only two of many variables that affect the dynamics of wildlife populations. Other factors that have been found to affect the survival of wetland-dependent species are surrounding land use, the structure of the plant community, and the intensity of human disturbance. If buffers are to be used to protect the water quality in wetlands, the factors that need to be considered are slope, soil chemistry, soil structure and the plant community.”

Booth (2005) notes “changes in flow regimes, in particular, are an important pathway by which urbanization influences biotic conditions. Precision (variable) riparian buffers would especially prioritize targeting hydrologic source areas that are not otherwise controlled (Qui 2009). It would also be consistent with the priority actions for urban rehabilitation recommended in Hughes et al. (2014a) to:

“(1) protect upstream high-quality catchments and habitats and (2) reestablish ecosystems processes and connectivity in the altered places (especially water quality and hydrological regime), before attempting to rehabilitate specific sites lower in the watershed.”

City of Kirkland Planning Commission  
March 24, 2016  
Page 5

This is in contrast to cases where:

“well-meaning mitigation projects are implemented at the site or reach scale in streams, lakes, and rivers when many of the limiting factors are occurring at the watershed scale.” (Hughes et al. 2014a)

This latter comment would apply equally to implementation of ineffective or poorly targeted uniform buffer widths.

Variable buffer widths would also help target longitudinal buffer continuity in higher priority basins where existing buffers may have greater existing continuity. The Watershed Company (2014) recognized:

“Longitudinal continuity of buffers along streams is also an important factor determining the effectiveness of buffers at improving channel conditions. Riparian continuity is correlated with abundance and diversity of sensitive invertebrates (Wooster and DeBano 2006) and metrics of physical stream conditions (McBride and Booth 2005). On the other hand, fragmented riparian zones may not be sufficient to improve degraded instream habitat conditions.” McBride and Booth (2005) likewise note “physical conditions can improve downstream from degraded stream reaches if the riparian zone is substantially forested and devoid of road crossings.”

Variable buffer widths are also in line with concentrating development as a means of reducing impervious area at the catchment scale as recommended by Hughes et al. (2014b). This results in reducing development pressure in prioritized basins where the existing degree of impact is currently more manageable. Allowing reduced buffer widths where existing basins are highly impacted by existing development infrastructures would, to that degree of concentrated development, reduce sprawl in underdeveloped basins.

The use of variable buffer widths indicates there are locations in a stream length where the local landscape conditions and receiving water will benefit from a wider buffer width, and other areas where increased buffer widths will have a highly diminishing benefit and the receiving waters will equally not benefit substantially from increased buffer widths. As noted by McBride and Booth (2005):

“policies and management strategies for protecting stream integrity in developing areas can be improved. With more robust knowledge the landscapes can be modified to preserve those streams or stream segments

that still function while targeting rehabilitation efforts to those degraded portions of streams that have realistic chances for improvement.”

The application of fixed, one size fits all, buffers to streams within an urban environment fails to meet the goal of environmental protection, circumvents the objectives of sustainable growth management, and increases financial burdens on citizens without providing the improvement to streams that they are intended to provide.

The application of precise, site specific buffers as well as appropriately designed and implemented stormwater controls would provide greater environmental protection and habitat improvement than the proposed code changes will.

Raedeke Associates, Inc. would welcome the opportunity to meet with the City of Kirkland staff and their consultants to discuss ways to implement a variable buffer width policy.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Berry, J., J. Delgado, R. Khosla, and F. Pierce. 2003. Precision conservation for environmental sustainability. *J. Soil W. Cons.* 58(6): 332 – 339.
- Booth, D. 2005. Challenges and prospects for restoring urban streams: a perspective from the Pacific Northwest. *J. N. Am. Benth. Soc.* 24: 724 – 737.
- Hughes, R., J. Yeakley, C. Schreck, M. Harte, N. Molina, C. Shock, V. Kaczynski, and J. Schaeffer. 2014a. A review of urban water body challenges and approaches: (1) Rehabilitation and remediation. *Fisheries* 39(1): 18 - 29.
- Hughes, R., S. Dunham, K. MMAas-Hebner, J. Yeakley, M. Harte, N. Molina, C. Shock, V. Kaczynski. 2014 b. A review of urban water body challenges and approaches: (2) Mitigating effects of future urbanization. *Fisheries* 39(1): 30 – 40.
- McBride, M. and D. Booth. 2005. Urban impacts on physical stream condition: Effects of spatial scale, connectivity, and longitudinal trends. *J. Wat. Res. Assoc.* 41(3): 565 – 580.
- Polyakov, V., A. Fares, and M. Ryder. 2005. Precision riparian buffers for the control of nonpoint source pollutant loading into surface waters: A review. *Env. Rev.* 13: 129-144.
- Qui, Z. 2009. Assessing critical source areas in watersheds for conservation buffer planning and riparian restoration. *Env. Man.* 44: 968 – 980.

