AGENDA
Wednesday – March 11, 2015 – 5:30 PM
Douglas County Public Services Building Hearing Room
140 19th Street NW, East Wenatchee, WA

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

II. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES
   a. Review minutes of the February 17, 2015 meetings.
   b. Review proposed revisions to Article IV subsection C of the Planning Commission Bylaws regarding the failure to approve a motion.

III. CITIZEN COMMENT
    The planning commission will allocate 15 minutes for citizen comments regarding items not related to the current agenda.

IV. OLD BUSINESS
    The continuation of the February 17, 2015 hearing, for decision only, on Tables 2 & 3 in Chapter 3 of the Countywide Comprehensive Plan.

V. NEW BUSINESS
   a. A public hearing to consider CPRZ-07-02A, an application submitted by Big River Development for a major amendment to the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort. The proposal includes amendments to the subarea plan to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, applicable development regulations and an environmental planned action.

   b. A workshop to review draft amendments to Sections 17.10 Definitions, 17.40 Use Chart, 17.44 Landscaping and Section 17.52 Conditional Uses of the Town of Waterville Municipal Code.

VI. Adjourn
I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 P.M.

Douglas County Planning Commission Members Present:
Chair Robert Knowles, Michael Machado, Fred Suter, Norm Cavadini and Wayne Hawks

Douglas County Staff Present:
Mark Kulaas, Land Services Director
Curtis Lillquist, Principal Planner
Stephen Neuenschwander, Principal Planner
Suzanne Austin, Associate Planner

II. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES-
Approval of the minutes from the November 12, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. Planning Commission member Suter motioned, Planning Commission member Machado seconded, to approve the minutes as presented. The vote passed with a unanimous vote in the affirmative.

III. Citizen Comment - None

IV. Old Business – None

V. New Business
a) Planner Lillquist presented a workshop on major amendments to the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort and introduced a presentation given by Eric Johnston of SCJ Alliance, representing Big River Development. The Planning Commission inquired about project phasing plans, vehicular access across the railroad tracks, extent of Grant County PUD shoreline ownership, use of Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) and emergency services facilities on the site.
A member of the public, Carol Anderson, inquired about the location of the project.

A short recess was called after the workshop in order to observe the published public hearing time of 4:00 P.M.

b) A public hearing to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Douglas County Code regarding expansion of the East Wenatchee Urban Growth Area and Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort and amendments to mineral resource policies. Planner Neuenschwander presented an overview of the amendments. Pete Fraley testified in favor of the proposed amendments.

Planning Commission member Machado motioned to approve the amendments as proposed based on the findings of fact and conclusions presented in the staff report.

The Planning Commission expressed concerns over whether their recommendation may result in pre-approval of decisions that may be made later in the evening at the City of East Wenatchee hearing. Staff responded that the Douglas County Planning Commission recommends adoption or rejection to the Board of County Commissioners regardless of the decision by the East Wenatchee Planning Commission.

The motion made by Planning Commission member Machado to recommend approval of the amendments as proposed was seconded by Planning Commission member Hawks.

Planning Commission member Machado made a motion to amend their recommendation and continue the hearing for Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3 Table 2 & Table 3 to March 11 for decision only. The motion was seconded by Planning Commission member Cavadini. The vote on the motion to amend the original motion passed with a unanimous vote in the affirmative.

The vote on the original motion as amended passed with a unanimous vote in the affirmative. The hearing was continued to March 11, 2015 for decision only in regards to amendments to Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3 Table 2 & Table 3.

VI. Adjournment
The public hearing adjourned at 4:50 P.M.
I. CALL TO ORDER - 5:35 pm

Douglas County Planning Commissioners (DCPC) Present:
Robert Knowles (Chair), Fred Suter, Norman Cavadini, Wayne Hawks, and Michael Machado,

City of East Wenatchee Planning Commissioners Present:
Norm Nelson (Chair), Chaun Birks, Courtney Hill, Kyle Mott and Robert Everett

Douglas County Staff Present:
Mark Kulaas, Stephen Neuenschwander, and Suzanne Austin

City Staff Present:
Lori Barnett and Marcia Martz

II. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

A. Explanation of Public Hearing procedures.
Presiding East Wenatchee Planning Commission Chair Norm Nelson reviewed the public hearing procedures for joint public hearings.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Joint public hearing to consider:

A. Proposed amendments to the Greater East Wenatchee Area Comprehensive Plan (GEWA) (map and text) including Chapters 1-8 and Chapter 10 and including a new Appendix B a Combined Capital Facilities Plan. This proposal includes area-wide map amendments changing the land use designations for various properties including an expansion of the urban growth area boundary for East Wenatchee. The expansion of the urban growth area boundary will also
require an amendment to the Douglas County Countywide Plan map to change the designation of properties that will be included in the expanded urban growth area. Other maps being updated include those for parks, utilities, and transportation.

B. Proposed amendments to the East Wenatchee Municipal Code (map and text). The map amendment includes an area wide rezone to implement the GEWA map amendments. The text amendments will be within Chapter 17 - the Zoning Code and are intended to implement the goals and policies in the GEWA. The amendments include:

A - New Section - 17.72.260 Required Use of Public Sanitary Sewer System.
B - New Section - 17.72.270 Density Standards
C - New Chapter - Chapter 17.73 Open Space Standards
D - New Chapter - Chapter - 17.43 C-L Light Commercial District
E - Amendment to EWMC 17.38.060 NC – Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District.

Planner Barnett presented a detailed staff report on the proposed amendments to the Greater East Wenatchee Area Comprehensive Plan and the proposed amendments to the East Wenatchee Municipal Code.

Chair Norm Nelson opened the Public Hearing for comments from those in attendance:

Jeff Kinzel of Dryden WA, owns property in Douglas County and spoke in support of the process and indicated that he would like to have his property within the UGA boundaries.

Ben Nickles, 2610 6th Street SE, spoke in support of the proposed amendments. He explained that as a farmer in the area for the past 39 years he is seeing changes to the agricultural industry that will supply a need for changes to the UGA.

Pete Fraley, 1528 Walnut Court, spoke in support of the proposed amendments and has family who own property in the proposed UGA expansion area. He briefly reviewed the history of the property and explained that they have addressed the issues with the stormwater by adding retention ponds; they have also worked on the realignment of Lyle Street to create a major corridor upon the wheat lands. The property owners have entered into an agreement with the water district for a land swap to reconfigure property so a new 2,000,000 gal reservoir can be built with a booster pump station site for future development.

Al Sherman, 2310 Lester Road, spoke in support of the proposed UGA expansions. He would like to see any future expansions include all property with the same ownership adjacent to proposed expansion be included in the expansion.

