ENGROSSED SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 2538

State of Washington 61st Legislature 2010 Regular Session

By House Ecology & Parks (originally sponsored by Representatives Upthegrove, Taylor, Eddy, Pedersen, Clibborn, Chase, and Springer)

READ FIRST TIME 01/21/10.

AN ACT Relating to high-density urban development; amending RCW 82.02.020; adding a new section to chapter 43.21C RCW; and creating a new section.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 1.** It is the intent of the legislature to encourage high-density, compact, in-fill development and redevelopment within existing urban areas in order to further existing goals of chapter 36.70A RCW, the growth management act, to promote the use of public transit and encourage further investment in transit systems, and to contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by: (1) Encouraging local governments to adopt plans and regulations that authorize compact, high-density urban development as defined in section 2 of this act; (2) providing for the funding and preparation of environmental impact statements that comprehensively examine the impacts of such development at the time that the plans and regulations are adopted; and (3) encouraging development that is consistent with such plans and regulations by precluding appeals under chapter 43.21C RCW.

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 2.** A new section is added to chapter 43.21C RCW to read as follows:

(1) Cities with a population greater than five thousand, in accordance with their existing comprehensive planning and development regulation authority under chapter 36.70A RCW, and in accordance with this section, may adopt optional elements of their comprehensive plans and optional development regulations that apply within specified subareas of the cities, that are either:

(a) Areas designated as mixed-use or urban centers in a land use or transportation plan adopted by a regional transportation planning organization; or

(b) Areas within one-half mile of a major transit stop that are zoned to have an average minimum density of fifteen dwelling units or more per gross acre.

(2) Cities located on the east side of the Cascade mountains and located in a county with a population of two hundred thirty thousand or less, in accordance with their existing comprehensive planning and development regulation authority under chapter 36.70A RCW, and in accordance with this section, may adopt optional elements of their comprehensive plans and optional development regulations that apply within the mixed-use or urban centers. The optional elements of their comprehensive plans and optional development regulations must enhance pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or other nonvehicular transportation methods.

(3) A major transit stop is defined as:

(a) A stop on a high capacity transportation service funded or expanded under the provisions of chapter 81.104 RCW;

(b) Commuter rail stops;

(c) Stops on rail or fixed guideway systems, including transitways;

(d) Stops on bus rapid transit routes or routes that run on high occupancy vehicle lanes; or

(e) Stops for a bus or other transit mode providing fixed route service at intervals of at least thirty minutes during the peak hours of operation.

(4)(a) A city that elects to adopt such an optional comprehensive plan element and optional development regulations shall prepare a nonproject environmental impact statement, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.030, assessing and disclosing the probable significant adverse environmental

impacts of the optional comprehensive plan element and development regulations and of future development that is consistent with the plan and regulations.

(b) At least one community meeting must be held on the proposed subarea plan before the scoping notice for such a nonproject environmental impact statement is issued. Notice of scoping for such a nonproject environmental impact statement and notice of the community meeting required by this section must be mailed to all property owners of record within the subarea to be studied, to all property owners within one hundred fifty feet of the boundaries of such a subarea, and to agencies with jurisdiction over the future development anticipated within the subarea.

(c) In cities with over five hundred thousand residents, notice of scoping for such a nonproject environmental impact statement and notice of the community meeting required by this section must be mailed to all small businesses as defined in RCW 19.85.020 of record within the subarea to be studied, to all small businesses as defined in RCW 19.85.020 within one hundred fifty feet of the boundaries of such a subarea, and to community preservation and development authorities established under chapter 43.167 RCW. The process for community involvement must have the goal of fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people with respect to the development and implementation of the subarea planning process.

(d) The notice of the community meeting must include general illustrations and descriptions of buildings generally representative of the maximum building envelope that will be allowed under the proposed plan and indicate that future appeals of proposed developments that are consistent with the plan will be limited. Notice of the community meeting must include signs located on major travel routes in the subarea. If the building envelope increases during the process, another notice complying with the requirements of this section must be issued before the next public involvement opportunity.

(e) Any person that has standing to appeal the adoption of this subarea plan or the implementing regulations under RCW 36.70A.280 has standing to bring an appeal of the nonproject environmental impact statement required by this subsection.

(f) In cities with over five hundred thousand residents, prior to the community meeting being held, a city shall analyze whether the

proposed subarea plan will result in the displacement or fragmentation of businesses, existing residents, including people living with poverty, families with children, and intergenerational households, or cultural groups within the proposed subarea plan. The analysis shall inform and be included in the nonproject environmental impact statement in (a) of this subsection. The city shall also discuss the results of the analysis at the community meeting.

(g) As an incentive for development authorized under this section, a city shall consider establishing a transfer of development rights program in consultation with the county where the city is located, that conserves county-designated agricultural and forest land of long-term commercial significance. If the city decides not to establish a transfer of development rights program, the city must state in the record the reasons for not adopting the program. The city's decision not to establish a transfer of development rights program is not subject to appeal. Nothing in this subsection (4)(g) may be used as a basis to challenge the optional comprehensive plan or subarea plan policies authorized under this section.

(5)(a) Until July 1, 2018, a proposed development that is consistent with the optional comprehensive plan or subarea plan policies and development regulations adopted under subsection (1) or (2) of this section and that is environmentally reviewed under subsection (4) of this section may not be challenged in administrative or judicial appeals for noncompliance with this chapter as long as a complete application for such a development that vests the application or would later lead to vested status under city or state law is submitted to the city within a time frame established by the city, but not to exceed ten years from the date of issuance of the final environmental impact statement.