City of Kirkland Planning Commission

March 24, 2016

Page 7

- Wahl, C., A. Neils, and D. Hooper. Impacts of land use at the catchment scale constrain the habitat benefits of stream riparian buffers. *Freshwater Bio.* 58: 2310-2324.
- Walsh, C.J., A. Roy, J. Feminella, P. Cottingham, P. Groffman, and R. Morgan. 2005. The urban stream syndrome: current knowledge and the search for a cure. *J. N. Am. Ben. Soc.* 24: 706 – 723.
- Washington State Department of Ecology. 2013. Update on Wetland Buffers: The State of the Science Final Report. Publication no. 13-06-11. Olympia, WA.
- Watershed Company. 2014. Best available science review. City of Woodinville Comprehensive Plan Update. Woodinville, WA.
- Watershed Company. 2016. City of Kirkland Critical Areas Regulations Technical Report. City of Kirkland, WA.
- Wooster D.E. and S.J. DeBano. 2006. Effect of woody riparian patches in croplands on stream macroinvertebrates. *Arch. Hydrobiol.* 165(2):241-68.

**Teresa Swan**

---

**From:** Paul Stewart  
**Sent:** Friday, April 22, 2016 1:19 PM  
**To:** Oskar Rey; Kevin Raymond  
**Cc:** Teresa Swan; Eric Shields; Joan Lieberman-Brill  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Changes to Chapter 90 - Critical Area Ordinance

FYI

---

**From:** Brent Carson [mailto:brc@vnf.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 22, 2016 12:15 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Cc:** Eric Shields <EShields@kirklandwa.gov>; Jeremy McMahan <JMcmahan@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Proposed Changes to Chapter 90 - Critical Area Ordinance

Planning Commission Members,

Most of you know that I am a land use attorney with several development clients in Kirkland. I am writing to suggest the inclusion of two important provisions in the City's proposed revisions to Chapter 90 – Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO).

The CAO update is likely to include a significant expansion of wetland buffers and other provisions that could dramatically increase regulatory burdens under the new CAO. Many projects have been built in Kirkland or are in the planning or application stages that were or are being designed based on the buffers and other requirements in the existing CAO. In the interest of fairness, I would encourage you to consider inclusion of the following two provisions in the new CAO.

First, I would ask you to include a grandfathering provision within Chapter 90 that would allow applicants that have submitted, prior to adoption of the new CAO, a complete application for a planned unit development, subdivision, short subdivision, Binding Site Plan, or a zoning permit, to be subject to the provisions of Chapter 90 in effect upon submittal of the complete application. As you may know, common law vesting has been the subject of significant litigation recently and is in a state of flux. This uncertainty regarding vesting creates a real and significant impact on the development community. Some jurisdictions, such as Snohomish County, have adopted broad new vesting rules, which we certainly would encourage in Kirkland. Many local governments have also included specific grandfathering provisions in new land use ordinances when the new ordinance imposes significant regulatory changes that would cause hardship to those applicants who are not legally vested but who have already submitted detailed land use applications in reliance on existing codes. I encourage the Planning Commission to include in your proposed CAO changes a provision that would assure that the new CAO not be imposed on anyone who has filed a complete land use application prior to the date of adoption for the new CAO.