Sal DiMare, 704 Gormley Street, a pasture of a local Church spoke in support of the proposed amendments.
Lisa Parks, Executive Director for the Port of Douglas County, 455 6th Street NE, Suite 100, wanted to voice the support of the Port District on the proposed text amendments A & B.

Jim Nakata, 17220 30th Ave NE, Lake Forest Park, WA 98155, owns property in the UGA explained that 40 acres is the minimum size to operate a commercial orchard. Any orchard smaller than that is obsolete also there is a problem with the soil disease and chemical spray, you have to fumigate the land before you can replant. Mr. Nakata supports the proposed amendments to the UGA and would like to see them extended further East.

Trent Moyers, Airport Director, explained that the Airport is not really in favor or against the proposed changes to the UGA, he passed out a map showing the overlay of two areas in zone 3 that cuts the corner of what is proposed and wanted to go on record noticing that the area should still comply with the Airport overlay.

Darin Klinginsmith, 412 Dogwood Lane, Wenatchee, WA 98801, suggested the property located on the SW corner of Grant & Mary be changed from RM to GC.

Pete VanWell, PO Box 1339, Wenatchee, WA 98807, owns property in the proposed expansion area. He asked to have his property removed from the UGA Expansion Area. The property is on the NW corner of Grant Road and Quincy.

The following people spoke in opposition of the Light Commercial zoning in the Canyon Hills area.

Robert Reaves, 2294 Deer Run Dr., East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Mike Hansen, 2216 Fancher Blvd. East Wenatchee, WA 98801
Bill Gregersen, 2293 Springwheat Road, East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Cheryl Roab, 1060 Horizon View Dr., East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Carlye Baity, 2280 Deer Run Dr., East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Suzi Graden, 2311 Springwheat Road, East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Darin Konrad, 2306 Canyon Hills Dr., East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Daniel Clark, 1031 N. Lyle Ave, East Wenatchee, WA 98802, had concerns with the Mule Deer Habitat being disrupted.

Jeanett Quaid, 1840 9th Street NE, East Wenatchee, WA 98802, recently purchased property on Lyle to build a new residence and is concerned with additional traffic to the area.

Jim Nakata, 17220 30th Ave NE, Lake Forest Park, WA 98155, spoke in support of having the VanWell property removed from the UGA.

**With no one offering additional testimony, Chairman Oliver closed the public comment period.**

The Commissioners discussed the following issues to be changed

Remove the Van Well property (parcel number 22210830033) from the proposed map amendment

Change the Klinginsmith property (parcel number 22211810010) to Light Commercial zoning.
Add the Snyder property (parcel number 75000003100) and 3 additional lots (parcel numbers 75000001803, 75000001804, 75000001805) zoning RL.

Remove the Hungelmann property (parcel number 75000003400) from the proposed map amendment.

Make all of the Canyon Hills property RL (parcel number 23203640001)

**Action:** Douglas County Planning Commission: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for the Greater East Wenatchee Area Comprehensive Plan proposed text and map amendments including Chapters 1-8 and Chapter 10 and a new Appendix B a Combined Capital Facilities Plan with changes noted by staff and with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions presented in the staff report. (Suter/Hawks).

Commissioners Robert Knowles, Norman Cavadini, Monty Bickford, Brad Vickery, voted in favor of the motion. No votes in opposition. The motion passed.

**Action:** Douglas County Planning Commission: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for the proposed amendments to the East Wenatchee Municipal Code (map & text). Text amendments A-E. with changes as noted by staff (Machado/Cavadini)

**Action:** East Wenatchee Planning Commission: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for the Greater East Wenatchee Area Comprehensive Plan proposed text and map amendments including Chapters 1-8 and Chapter 10 and a new Appendix B a Combined Capital Facilities Plan with changes noted by staff and with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions presented in the staff report (Everett/Birks).

Commissioners Kyle Mott voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

**Action:** East Wenatchee Planning Commission: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for the proposed amendments to the East Wenatchee Municipal Code (map & text). Text amendments A-E. with changes as noted by staff (Birks/Everett) 4-1 Commissioner Norm Nelson voted in opposition. The motion passed

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT** 7:45 P.M.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Douglas County Planning Commission  
FROM: Douglas County Transportation and Land Services  
DATE: February 26, 2015  
SUBJECT: Draft revisions to the Planning Commission By-Laws

In October 2014, Transportation and Land Services staff discussed with you potential amendments to the Planning Commission By-Laws and Rules of Procedures regarding recommendations when a motion fails to pass. The current By-Laws under Article IV Voting subsection C states that when a motion to approve any matter fails the result is a recommendation of denial. The draft revisions to the By-Laws strike this subsection entirely. The remaining voting procedures and requirements remain unchanged.

If you have any questions, please call Stephen or Suzanne at 609-884-7173.
BY-LAWS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS

We, the members of the Planning Commission of the County of Douglas, authorized by Chapter 36.70 RCW and duly appointed by the Douglas County Board of Commissioners, do hereby adopt, publish, and declare the following by-laws and rules of procedure:

ARTICLE I. NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS

A. The official name shall be the “DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION”, herein referred to as “Planning Commission.”

B. The official mailing address of the Planning Commission shall be the same as the mailing address for the Douglas County Department of Transportation and Land Services.

ARTICLE II. MEETINGS AND QUORUM

A. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission shall be held at 5:30 PM in the Douglas County Public Services Building, 140 19th Street NW, East Wenatchee, Washington, or such other place as the Chair shall designate, on the second Wednesday of the month. A meeting may be canceled if there are no matter for the Planning Commission to consider. Special meetings of the Planning Commission may be held upon the call of the Chair, Vice-Chair, Executive Secretary or at the request of a majority of the members of the Planning Commission. Five (5) days written notice of any meetings shall be given to each member of the Planning Commission.

B. A majority of the total members of the Planning Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business that may come before any regular or special meeting of the Planning Commission.

C. The sessions of the Planning Commission shall be open to the public and shall proceed in accordance with provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act of 1971, RCW 42.30 as amended.

D. Except where in conflict with these By-laws and Rules of Procedure, Roberts Rules of Order shall govern the conduct of all public meetings and hearings of this body.
ARTICLE III. OFFICERS, ELECTIONS AND TERMS

A. The officers of the Planning Commission shall be a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Executive Secretary. The officers, except the Executive Secretary, shall be regularly appointed members of the Planning Commission.

B. The Chair shall preside over the meetings of the Planning Commission and exercise all the powers usually incident of the office, retaining the full privileges of a Planning Commissioner. The Chair shall decide on all points of order and procedure, subject to these by-laws and Roberts Rules of order. The Chair shall appoint any committees found necessary to investigate any matters before the Planning Commission.

