

LOPEZ VILLAGE PLANNING MATRIX
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / UDC ANALYSIS BY ISSUE

DRAFT
 DATE: MAR 4, 2010 REV. 4/5/10

1 ITEM	2 CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / UDC	3 RECOMMENDED CHANGE OR DEVIATION	4 Initial CD&P Comments
<p>LIGHTING</p>	<p>SJCC 18.60.170 Lighting is to be energy-efficient, shielded or recessed so that glare is contained within parcel. Directed away from adjoining properties. Appropriate in scale, intensity, height. Cut-off lights in parking areas. Decorative 25 w / incandescent bulb or 500 w overall.</p>	<p>Existing regulations are written for single-family residences on large lots. UGA by definition will be much more dense and as such will produce more light and so may not be practical. Residents have expressed a desire to see the stars at night. A plan detailing hours for lighting, definition of decorative lighting, appropriate scale, intensity and height and energy efficiency. Possible use of fixtures approved per International Dark Sky Association or approved equivalent may be appropriate.</p>	<p>There are several sections within the code that address lighting. Most attempts to restrict or limit the offsite glare, reflections, or nuisance to adjacent properties; and also restrict moving or blinking lights. However, in Section 18.40.070.G requires that service and fuel stations must also be adequately lighted to permit safe nighttime operation. While not specifically addressed, street lighting is frequently installed at dangerous intersections, in neighborhoods to increase walk ability during the evening, night and early morning hours, or at commercial business for a sense of increased safety and security. Any code changes should make allowances for these concerns. While verification may be accomplished at time of initial building permitting; future electrical upgrades, replacements or enhancements are only permitted through L&I and do not go through CD&P. This presents issues with increased enforcement responsibilities and the associated cost and staffing requirements.</p>
<p>TREE AND VEGETATION PLAN</p>	<p>SJCC 18.60.160. Current regulations are done site by site. No overall master planning is required or mentioned. Primarily focuses on screening.</p>	<p>A subarea plan would allow for the development of a landscaping plan for the Village as a unified whole. The plan would provide appropriate plant recommendations and provide guidelines beyond screening. Plan would represent an agreed aesthetic for Lopez UGA.</p>	<p>While the SJCC currently has some landscaping requirements, especially in Sub Areas and Activity Centers, these are fairly generic and do not require a lot of special knowledge by staff. However, even these have presented enforcement and compliance issues for CD&P staff. CD&P does not employ a landscape architect, horticulturist, or botanist and is not adequately staffed to review plans or inspect or approve specialized plantings. Additionally, there is currently no follow-up inspection mechanism. There are also issues of survivability and the maintenance of plantings and the possible need for obtaining and administering landscape bonds. Any requirements that become more technical in nature will exacerbate our current short</p>

1
2
3
4
ITEM CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / UDC RECOMMENDED CHANGE OR DEVIATION

Initial CD&P Comments

			<p>comings and add additional cost.</p>
<p>PARKING</p>	<p><u>SJCC 18.30.21</u> Land Use Controls Lopez UGA: Village Commercial applies to entire UGA <u>SJCC 18.60.12</u> Parking: Sets requirements on a use by use, permit by permit basis. Range from 1/residential unit – 10/1000sq.ft for restaurants. Applicant can reduce min. required if administrator approves parking study proving reduced need. Allows for shared use of off street parking lots and adjustments if businesses have different peak periods. Off site parking may be allowed if public parking areas are made available.</p>	<p>Development of a UGA-wide coordinated Parking and Public access plan (rather than on a parcel by parcel basis) would ensure that: Parking occurs behind new buildings. Total amount of parking reflects seasonal use patterns. Residential parking happens on site. Develop angle and street parking using developer fees.</p>	<p>Developing rules to implement the recommended changes are not seen as a problem except for utilizing developer fees. Fees in lieu of parking are an option. However, in Eastsound, these have not shown to work well, or even be implemented. Charging developer fees for developing angle and street parking through institution of an impact fee is problematic, highly regulated, and may not be realistic. A better method might be to institute a special taxing district to shoulder the cost of such street improvements.</p>
<p>BICYCLE ACCES</p>	<p><u>SJCC 18.60.130</u> No provision is made for bike travel. The current code only regulates bike parking.</p>	<p>SJ County has a mandate for creating healthy cities and encouraging physical exercise. A coherent bicycle plan would also ensure safety by developing specific regulations for bike paths and standards as well as means to divert bicycle traffic from the roads. A unified development plan for bike paths and bike parking for the entire UGA area would facilitate the coordination of bike paths, walking paths, and car traffic and parking patterns. Plan would further identify design standards and materials, placement.</p>	<p>This should need to be coordinated through the Public Works transportation planning functions. PW's already has a 2005 Non-motorized Transportation Plan, which incorporates some bikewalkway improvement on Lopez including some provisions for Lopez Village. These provisions would require blending new requirements and provisions with existing plans. This would also require a willingness to accept and budget for construction and maintenance responsibilities and cost over time. Instituting a special taxing district to shoulder the cost design and development might also be appropriate.</p>
<p>PEDESTRIA N</p>	<p><u>SJCC 18.60.110</u> This section of code is ineffective because UGA's are not mentioned.</p>	<p>Recommend creating a unified plan for walking paths for the entire UGA area. Recommend that that walking paths, bike trails and car</p>	<p>As with the bike plan, this should be coordinated through the Public Works transportation planning functions and contains</p>