Second, I would ask you to include an express provision in the new CAO that addresses legally authorized or established breaks in a stream and wetland buffer. The Shoreline Master Program was adopted with the following language in KMC 83.500.4:

*Modification to Buffer for Divided Wetland Buffer – Where a legally established, improved public right-of-way, improved easement road or existing structure divides a wetland buffer, the Planning Official may approve a modification of the required buffer in that portion of the buffer isolated from the wetland by the road or structure, provided the isolated portion of the buffer:*

1) *Does not provide additional protection of the wetland from the proposed development; and*

2) *Provides insignificant biological, geological or hydrological buffer functions relating to the portion of the buffer adjacent to the wetland.*

This or similar language should be included in the new CAO. This is different from the nonconformity discussion you have had at your previous meeting. This provision is needed to address the situation where an existing wetland or stream buffer is crossed by a legally established road or structure, effectively cutting off the functions and values of that stream or wetland buffer beyond the road or structure. A new development proposed beyond the road or structure, which would otherwise be within the buffer area, should be able to demonstrate that the buffer in the location of the new development no longer serves any value.

I will be unable to attend your meeting on Thursday but would appreciate your discussion of these issues.

**Brent Carson | Partner**

**VanNess  
Feldman** LLP

719 Second Avenue, Suite 1150  
Seattle, Washington 98104-1728

(206) 623-9372 | [brc@vnf.com](mailto:brc@vnf.com) | [vnf.com](http://vnf.com)

*This communication may contain information and/or metadata that is legally privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read or review the content and/or metadata and do not disseminate, distribute or copy this communication. Anyone who receives this message in error should notify the sender immediately by telephone (206-623-9372) or by return e-mail and delete it from his or her computer.*

**Teresa Swan**

---

**From:** Jeremy McMahan  
**Sent:** Monday, April 25, 2016 7:52 AM  
**To:** Teresa Swan  
**Subject:** FW: Comments regarding the Proposed Wetlands & Streams Code Amendments

**From:** Stephen Haugen [mailto:haugensd@outlook.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 24, 2016 2:55 PM  
**To:** Jeremy McMahan <JMcmahan@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments regarding the Proposed Wetlands & Streams Code Amendments

My wife and I spoke to you before the last commission meeting. I sent my comments to the commissioners in an email. I am sharing this with you also. Thanks for taking the time to talk with us and read my comments.  
 Steve Haugen

As a home owner with property that is adjacent to a stream, I will be affected by your proposed wetlands and streams code changes. I have attended two previous public meetings regarding this issue. At these meetings I have heard a wide range of ideas for the final buffer and buffer requirements and how this would affect the future development of an existing home owners property. The current staff proposal that will be reviewed on April 28th has made changes from previous versions, but as an affected home owner I still have concerns.

First, in an urban developed residential area, to now increase a buffer zone along a stream will have little impact to improving the health of the stream while having potential major impact to the existing or future home owner. A wider buffer zone for streams should have been considered before development occurred. Once a home owner has bought the property at a comparative price to a home not in an affected area, the home owner should have the right to develop their property in the same consistent way that any other home owner in the same neighborhood can. To change the development rights of an existing home owner that is in the proposed buffer zone will ultimately decrease the resale value of the home and minimize what improvements the current or future home owner can make to the property that they own. This is the equivalent of a land grab without giving compensation for the diminished use or valuation.

Second, the proposed code change is completely non enforceable unless a home owner comes to the city for a construction permit. Home owners will continue to do improvements or alterations with potential negative actions to the stream quality, either out of disregard of the code or lack of understanding. There is no way that the city has staff potential to enforce actions taken by home owners along every stream in Kirkland. The home owner's action may be as simple as using fertilizer or pesticides that would be undetectable and unenforceable.

Third, commissioner Mike Miller spoke at a prior meeting about how does having the buffer 100 feet instead of 50 feet in a developed residential area improve the quality of the stream. His point, if I am correct is that most of the impact from these developed properties is already done and to add an increased buffer, unnecessarily places a burden an potential financial impact to the home owner with minimal improvement to the health of the stream. As an affected home owner a 50 foot buffer, even for a fish bearing stream would effect way less home owners than the proposed 100 feet for a fish bearing stream.