C. The Vice-Chair shall, in the absence of the Chair, perform all the duties incumbent upon the Chair. In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, the members present may elect for the meeting an acting Chair who shall have full powers of the Chair during the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair.

D. The Douglas County Director of Land Services or his/her designee shall serve, ex officio without vote, as the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary shall keep a record of all meetings of the Planning Commission and, when requested to do so, its committees. These records, together with the seal, shall remain the property of the Planning Commission and be retained at the office of the Douglas County Department of Transportation and Land Services.

E. The officers, with the exception of the Executive Secretary, shall be elected prior to July 1 of each calendar year and shall assume office on July 1 of each calendar year. The officers shall serve for a period of one year, serving until a successor has been elected and assumes office.

F. Vacancies in office shall be filled by special election.

ARTICLE IV. VOTING

A. Each regularly appointed member, including the Chair, shall be entitled to one vote on any matter that may come before the Planning Commission. Except on administrative or procedural matters, the record of the Planning Commission shall show the individual vote of each member.

B. The approval of a comprehensive plan, or any amendment, extension, or addition thereto; or the recommendation to the Board of Commissioners of any official control or amendments thereto, shall require the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total membership of the Planning Commission. Passage of other matters upon which the Planning Commission is authorized to act shall require the majority vote of the Planning Commissioners present in session at the time.
C. Failure of a motion to approve any matter upon which the Planning Commission is authorized to act shall be deemed a denial. Failure of a motion to deny any matter upon which the Planning Commission is authorized to act shall not constitute approval.

D.C. The Planning Commission shall include findings of fact supporting any action upon which it authorized to act. A clear description of conditions necessary to carry out the spirit and intent of any comprehensive plan or official control shall be included in the action. The Executive Secretary shall submit to the Board of Commissioners, in writing, the recommendation of the Planning Commission not later than fourteen (14) calendar days following action by the Planning Commission. The transmittal to the Board of Commissioners shall include the motion and findings of fact considered by the Planning Commission.

ARTICLE V. COMMITTEES

Committees may be established by the Chair or by affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the Planning Commission. Standing or temporary committees of one or more members, shall be charged with such duties of examination, investigation and inquiry relative to one or more subjects of interest to the Planning Commission, as the Chair may direct or the Planning Commission may by motion or resolution determine. No standing or temporary committee shall have the power to commit the Planning Commission to the endorsement of any plan or program without its submission to the Planning Commission for consideration at a regular or special meeting.

ARTICLE VI. AMENDMENTS

The Planning Commission may amend these By-laws and Rules of Procedure by majority vote of the total membership at any regular or special meeting. A copy of the proposed amendments must be transmitted in writing by the Executive Secretary to each member of the Planning Commission at least fourteen (14) calendar days in advance of the meeting at which action is scheduled.
Dated this _____________ day of __________________, 2015.

___________________________  ______________________________
Robert Knowles, Chair       Joanne Rosenthal, Vice Chair

___________________________  ______________________________
Norman Cavadini             Britt Dudek

______________________________  ______________________________
Kathalene Humphrey          Carol Kavanaugh

______________________________  ______________________________
Michael Machado              Fred Suter

______________________
Brad Vickery

ATTEST:

______________________________
Mark D. Kulaas
Executive Secretary
TO: Douglas County Planning Commission
FROM: Douglas County Planning Staff
DATE: February 26, 2015
SUBJECT: Staff report for major amendment to Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort; includes amendment to subarea plan (Douglas County Countywide Plan), development regulations, and environmental planned action. CPRZ-07-02A

I. PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Requested Action: Big River Development has filed an application for a major amendment to the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort. The application proposes to:

- Increase the MPR in size from 660 acres to 860 acres.
- Incorporate irrigated agriculture (vineyard) into the design of the resort.
- Reconfigure land use based on the above plan changes.
- Revise recreation plan to include wine tasting and adventure amenities.
- Amend the phasing structure of the development plan to a ERU (Equivalent Residential Units) approach for required improvements.
- Update Transportation plan (traffic, pedestrian, rail) to support current development plan and ongoing collaboration with Douglas County, WSDOT and BNSF
- Update technical reports to address the MPR expansion and amended development plan

Location: The subject property is located west of the intersection of Spanish Castle Rd. and SR 28 and may more particularly be described as a portion of Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, Township 20 N, Range 22 E. W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The Douglas County Assessor Numbers for the subject property are 20221030001, 20221030002, 20220420001, 20220430001, 20220430002, 20220430003, 20220430004, 20220430005, 20220440002, 20220430002, 20220900001, 20220900002, 20220900002, 20220910002, 20220920001, and 20220920002.
II. POLICY REVIEW

RCW 36.70A.360 Master Planned Resorts
(1) Counties that are required or chose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 may permit master planned resorts which may constitute urban growth outside of urban growth areas as limited by this section. A master planned resort means a self-contained and fully integrated planned unit development, in a setting of significant natural amenities, with primary focus on destination resort facilities consisting of short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of developed on-site indoor or outdoor recreational facilities.

(2) Capital facilities, utilities, and services, including those related to sewer, water, stormwater, security, fire suppression, and emergency medical, provided on-site shall be limited to meeting the needs of the master planned resort. Such facilities, utilities, and services may be provided to a master planned resort by outside service providers, including municipalities and special purpose districts, provided that all costs associated with service extensions and capacity increases directly attributable to the master planned resort are fully borne by the resort. A master planned resort and service providers may enter into agreements for shared capital facilities and utilities, provided that such facilities and utilities serve only the master planned resort or urban growth areas.

(3) A master planned resort may include other residential uses within its boundaries, but only if the residential uses are integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

(4) A master planned resort may be authorized by a county only if:
   (a) The comprehensive plan specifically identifies policies to guide the development of master planned resorts;
   (b) The comprehensive plan and development regulations include restrictions that preclude new urban or suburban land uses in the vicinity of the master planned resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110
   (c) The county includes a finding as part of the approval process that the land is better suited, and has more long-term importance, for the master planned resort that for the commercial harvesting of timber or agricultural production, if located on that that otherwise would be designated as forest land or agricultural land under RCW 36.70A.170.
   (d) The county ensures that the resort plan is consistent with the development regulations for critical areas;
   (e) On-site and off-site infrastructure and service impacts are fully considered and mitigated.

Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan
Rural Element – Master Planned Resorts

GOAL: Provide opportunities for Master Planned Resorts (MPR’s) that will provide a mixture of recreational, commercial, lodging and resort-residential land uses that are appropriate for the site.

POLICY MPR-1: Encourage MPR’s, which do not conflict with existing adjacent land uses, and in cases where conflicts may be created, ensure that appropriately planned buffers are provided.