(b) After July 1, 2018, the immunity from appeals under this chapter of any application that vests or will vest under this subsection or the ability to vest under this subsection is still valid, provided that the final subarea environmental impact statement is issued by July 1, 2018. After July 1, 2018, a city may continue to collect reimbursement fees under subsection (6) of this section for the proportionate share of a subarea environmental impact statement issued prior to July 1, 2018.

(6) It is recognized that a city that prepares a nonproject environmental impact statement under subsection (4) of this section must endure a substantial financial burden. A city may recover its reasonable expenses of preparation of a nonproject environmental impact statement prepared under subsection (4) of this section through access to financial assistance under RCW 36.70A.490 or funding from private sources. In addition, a city is authorized to recover a portion of its reasonable expenses of preparation of such a nonproject environmental impact statement by the assessment of reasonable and proportionate fees upon subsequent development that is consistent with the plan and development regulations adopted under subsection (5) of this section, as long as the development makes use of and benefits, as described in subsection (5) of this section, from the nonproject environmental impact statement prepared by the city. Any assessment fees collected from subsequent development may be used to reimburse funding received from private sources. In order to collect such fees, the city must enact an ordinance that sets forth objective standards for determining how the fees to be imposed upon each development will be proportionate to the impacts of each development and to the benefits accruing to each development from the nonproject environmental impact statement. Any disagreement about the reasonableness or amount of the fees imposed upon a development may not be the basis for delay in issuance of a project permit for that development. The fee assessed by the city may be paid with the written stipulation "paid under protest" and if the city provides for an administrative appeal of its decision on the project for which the fees are imposed, any dispute about the amount of the fees must be resolved in the same administrative appeal process.

(7) If a proposed development is inconsistent with the nonproject environmental impact statement developed under subsection (4) of this section or if potential impacts from a proposed development are not adequately addressed in the nonproject environmental impact statement developed under subsection (4) of this section, the city shall require a supplement environmental impact statement.

Sec. 3. RCW 82.02.020 and 2009 c 535 s 1103 are each amended to read as follows:

Except only as expressly provided in chapters 67.28, 81.104, and 82.14 RCW, the state preempts the field of imposing retail sales and

use taxes and taxes upon parimutuel wagering authorized pursuant to RCW 67.16.060, conveyances, and cigarettes, and no county, town, or other municipal subdivision shall have the right to impose taxes of that nature. Except as provided in RCW 64.34.440 and 82.02.050 through 82.02.090, no county, city, town, or other municipal corporation shall impose any tax, fee, or charge, either direct or indirect, on the construction or reconstruction of residential buildings, commercial buildings, industrial buildings, or on any other building or building space or appurtenance thereto, or on the development, subdivision, classification, or reclassification of land. However, this section does not preclude dedications of land or easements within the proposed development or plat which the county, city, town, or other municipal corporation can demonstrate are reasonably necessary as a direct result of the proposed development or plat to which the dedication of land or easement is to apply.

This section does not prohibit voluntary agreements with counties, cities, towns, or other municipal corporations that allow a payment in lieu of a dedication of land or to mitigate a direct impact that has been identified as a consequence of a proposed development, subdivision, or plat. A local government shall not use such voluntary agreements for local off-site transportation improvements within the geographic boundaries of the area or areas covered by an adopted transportation program authorized by chapter 39.92 RCW. Any such voluntary agreement is subject to the following provisions:

(1) The payment shall be held in a reserve account and may only be expended to fund a capital improvement agreed upon by the parties to mitigate the identified, direct impact;

(2) The payment shall be expended in all cases within five years of collection; and

(3) Any payment not so expended shall be refunded with interest to be calculated from the original date the deposit was received by the county and at the same rate applied to tax refunds pursuant to RCW 84.69.100; however, if the payment is not expended within five years due to delay attributable to the developer, the payment shall be refunded without interest.

No county, city, town, or other municipal corporation shall require any payment as part of such a voluntary agreement which the county,

city, town, or other municipal corporation cannot establish is reasonably necessary as a direct result of the proposed development or plat.

Nothing in this section prohibits cities, towns, counties, or other municipal corporations from collecting reasonable fees from an applicant for a permit or other governmental approval to cover the cost to the city, town, county, or other municipal corporation of processing applications, inspecting and reviewing plans, or preparing detailed statements required by chapter 43.21C RCW, including reasonable fees that are consistent with section 2(6) of this act.

This section does not limit the existing authority of any county, city, town, or other municipal corporation to impose special assessments on property specifically benefitted thereby in the manner prescribed by law.

Nothing in this section prohibits counties, cities, or towns from imposing or permits counties, cities, or towns to impose water, sewer, natural gas, drainage utility, and drainage system charges. However, no such charge shall exceed the proportionate share of such utility or system's capital costs which the county, city, or town can demonstrate are attributable to the property being charged. Furthermore, these provisions may not be interpreted to expand or contract any existing authority of counties, cities, or towns to impose such charges.

Nothing in this section prohibits a transportation benefit district from imposing fees or charges authorized in RCW 36.73.120 nor prohibits the legislative authority of a county, city, or town from approving the imposition of such fees within a transportation benefit district.

Nothing in this section prohibits counties, cities, or towns from imposing transportation impact fees authorized pursuant to chapter 39.92 RCW.

Nothing in this section prohibits counties, cities, or towns from requiring property owners to provide relocation assistance to tenants under RCW 59.18.440 and 59.18.450.

Nothing in this section limits the authority of counties, cities, or towns to implement programs consistent with RCW 36.70A.540, nor to enforce agreements made pursuant to such programs.

This section does not apply to special purpose districts formed and

acting pursuant to Title 54, 57, or 87 RCW, nor is the authority conferred by these titles affected.

--- END ---