Fourth, being personally concerned about the stream and it's health, over the last 30 plus years I have made significant improvements to the greenbelt buffer and stream area behind my property. These changes would all comply with your current vegetation requirements and all have improved the buffer zone and stream protection

for the area behind my household. As new code is being proposed and written now, should there be a provision for buffer improvements that a home owner has already made and should this not help to minimize the proposed buffer zone. My efforts to protect the health of the stream should be acknowledged and provide less limited use impact to the property that I own.

Lastly, thank you for reading and considering my comments. I would hope that you would consider fairness for the home owners that will be affected by this proposed code change as you finalize the policy regarding streams. The majority of the home owners that will be affected by these changes, I believe have no knowledge that this process is under way by the city. Many of these home owners will have potential consequences to their property without providing their input. Again, commissioner Mike Miller spoke to this issue at a previous meeting. There should be some additional consideration given to how the city could reach out to the affected home owners.

Steve Haugen

# Proposed Critical Areas Update –Case Studies


Prepared by The Watershed Company

June 13, 2016

## INTRODUCTION

The following four case studies have been developed to inform the City’s review and discussion of the proposed updated critical areas regulations. **These case studies represent theoretical developments.** In the tables below each project has been evaluated under the existing and proposed provisions to provide a comparison and understanding of the outcomes of proposed regulatory changes.

## CASE STUDY 1: EXPANSION OF NON-CONFORMING RESIDENTIAL USE

<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p>The applicant would like to repair and expand the primary residential structure marked with a star. The primary structure is located 20 feet from the mapped edge of the <b>Juanita Bay wetlands</b>, and it is entirely within both the existing and proposed buffers.</p> <p>Although Juanita Bay Wetlands are themselves within shoreline jurisdiction, the wetland buffers are regulated under the CAO.</p>		
<p><b>Distinguishing Wetland Characteristics</b></p> <p>Water quality improvement potential is moderate because there is extensive development and degraded water quality in the basin, but there is also limited water retention capability. Flood control structures and low water retention potentially limit functions associated with flooding and erosion.</p> <p>The potential to provide wildlife habitat is extremely high, based on the complex physical structure (e.g., forested, scrub-shrub, aquatic bed, etc.) and variety of hydrologic regimes (e.g., permanently flooded, seasonally flooded, etc.). At the landscape-scale, habitat is limited by surrounding development.</p>		
	<p><b>Existing</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>
<p><b>Wetland Rating</b></p>	<p>Type 1</p>	<p>Category 2, Habitat Score 7</p>
<p><b>Standard Buffer</b></p>	<p>100 feet</p>	<p>165 feet</p>
<p><b>Code Requirements</b></p>	<p>The structure is nonconforming as to the current buffer requirements. As a legally established, nonconforming structure, the applicant could repair and maintain the existing structure [KZC 90.20(6)]. However, reconstruction is not permitted, except in the case of extensive casualty damage [KZC 163.30]. An expansion is not possible because a buffer width can only be reduced by one-third through a reduction process, which is not enough to allow an expansion.</p>	<p>As a legally established, nonconforming use, the applicant can rebuild on the existing foundation. The applicant would have the following options for expanding the structure: 1) up to 1,000 square feet on the southern side of the house, away from the wetland; 2) up to 500 square feet on the side of the house, but no closer to the wetland than the existing structure; or 3) up to 250 square feet toward the wetland, subject to the minimum setback from the wetland that will be established. Mitigation for buffer impacts would be required.</p>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>The proposed changes would allow reconstruction of the primary structure on the same footprint and provide options to add an addition in the buffer.</p>	

**CASE STUDY 1: CONTINUED**

Juanita Bay Wetlands, facing northwest. Note diversity of plant communities that provide a wide variety of habitat niches.



Photo 1 (Source: Google Earth)

Juanita Bay Wetlands, facing north. Note interspersed habitat communities.




Photo 2 (Source: Google Earth)

Aerial photograph of Juanita Bay Wetlands. Note extensive surround development, which limits habitat connectivity.