POLICY MPR-2: Provide a process that will encourage MPR’s to be high quality developments that are shown to be beneficial to the overall economy of the area and Douglas County, as well as being environmentally sound and appropriate for the site.
POLICY MPR-3: Plans developed for MPRs will be consistent with the other elements of this comprehensive plan, particularly the designated Resource Lands Element.

POLICY MPR-4: MPRs will be separated physically and aesthetically from the nearest existing developed areas.

POLICY MPR-5: New urban and suburban type land uses, including commercial activities, not associated with a MPR will be prohibited in the surrounding vicinity, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth.

POLICY MPR-6: When a MPR seeks to maintain a portion of resource use, it will be encouraged to located on the least productive of the resource lands, and open space will be made part of that development in order to buffer and protect the adjacent resource use.

POLICY MPR-7: MPRs will avoid, whenever possible, any critical areas or at a minimum will mitigate possible impacts to those critical areas, as directed in the Resource and Critical Areas Conservation element of this plan.

POLICY MPR-8: Necessary infrastructure for the resort development will be provided by the proponent at the time of development, and will be consistent with the size of the development. Actual improvements may be phased in concurrent with phased development, provided the overall size of the project is planned for.

POLICY MPR-9: Development plans will seek to blend the site development and architecture with the natural character and features of the land, including but not limited to topography, vegetation, geology, slope, soils, etc. The Master Plan will take all of these features and other considerations, such as cultural heritage and the nature of the resource use, into consideration to keep the facility compatible with the surrounding area.

POLICY-10: Encourage site planning that emphasizes cluster development with low impact site design that reflects the natural land characteristics wherever practical, and define these clusters with surrounding open space areas.

POLICY MPR-11: Encourage the MPR to employ local citizens and provide affordable housing for its employees where appropriate for a given MPR Site.

POLICY MPR-12: The MPR will seek to internalize and provide needed facilities, services and utilities which avoid, where feasible, impacts on existing public systems such as transportation, water sewer, power, etc.

POLICY MPR-13: The MPR must have a primary focus on visitor accommodations, including short-term visitors and second homes, as opposed to full time residential subdivisions. Some short-term visitor accommodations will be included in the initial phases.

POLICY MPR-14: Where the scale and location of the MPR makes it economically feasible, the MPR may also provide basic convenience good and services to resort guests to reduce off-site traffic demands. Commercial activities will be encourage to serve and focus primarily on the MPR’s resort market, and will be located in the interior of the development rather than on the perimeter.

POLICY MPR-15: All on-site and off-site infrastructure, utility and public service impacts will be appropriately mitigated. Capital facilities, utilities and services can be provided in phases to meet the needs of different development phases. To avoid over-sizing, it may be appropriate for these development to be designed by total loads rather than peak demands.

POLICY MPR-16: It is incumbent upon the MPR to provide environmental and archaeological protection of the site.

POLICY MPR-17: When feasible the MPR will emphasize internal transit-oriented site planning to provide resort guests with convenient linkages between recreational activity areas and housing/lodging facilities through such means as mini-shuttles, bike paths, hiking paths, equestrian trails that minimize an extensive, paved automobile circulation system.

POLICY MPR-18: Community sewer, water, police and fire facilities may be provided on-site, but will be sized to meet only the needs of the development. Existing public service purveyors may provide services as long as costs related to service extensions and any capacity increases
generated by the development are borne by the development. MPR sewer and water facilities
will not serve intervening uses, except those specifically designated in the comprehensive plan.

POLICY MPR-19: School facility, solid waste service, emergency medical service, storm
drainage facility, parks and recreation and any other public service impacts will be addressed
and appropriately mitigated by the MPR.

POLICY MPR-20: Coordinate the transportation/circulation system, emergency services plan,
signage and general access provisions to assure quick response in case of emergency.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Pursuant to WAC 197-11-620, Douglas County Land Services issued a Final
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, FSEIS, on February 19, 2015, with
respect to application CPRZ-07-02A. The FSEIS provides a review and analysis of
existing conditions, impacts, and mitigation measures associated with the following
categories of the environment: earth, air, water, plants and animals, environmental
health, land and shoreline use, transportation, public services and utilities, and fiscal
impacts.

IV. PUBLIC PROCESS

• Application materials determined complete on August 5, 2014.
• On August 12, 2014 Douglas County initiated a 60-day review period for the
  proposed amendments. Draft documents, including a Draft Supplement to the
  Environmental Impact Statement, were sent the Department of Commerce and
copies of the environmental documents were sent to the Department of Ecology
SEPA Register on August 12, 2014;
• Notice of the comment period was published in the Empire Press and Wenatchee
  World on August 14, 2014;
• Notice of the comment period was sent via email to the interested parties list, on
  August 12, 2014;
• Notice of the comment period was mailed to 22 agencies/utilities and 18
  surrounding property addresses on August 12, 2014.
• A website with the draft amendments and environmental documents was
  launched in August 12, 2014;
• The Washington State Department of Commerce acknowledged receipt of the
  review on August 18, 2014.
• The Douglas County Planning Commission held a public workshop on the major
  amendment proposal for the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort plan on
February 17, 2015.
• A Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Empire Press and the
  Wenatchee World on February 26, 2015 establishing a public hearing before the
Planning Commission on March 11, 2015; and
• The Notice of Public Hearing was sent February 24, 2015 via email to the
  interested parties list.
• The notice of public hearing was sent to 16 addresses on February 24, 2015.
• On March 11, 2015, the Douglas County Planning Commission conducted an advertised public hearing.

V. AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Douglas County initiated the 60-day review on August 13, 2014 with a public and agency comment period concluding on October 13, 2014. Two (2) public comments were submitted during this timeframe.

1. **October 2, 2014:** Washington State Department of Ecology, submitted comment regarding the availability of water resources on the subject properties, the potential for residual concentrations of pesticides in soils, and the need to include the expansion area in the existing Constriction Stormwater General Permit.

2. **October 29, 2012:** Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation submitted comment regarding the need for cultural resources surveys for the property.

Two (2) comments were received after the close of the 60 day review period.

1. **October 21, 2014:** Douglas County Transportation Services, submitted comment regarding transportation related corrections.

2. **November 4, 2014:** Grant County PUD, submitted comment regarding references in the plan to the PUD’s adjacent shoreline property.

The comments are included in Appendix 12 of the plan document.