1

2

3

4

ITEM 1 CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / UDC RECOMMENDED CHANGE OR DEVIATION

Initial CD&P Comments

PATHWAYS	There is no call for an overall path circulation plan and an amendment will not help because no master plan is advised or referred to in this existing code.	traffic and parking be coordinated. Need to call out design standards, materials, placement and create a coordinated plan.	similar conditions, requirements and options.
VIEW PROTECTIO N	SJJCC 18.60.050, 18.60.090 C Lots in the Lopez village UGA are required to have 10% open space and community centers to have 20ft wide view corridors to "visual points of interest". County road ends may not be vacated if they provide "scenic vistas". However screening is required for many activities as well.	Need to develop plan identifying specific view corridors in Lopez village and requiring that development preserve identified viewsapes.	Specific access and view corridors were identified in the Eastsound subarea plan and are maintained by requiring increased set backs on specific lots. (See the Eastsound Waterfront Access Plan). Lot specific restrictions or requirements are problematic and should be avoided. Restrictions for height, lot coverage, structural size, and separation between structures based on specific land use designations might be appropriate.
BUILDING STANDARD S / LAND USES	SJJCC 18.30.200 Provides interim controls in village and hamlet activity centers. Building height is 30 ft. unless a taller building exists. Generic land uses per table 3.1 in 18.30.030 Maximum lot coverage 50-65%. Landscaped area 5-30%. Setbacks 10 feet.	Recommend unified plan for potential increase in structure height, specific uses and zoning within UGA, revision of maximum lot coverage and building envelope size and density revisions per zoning. Plan would also allow for opportunity to rethinking site planning to ensure future development is responsive to the residents wishes, such as changing the location of buildings on lots, architectural and design standards and other site elements which affect the quality of the Village.	SJJCC 18.30.200 is the wrong section. This should reference SJJCC 18.30.210 which has specific standards for Lopez Village UGA, Growth Reserve area, and Marine Center LAMRID. This section sends you back to 18.30.030 – Table 3.1 (for Allowable & Prohibited Uses) and 18.60.050 – Table 6.1 (for Density, Dimension, and Open Space Standards requirements) for Village Commercial (VC). While 18.30.210.C.2.a provides for a maximum allowable height of 30 ft., it implies a higher height may be permissible where more than one building in the area exceeds the 30 ft. height limit. However, such increased height would be controlled by Table 6.1 which has a maximum height VC designation of 30 ft. This is essentially a hollow reference to a possible permissible height increase. Maximum lot coverage is 100% Landscaped area requirements is 10% Set Backs are 10 ft. Front or Road and 0 ft. Side or Rear
PERSONAL	(REGULATIONS CURRENTLY UNDER	Community has expressed considerable	The County is in the process of updating its

1
2
3
4

ITEM CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / UDC RECOMMENDED CHANGE OR DEVIATION

Initial CD&P Comments

<p>WIRELESS COMMUNC. FACILITIES</p>	<p>CONSIDERATION BY COUNTY COUNCIL)</p>	<p>Interest in controlling the installation of cell towers in the Lopez UGA. Depending upon outcome of current regulatory changes, further clarification may be desired for Lopez Village.</p>	<p>personal wireless communication facilities requirements which will adequately address siting issues and concerns. This is an issue of County wide concern and should not be differentially based on specific sub-area regulations. Multiple regulations, which are maintained and updated at different times, create confusion and lead to differential enforcement and application.</p>
<p>HABITAT / ENVIR. PROTECTIO N</p>	<p><u>SJCC 18.30.150, 18.30.160, WAC 232-12-292, ESA</u> Wetlands are protected, but most parcels in Lopez village are less than 1 acre, and thus exempt. Bald Eagles are protected (County, State and Federal law). State listed rare plants must be taken into consideration in development, but protection requirements are at the county's discretion. Stream flows are to be maintained.</p>	<p>Recommend identifying locally critical habitats and species in Lopez Village and establishing standards for their protection.</p>	<p>The County is currently updating its critical areas requirements and will adequately address these issues. This is an issue of County wide concern and should not be differentially based on specific sub-area regulations. Multiple regulations, which are maintained and updated at different times, create confusion and lead to differential enforcement and application. However, if there are specific Natural, Historic, or Cultural sites or location of special local concern, these may be identified and protected as determined appropriate. However, such protections should be separate and distinct from Critical Area protections and based on differing criteria.</p>
<p>STORM WATER</p>	<p><u>LOPEZ VILLAGE WSWP (DRAFT FORM ONLY)</u> Current draft plan is not based on final UGA/Reserve Area and will need to be updated. Various densities and allowable maximum percentage of lot coverage were assumed – do not match current ordinance (SJCC 18.30.210)</p>	<p>Stormwater is a collective and requires a collective solution. Current plan is out of date and current regulations are based on single lot solutions which do not reflect UGA intent and are inappropriate tool for working with current and future urban densities.</p>	<p>The draft Lopez Village stormwater plan does need to be updated. However, this should be developed, maintained and implemented through the Stormwater Utility and a regional and basin study area analysis process. Because stormwater issues do not generally follow politically subdivision lines, stormwater planning is an issue of County wide concern and, while such plans should be referenced by the sub area plan, they should be developed and updated outside the subarea planning</p>

1	2	3	4
ITEM	CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / UDC	RECOMMENDED CHANGE OR DEVIATION	Initial CD&P Comments
			process.