Photo 3 (Source: King County iMAP)

## CASE STUDY 2: NEW RESIDENTIAL USE

<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p>The applicant would like to develop an undeveloped residential parcel along <b>Forbes Lake</b>. All but 400 square feet of the parcel is within the proposed wetland buffer.</p>		
<p><b>Distinguishing Wetland Characteristics</b></p> <p>Water quality improvement potential is moderate due to the presence of organic soils and extensive development and water quality degradation in the basin. Low seasonal water level variations limit value associated with controlling flooding and erosion, although the potential is high, due to intensive development of the basin.</p> <p>The potential to provide wildlife habitat is extremely high, based on the complex physical structure (e.g., forested, scrub-shrub, aquatic bed, etc.) and variety of hydrologic regimes (e.g., permanently flooded, seasonally flooded, etc.). On the landscape-scale, habitat is limited by surrounding development.</p>		
	<p><b>Existing</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>
<p><b>Wetland Rating</b></p>	<p>Type 1</p>	<p>Category 3, Habitat Score 7</p>
<p><b>Standard Buffer</b></p>	<p>100 feet</p>	<p>165 feet</p>
<p><b>Code Requirements</b></p>	<p>Approximately 12,000 square feet falls outside of the current 100-foot-wide buffer. This may yield enough room for construction of a new residence. However, if additional area were necessary, utilization of the existing buffer reduction mechanism could be used to reduce the standard buffer from 100-feet to a minimum of 66.6-feet [KZC 90.60(2)(a)(2)]. Reduction of the buffer would require enhancement of the remaining reduced buffer. Approval for the buffer reduction would be granted by the City's Hearing Examiner.</p>	<p>Under proposed buffer standards, nearly the entire parcel would be encumbered. Buffer reduction is not allowed under proposed provisions. Therefore, the new residence would fall under the City's reasonable use exception (RUE) provision. RUE would allow a disturbance area of up to 8,500 square feet, depending on the size of the property, through a Planning Director decision. Mitigation sequencing would be required.</p>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>The wider proposed buffer encumbers this lot, meaning that new development would fall under an RUE. A new residential use is allowed under either scenario; however, the RUE would limit the area of disturbance. The RUE process would be simplified from a Hearing Examiner decision to a Planning Director decision. The area of disturbance allowed under an RUE would depend on lot size, with more disturbance allowed on larger lots.</p>	

**CASE STUDY 2: CONTINUED**

Forbes Lake, facing southeast. Note diversity of plant communities and flooding regimes.



Photo 1

Beaver lodge on Forbes Lake, a reflection of habitat function and variable hydrologic regimes.




Photo 2

Aerial photograph of Forbes Lake Wetland. Note extensive development in the surrounding landscape.



Photo 3 (Source: King County iMAP)

### CASE STUDY 3: NEW OVERPASS STRUCTURE

<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p>The City would like to construct a new elevated pedestrian walkway in the area marked with a star. The proposed location is 25 feet from the mapped edge of the <b>Totem Lake wetlands</b>, and entirely within both the existing and proposed buffers.</p>		
<p><b>Distinguishing Wetland Characteristics</b></p> <p>Totem Lake provides moderate to high levels of water quality functions and very high levels of function related to flooding and erosion, due to its ability to retain stormwater flows and seasonal fluctuations; its large size relative to its contributing basin; and the intense development of the basin.</p> <p>The potential to provide wildlife habitat is moderate, based on physical structure (scrub-shrub, emergent, and aquatic bed) and variety of special habitat features (e.g., snags, woody debris, amphibian egg-laying structures, etc.). On the landscape-scale, habitat is limited by surrounding development.</p>		
	<p><b>Existing</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>
<p><b>Wetland Rating</b></p>	<p>Type 1</p>	<p>Category 2, Habitat Score 6</p>
<p><b>Standard Buffer</b></p>	<p>100 feet</p>	<p>165 feet</p>
<p><b>Code Requirements</b></p>	<p>The proposed work area is nearly entirely encumbered by the standard buffer under existing provisions. The buffer could be reduced from 100-feet to a minimum of 66.6-feet, although this would likely not result in the ability to place the entire structure outside the buffer and associated setback.</p> <p>Any proposed impacts within the wetland itself would require City Council approval. In addition, no more than 5 percent of the total wetland area on the property could be impacted.</p>	<p>The proposed work would require demonstration of mitigation sequencing to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate while still meeting the objective of the project. Approval would be administrative if work is done in the outer 1/4 of the buffer or a Planning Director decision for work in the remainder of the buffer.</p>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>The existing provisions do not allow this type of improvement in the inner 2/3<sup>rd</sup>s of the buffer. Under the proposed provisions, the project could be approved administratively or through the Planning Director process with mitigation.</p>	