VI. PROJECT ANALYSIS

The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort (MPR) development plan includes three components; sub-area plan within the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan (Res. TLS-08-01), planned action environmental review (Ord. TLS-08-01-03), and MPR development regulations (Ord. TLS-08-02-04). All three of these components are combined into one integrated document titled “Spanish Castle Resort Master Planned Resort”. The sub-area plan component is identified as the Master Plan. The planned action environmental review is made up of an integrated SEPA/GMA document comprising of the Draft and Final SEIS. The purpose of the planned action is to streamline project proposals by performing the environmental analysis during this stage of review. Therefore project phase proposals that are consistent with the development plan, design standards and environmental mitigation are not subject to environmental review. The section titled Chapter 10 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement analyzes the environmental impacts and alternatives. Third, the development standards are listed in the Design and Development Manual and the Landscape Standards section.

**NOTE:** The three resolution/ordinances listed above are included in the planning commission packet.
The Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners are being asked to review and take action to amend three different regulatory mechanisms. The proposed sub-area plan amendments must be adopted as a component of the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan by resolution. Second, the amendments to the Planned Action must be adopted by a stand alone ordinance pertaining to all project proposals within the boundary of the MPR. Lastly, the amended Development Regulations must be adopted by a stand alone ordinance pertaining to all development within the boundary of the MPR.

Following is a staff review and analysis of each of these three regulatory mechanisms.

NOTE: There have been no changes to the proposed document since the February 17, 2015 Planning Commission Workshop. Please refer to that CD for the document materials.

SUB-AREA PLAN

Consistency with RCW 36.70A Growth Management Act
The project is designed as a self-contained fully integrated planned unit development. All utilities and capital facilities are designed to serve only the development. The Rural Element of the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan includes goals and policies for master planned resorts. Policy MPR-5 prohibits new suburban or urban development in the surrounding vicinity of the MPR except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth. The development plan includes updated provisions for a new wastewater treatment facility, water system, stormwater system, electrical system and improved transportation facilities which adequately accommodate the expansion area. Mitigation measures have been proposed for emergency services and schools. On-site and off-site infrastructure and service impacts have been fully considered.

The sub-area plan is consistent with RCW 36.70A, the Growth Management Act.

Consistency with Douglas County Code
The Spanish Castle Master Plan contains an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the development standards for Master Planned Resorts. The site size is greater than 40 acres. The Master Plan provides adequate yard and setbacks for building separation, interior required yards and perimeter boundary setbacks. At least forty percent of the total acreage is dedicated to open space, natural areas or active/passive recreational areas. Commercial and retail uses are sized and oriented to serve the resort. Landscape standards are established which will preserve and incorporate natural features into the development plan. The Master Plan accommodates required parking. The nature of the development encourages pedestrian access throughout the project to reduce parking demand. The Master Plan accommodates additional parking within satellite parking lots with provisions for shuttle service during periods of peak parking demand. Pedestrian and equestrian facilities are designed to provide access to all areas of the resort. The design of the resort encourages pedestrian or non-motorized access between the residential,
commercial and recreational uses. Improvements and activities are located and designed in such a manner as to avoid or minimize adverse effects of the MPR on surrounding lands and property. Archaeological survey work has been performed on most of the property and is included in Appendix 13. Some of the property within the expansion area has not been surveyed to date. These areas include the property that was previously a livestock feedlot and corresponding pens. The Environmental Mitigation requires that those areas be surveyed prior to development. The Master Plan establishes protection measures for the archaeological resources consistent with the survey recommendations. The MPR will be appropriately served by a full range of facilities and services. On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts have been fully considered and will be mitigated at the time of development.

The sub-area plan is consistent with Chapter 18.74 Master Planned Resorts.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) PLANNED ACTION
The purpose of a planned action is to combine environmental analysis with land use planning; as well as, to streamline and expedite the land use permit review process by relying on completed and existing environmental analysis for the subject property.

What effect does a Planned Action designation have? When the SEPA Responsible Official or designees determines that a development proposal within the designated area qualifies as a planned action, the project shall not be subject to a SEPA threshold determination, an environmental impact statement (EIS), SEPA appeal or any other additional review under SEPA. Projects designated as planned action projects will not be subject to further SEPA review. However, the projects must have any necessary mitigation measures outlined in the integrated document and must be found consistent with the development parameters and environmental analysis. Additionally, the planned action designation does not exempt the project from meeting applicable County, State and Federal code requirements, apart from SEPA. These proposed major amendments require a Supplement to the original EIS; therefore the planned action ordinance must be amended to include this new SEIS environmental review and mitigation.

The original planned action is in three parts; the environmental impact statement, the planned action boundary (Attachment B, Ord TLS-08-01-03) and the Procedures and Criteria for Evaluating and Determining Projects as Planned Actions (Attachment C, Ord TLS-08-01-03). This major amendment under consideration proposes to change only the environmental impact statement and planned action boundary. The Procedures and Criteria for Evaluating and Determining Projects as Planned Actions will not be amended by this process.

DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS
Development within the Spanish Castle MPR is guided by it’s own set of development regulations. These regulations are established by Ordinance TLS-08-02-04 and apply within the boundaries of the MPR. The regulations are identified in the integrated document as the Design and Development Manual and the Landscape Standards.
The amended development regulations include a new set of landscape standards and expansion of the uses to include the agricultural (vineyard) uses brought in with the expansion area. The new landscape standards are focused more on a Eastern Washington semi-arid style.

The original development regulations are in three parts; the Design and Development Manual, Landscape Standards and the SCMPR Development Regulations and Application Review Procedure (Attachment B, Ord TLS-08-02-04). This major amendment under consideration proposes to change only the Design and Development Manual and Landscape Standards. The SCMPR Development Regulations and Application Review Procedure will not be amended by this process.

The development regulations and review procedures are consistent with DCC 18.74, the Master Plan, RCW 36.70A.

VII. Recommendation:

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of CPRZ#07-02A Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort, amending the Spanish Castle MPR Sub-area plan within the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, amending the Spanish Castle MPR Environmental Planned Action, and amending Spanish Castle MPR Development Standards and Development Review Procedures Ordinance based on the following findings of fact and conclusions:

Suggested Findings of Fact:

**General**

1. The applicants are Big River Development, 3559 Road K NW, Quincy WA and Evergreen Vineyards LLC, PO Box 1260, Quincy WA.

2. **General Description:** An application for a major amendment to the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort. The application proposes to:
   - Increase the MPR in size from 660 acres to 860 acres.
   - Incorporate irrigated agriculture (vineyard) into the design of the resort.
   - Reconfigure land use based on the above plan changes.
   - Revise recreation plan to include wine tasting and adventure amenities.
   - Amend the phasing structure of the development plan to a ERU (Equivalent Residential Units) approach for required improvements.
   - Update Transportation plan (traffic, pedestrian, rail) to support current development plan and ongoing collaboration with Douglas County, WSDOT and BNSF
   - Update technical reports to address the MPR expansion and amended development plan

3. **Location:** The subject property is located west of the intersection of Spanish Castle Rd. and SR 28 and may more particularly be described as a portion of Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, Township 20 N, Range 22 E. W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The Douglas County Assessor Numbers for the subject property are 20221030001,
4. Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort was originally approved on January 8, 2008 via the following documents; Subarea Plan (Res. TLS-08-01), Development Regulations (Ord TLS-08-02-04), and Environmental Planned Action (ORD. TLS-08-01-03).

5. Douglas County approved a minor amendment to the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort pursuant to DCC 18.74.150(B) on July 31, 2014. The minor amendments included; update to existing conditions, update utility components to match current service delivery plans, remove/modify language regarding shoreline access, amend transportation plan, amend public facility language, amend open space language.

6. Pursuant to WAC 197-11-620, Douglas County Land Services issued a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, FSEIS, on February 19, 2015, with respect to application CPRZ-07-02A.

7. D.C.C. Chapter 18.74.150 provides a process by which the MPR may be amended. Provisions are made for minor amendments and for major amendments.

8. The applicant and Douglas County Land Services prepared the amendments to the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area Plan, conducted a thorough review of the development anticipated for the land use designations established within the sub-area, completed a detailed environmental analysis of the potential development, prepared a supplemental environmental impact statement for the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort which includes an analysis of the impacts of uses allowed in the Spanish Castle MPR Sub-area and the capital facilities needed for the area to accommodate the types and intensity of development anticipated and planned for in the Spanish Castle MPR sub-area.

9. Douglas County has established and provides opportunities to the public, local and state jurisdictions and agencies for early and continuous public participation in the drafting of amendments for the comprehensive plan. Public involvement included the opportunity for oral and written comment and testimony during the 60 day comment period following the issuance of the Notice of Availability/DSEIS, public workshop, and public hearings advertised by legal notice, mailed notice to surrounding properties and interested parties, affected agencies and news media.


11. The Douglas County Planning Commission conducted a duly advertised public hearing on March 11, 2015. The Planning Commissions entered into the record the files on this amendment, accepted public testimony, and deliberated the merits of the proposal.

12. The Douglas County Planning Commission have reviewed the entire record including the countywide planning policies, written and oral public testimony, and agency comments as they relate to the proposed comprehensive plan amendments.
This major amendment to Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort amends Resolution TLS-08-01.

RCW Chapter 36.70 authorizes the adoption of comprehensive plans.

Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans there were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of the adjoining jurisdictions.

Douglas County Planning Commission is responsible for long range planning matters and providing implementation recommendations to assure compliance with the growth management act for unincorporated areas of Douglas County. These measures include updates and amendments to the comprehensive plan; development regulations, environmental regulations, and any other rules, actions or regulations deemed necessary to implement the Growth Management Act.

An application for approval of the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort and associated map amendments was received on February 27, 2013, and the application was determined complete on August 5, 2014.

The proposed amendments to the sub-area plan and development regulations and draft supplemental environmental impact statement were sent to the Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development and local and state agencies for a 60 day review pursuant to Section 36.70A.106. The 60-day review began on August 13, 2014 and ended on October 13, 2014.

The Spanish Castle MPR major amendment (CPRZ-07-02A) amends, modifies, and changes certain provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, zoning map and development regulations.

The subject property proposed for inclusion into the MPR is designated as agricultural lands of long term commercial significance.

A Geologic Risk Assessment from Munson Engineers, dated May 14, 2007 was submitted for a portion of the proposed expansion area. Another Geologic Risk Assessment from Munson Engineers dated June 25, 2014 was submitted for the remaining expansion area. These two reports are combined with the original geotechnical investigation by Western Pacific Engineering, Inc, dated May 8, 2007 meeting the requirements of DCC 19.18D.

A new traffic analysis for the project was performed by SCJ Alliance, dated June 2, 2014. This new analysis replaces the original document.

A new preliminary wastewater system plan and sewer feasibility analysis, performed by SCJ Alliance and RH2 Engineering, dated June 2014 was submitted for the entire project to replace the original plan. This preliminary plan establishes the wastewater flow and loading projections to establish design criteria and a general system phasing plan for the project.

A new preliminary water system plan written by SCJ Alliance, dated June 2014 was submitted by the applicant. This report details the necessary preliminary sizing information for the water storage facilities, wells and water mains.

A cultural resources assessment from Cultural Resource Consultants, dated September 10, 2007 and a Preliminary Cultural Resources Review from Plateau
Archaeological Investigations, dated June 25, 2014 were submitted for a portion of the proposed expansion area. These reports are combined with the original cultural resources survey was conducted for the project by Archaeological and Historical Services, dated April 2007, revised May 2007. For the portions of the expansion area not archaeologically surveyed; the environmental mitigation conditions require that a cultural resources survey be performed prior to development approval.

26. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort plan establishes the development as a significantly self-contained and integrated development that includes short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range to indoor and outdoor recreational facilities within the property boundaries in a setting of significant natural amenities.

27. The Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan specifically identifies policies to guide the development of master planned resorts.

28. The Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan include restrictions that preclude new urban or suburban land uses in the vicinity of the resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.360(1).

29. The subject property is better suited for the master planned resort use than for commercial agriculture production.

30. The development plan for the Spanish Castle MPR is consistent with Douglas County critical area regulations.

31. On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts have been fully considered and are mitigated.

32. The amended Spanish Castle Master Plan describes the project and provides a framework for project control and operation during and after development. Specifically, the master Plan includes an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the following elements of the Master Planned Resort:
   a. A description of the destination resort facilities of the MPR, including short-term visitor accommodations, on-site outdoor and indoor recreational facilities, commercial and supportive services provided. The manner in which these services will support and be integrated into the on-site recreational nature of the resort is discussed in the master plan.
   b. Maps that depict the completed MPR development, showing the full extent and ultimate development of the Resort and its facilities and services.
   c. Additional maps, drawings, illustrations, or other materials, as appropriate, to assist in understanding and visualizing the design and operation of the development and its facilities and services, landscaping, protection of environmentally sensitive areas and other features of the development.
   d. A description, with supportive information, of the design and functional features that provide for a unified development, superior site design and protection of natural amenities, and which further the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The Master Plan explains how landscaping and open space, recreational facilities, road and parking design, capital facilities, and other components of the Master Plan work together in the project.
   e. The Master Plan lists allowable uses and maximum density of the MPR.
f. A description of the intended phasing of the development of the project. The application for the MPR provided sufficient detail for the phases such that the full intended scope and intensity of the development could be evaluated.

g. A description of the environmentally sensitive areas of the project acre, and the measures that will be employed for their protection.

h. A demonstration that sufficient facilities and services which may be necessary or appropriate for the support of the development will be available.