**CASE STUDY 3: CONTINUED**

Totem Lake facing east. Note diversity and interspersed of different vegetation communities and hydrologic regimes.



Photo 1

Totem Lake facing south. Close proximity of commercial development increased the potential for improving water quality and reducing flooding and erosion; however, it creates habitat fragmentation that hinders wildlife passage.



Photo 2

Aerial photograph of Totem Lake. Note the intense, commercial development in the surrounding landscape.



Photo 3 (Source: King County iMAP)

**CASE STUDY 4: COMMERCIAL EXPANSION**

ATTACHMENT 12

<p><b>Project Overview</b></p> <p>The applicant would like to expand the existing parking and roadway for a commercial property into the critical area buffer. Existing development is entirely outside of the wetland and wetland buffer.</p>		
<p><b>Distinguishing Wetland Characteristics</b></p> <p>Slope-type wetlands, such as this have limited ability to perform water quality and hydrologic functions since they cannot retain water for long periods. The limited ability to perform these functions is exacerbated with a lack of dense, low-lying vegetation that can slow water velocities and trap sediments and pollutants.</p> <p>This wetland provides very low habitat function, due to a lack of structural complexity, special habitat features, species diversity, and complete isolation from other habitat areas.</p>		
	<p><b>Existing</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed</b></p>
<p><b>Wetland Rating</b></p>	<p>Type 3</p>	<p>Category 4, Habitat Score 3</p>
<p><b>Standard Buffer</b></p>	<p>50 feet</p>	<p>40 feet</p>
<p><b>Code Requirements</b></p>	<p>Because the wetland is larger than 1,000 SF, wetland buffers apply. If necessary, a portion of the buffer could be reduced from 50-feet to a minimum of 33-feet. This could occur through buffer averaging or buffer reduction. Averaging would require an equivalent expansion of the buffer elsewhere and vegetation enhancement, whereas reduction would require that the remaining reduced buffer be enhanced. Avoidance and minimization efforts would not need to be demonstrated as part of a buffer modification. Approval for averaging or reduction would be obtained administratively.</p>	<p>Because the wetland is larger than 1,000 SF, wetland buffers apply. Under the proposed changes, the required buffer width would be 10 feet less than the current code. The applicant would need to work through mitigation sequencing. This may include identifying opportunities to reposition or reconfigure parking areas (avoidance), employing LID techniques (minimization), and mitigating for unavoidable impacts. The applicant could propose buffer averaging to reduce the width to a minimum of 75% of the standard buffer (30 feet wide), but must widen the buffer in other areas so that the total area before the reduction is provided and it is enhanced to meet vegetation standard. The permit process is administrative.</p>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>In some cases such as this example of a lower quality wetland, the proposed regulations will result in a reduction in the standard buffer width and minimal change in how the site could be developed. Mitigation sequencing is an important proposed requirement to ensure that impacts to critical areas and their buffers are avoided and minimized to the greatest extent feasible.</p>	

**CASE STUDY 4: CONTINUED**

Totem Lake Mall Wetland, facing east. Note lack of dense groundcover that can reduce stormwater velocities and trap sediments and pollutants.



Photo 1

Totem Lake Mall Wetland, facing northeast. Note moderately steep gradient and preponderance of invasive vegetation (e.g., English holly and Himalayan blackberry).



Photo 2

Aerial photograph of wetland. Note the complete isolation from other habitat areas by high-intensity land uses.




Photo 3 (Source: King County iMAP)