33. The amended Spanish Castle Master Plan contains an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the use provisions for Master Planned Resorts found in DCC 18.74 as follows:

a. Permitted uses and their locations within the Master Planned Resort are set forth in the Master Plan.

b. A mix of residential densities is established in the Master Plan. The Plan provides that these residential uses will be integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

c. All necessary supportive and accessory on-site urban-level commercial and other services will be contained within the boundaries of the Spanish Castle master Planned Resort, and such services shall be oriented to serve the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort.

33. The amended Spanish Castle Master Plan contains an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the development standards for Master Planned Resorts as follows:

a. The site size is greater than 40 acres.

b. The Master Plan provides adequate yard and setbacks for building separation, interior required yards and perimeter boundary setbacks. Structures for human habitation will be located at least 100 feet from the boundary of the site in conformance with DCC 18.16.080(F).

c. At least forty percent of the total acreage is dedicated to open space, natural areas or active/passive recreational areas.

d. Commercial and retail uses are located interior to the development but adjacent to the Columbia River in accordance with DCC 18.74.070(B)(1)(a) and sizes and oriented to serve the resort.

e. Landscape standards are established which will preserve and incorporate natural features into the development plan.

f. The Master Plan accommodates required parking. The nature of the development encourages pedestrian access throughout the project to reduce parking demand. The Master Plan accommodates additional parking within satellite parking lots with provisions for shuttle service during periods of peak parking demand.

g. Pedestrian and equestrian facilities are designed to provide access to all areas of the resort. The design of the resort encourages pedestrian or non-motorized access between the residential, commercial and recreational uses.

h. Improvements and activities are located and designed in such a manner as to avoid or minimize adverse effects of the MPR on surrounding lands and property.
i. An archaeological survey of the property was performed that identified archaeological resources. The Master Plan establishes protection measures for the archaeological resources consistent with the survey recommendations.

j. An analysis was performed on the property that assessed the impacts of the property on the commercial agricultural and social-economic structure of the immediate area and of the county as a whole. The analysis determined that only a part of the property has agricultural production potential and that the remote location has had a negative impact on the agricultural operation. The removal of the property from production will result in a loss to agriculture but will be replaced by other primary economic activity.

k. The MPR will be appropriately served by a full range of facilities and services. On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts have been fully considered and will be mitigated at the time of development.

34. The Master Plan & Environmental Impact Statement document includes a suitability analysis of the subject property for the proposed master planned resort. The analysis determined that the property is suitable for resort development.

Planned Action

35. This major amendment to Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort amends the environmental impact statement, with a FSEIS, and planned action boundary. The Procedures and Criteria for Evaluating and Determining Projects as Planned Actions (Attachment C, Ord TLS-08-01-03) are still in effect.

36. Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans there were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of the adjoining jurisdictions.

37. Douglas County issued a Determination of Significance and Adoption of Existing Environmental Documents in accordance with WAC 197-11-360 on August 11, 2014.


39. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Planned Action Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement identifies and addresses all significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

40. The mitigation measures contained within the supplemental environmental impact statement, together with the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Development Regulations and applicable County development standards are adequate to mitigate the significant adverse environmental impacts of planned action development.

41. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort is not a essential public facility.

42. The Planned Action is consistent with the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area Plan and the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan.
Development Regulations

43. This major amendment to Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort amends the Design and Development Manual and Landscape Standards. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Development Regulations and Application Review Procedure (Attachment B, Ord TLS-08-02-04) are still in effect.

44. The proposed amendments to the sub-area plan and development regulations and draft supplemental environmental impact statement were sent to the Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development and local and state agencies for a 60 day review pursuant to Section 36.70A.106. The 60-day review began on August 13, 2014 and ended on October 13, 2014.

45. The Spanish Castle MPR major amendment (CPRZ-07-02A) amends, modifies, and changes certain provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, zoning map and development regulations.

46. Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans there were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of the adjoining jurisdictions.

47. Douglas County Planning Commission is responsible for long range planning matters and providing implementation recommendations to assure compliance with the growth management act for unincorporated areas of Douglas County. These measures include updates and amendments to the comprehensive plan; development regulations, environmental regulations, and any other rules, actions or regulations deemed necessary to implement the Growth Management Act.

48. DCC Chapter 18.74.150 establishes provisions for amendments to the master planned resort.

49. The proposed Design Development Manual & Landscape Plan are consistent with and implement the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Subarea Plan.

Suggested Conclusions:

1. Comments received from reviewing agencies and public have been considered and addressed where appropriate.

2. The procedural and substantive requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act have been complied with.

3. Potential impacts to resource lands, critical areas, open spaces and historic archaeological and/or cultural sites have been considered and addressed by mitigation and avoidance measures, as identified by the FSEIS.

4. Potential impacts to the environment and necessary mitigation and avoidance measures identified by the FSEIS have been incorporated into the project by the applicant.

5. Alternatives to the proposed action were considered with the development and adoption of the FSEIS. The proposed action is the preferred alternative, based upon the conclusions of the environmental review and analysis of the FSEIS.
6. The proposed amendments to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan are consistent with RCW 36.70A and the Douglas County Regional Policy Plan and RCW Chapter 36.70A
7. Appropriate provisions have been made for the public health, safety and general welfare.
8. The public use and interest will be served by the approval of the proposal.
Proposed Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Amendment
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Note: This map is intended for general information purposes only. Douglas County makes no claim as to the accuracy or current condition of the data shown on this map.
Resolution No. TLS 08-01

Resolution Approving Spanish Castle )
Master Planned Resort and adopting )
A sub-area plan to the Douglas County )
Countywide Comprehensive Plan )

LAND SERVICES

Notice of Hearing Resolution No. TLS-07-50A.

WHEREAS, Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans which were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of adjoining jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.360 authorizes Douglas County to designate “Master Planned Resorts”; and

WHEREAS, the Rural Element of the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan and Douglas County Code (DCC) Chapter 18.74 establishes standards and requirements for Master Planned Resorts and provide a process whereby the owner may submit a plan for resort development and uses to the County for approval; and

WHEREAS, under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) a Determination of Significance and Scoping Notice was issued on May 2, 2007; a scoping workshop was held May 16, 2007; a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was issued August 17, 2007 and a final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was issued on October 19, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Douglas County Planning Commission has transmitted a recommendation of approval to this Board regarding the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area Plan; and

WHEREAS, notice of all public hearings and public meetings on this matter have been published according to law.

WHEREAS, this proposal is a component of the 2007 comprehensive plan review and amendment process for Douglas County. These components are being considered through a phased review process. Once the review process has been completed for all components, the 2007 review and amendment process will have concluded.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of County Commissioners hereby accepts the Findings of Fact and Conclusions adopted by the Douglas County Planning
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Commission, entering those findings into the record as their own as set forth in Attachment A and incorporating them in this resolution by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the recommendation of the Douglas County Planning Commission is accepted and the Spanish Castle MPR Sub-area Plan is adopted amending the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan as set forth in Attachments B and C, and incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

This resolution shall be effective immediately.

Dated this 8th day of January 2008 in East Wenatchee, Washington.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOUGLAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Ken Stanton, Chair

Dane Keane, Vice-Chair

Mary Hunt, Member

ATTEST:

Dayna Prewitt, Clerk of the Board
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ATTACHMENT A

Findings of Fact:
1. The applicant is Entezar Group Eastern Washington LLC, 110 C St. SW, Quincy WA.
2. General Description: An application for a Master Planned Resort. The proposal includes the creation of a subarea plan to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, applicable development regulations and a planned action under WAC 197-11-164 and 172. The proposed project includes the following elements:
   - Mixture of residential uses including single family, multifamily condominium and townhouse residences totaling 1140 units.
   - Commercial uses include retail, office & service space totaling 62,000 sq. feet and a 100 room hotel.
   - Recreation uses include an 18 hole golf course, equestrian center and 20,000 sq. foot wellness/therapy spa.
   - Necessary resort/community support facilities such as water, wastewater, electrical, maintenance, administration, security facilities.
3. Location: The subject property is located west of the intersection of Spanish Castle Rd. and SR 28 and may more particularly be described as a portion of Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, Township 20 N, Range 22 E. W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The Douglas County Assessor Numbers for the subject property are 20220430001, 20220900002, 20220910002, 20220920001, 20220920002, 20221030001, and 20221030002.
4. Site Information:
   - Total Project Size: 659 acres
   - Domestic Water: New Group A water system
   - Sewage Disposal: New sewage treatment system
   - Power/Electricity: Douglas County PUD
   - Fire Protection: Douglas County Fire District #2
5. Site Characteristics: The subject property is characterized as moderately to steeply sloping down in a series of benches from the highway to the Columbia River. The property is bisected by the railroad. There is an existing concrete foundation, a couple of irrigation pumping stations and underground irrigation lines serving an adjoining orchard. There are two unimproved roads that traverse the property; the first is for access to the pumping stations and the other runs adjacent to the railroad and telephone line. The site vegetation is a mix of native grasses, small plants and sagebrush. The site has a prominent ridgeline running parallel to the river with a couple of good size ravines. There are a fairly large number of significant basalt rock outcroppings. These outcroppings vary in size from about the size of a riding lawn mower to the size of a single-family house.
6. Surrounding Property: To the north, Vacant Land, Former Feedlot; to the south, Orchard Land, Vacant Land, to the east, Former Feedlot, SR 28, Orchard Land; to the west, Former Feedlot, SR 28, Orchard Land.
7. Douglas County has established and provides opportunities to the public, local and state jurisdictions and agencies for early and continuous public participation in the drafting of amendments for the comprehensive plan. Public involvement included the opportunity for oral and written comment and testimony at during the EIS Scoping Period, following the issuance of the DEIS, public hearings advertised by legal notice, mailed notice to surrounding properties and interested parties, affected agencies and news media.
8. In addition to the comments received and addressed in the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort FEIS, comments were received after the close of the EIS comment period but before the close of the GMA comment period from Dean Taplett and WA State Dept. of Transportation.
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10. The Douglas County Planning Commission conducted a duly advertised public hearing on November 5, 2007. The Planning Commissions entered into the record the files on this amendment, accepted public testimony, and deliberated the merits of the proposal.

11. The Douglas County Planning Commission have reviewed the entire record including the countywide planning policies, written and oral public testimony, and agency comments as they relate to the proposed comprehensive plan amendments.

12. The amendment to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the Douglas County Regional Policy Plan (countywide planning policy) and RCW Chapter 36.70A.

13. RCW Chapter 36.70 authorizes the adoption of comprehensive plans.

14. Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans there were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of the adjoining jurisdictions.

15. Douglas County Planning Commission is responsible for long range planning matters and providing implementation recommendations to assure compliance with the growth management act for unincorporated areas of Douglas County. These measures include updates and amendments to the comprehensive plan, development regulations, environmental regulations, and any other rules, actions or regulations deemed necessary to implement the Growth Management Act.

16. An application for approval of the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort and associated map amendments was originally received on April 2, 2007, and the application was determined complete on April 18, 2007.

17. The applicant and Douglas County Land Services prepared the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area Plan, conducted a thorough review of the development anticipated for the land use designations established within the sub-area, completed a detailed environmental analysis of the potential development, prepared an environmental impact statement for the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort which includes an analysis of the impacts of uses allowed in the Spanish Castle MPR Sub-area and the capital facilities needed for the area to accommodate the types and intensity of development anticipated and planned for in the Spanish Castle MPR sub-area, all with respect to the elements of the environment set forth in the County's scoping document.

18. The proposed sub-area plan and development regulations and draft environmental impact statement was sent to the Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development and local and state agencies for a 60 day review pursuant to Section 36.70A.106. The 60-day review began on August 17, 2007 and ended on October 16, 2007.

19. The Spanish Castle MPR Sub-area Plan amends, modifies, and changes certain provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, zoning map and development regulations.

20. The subject property is designated as agricultural lands of long term commercial significance.

21. A geotechnical investigation was performed for the project by Western Pacific Engineering, Inc, dated May 8, 2007 meeting the requirements of DCC 19.18D. The report determined that subsurface conditions of the site are geotechnically suitable for construction as long as some design considerations are taken into account.
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22. A traffic analysis for the project was performed by Western Pacific Engineering, Inc., dated June 14, 2007.

23. A memo report detailing planning information for wastewater treatment and management facilities for the project written by Gesvelt Environmental Engineering dated June 21, 2007 was submitted by the applicant. This memo establishes the wastewater flow and loading projections to establish design criteria and anticipated effluent quality criteria for reclaiming the treated effluent for beneficial use and identifies a plan for disposal of biosolids for the project.

24. A water system evaluation report written by Western Pacific Engineering, dated June 14, 2007 was submitted by the applicant. This report details the necessary preliminary sizing information for the water storage facilities, wells and water mains.

25. A cultural resources survey was conducted for the project by Archaeological and Historical Services, dated April 2007, revised May 2007. During the survey 3 archaeological sites and 2 prehistoric isolated finds were identified. The report identified management recommendations for these areas.

26. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort plan establishes the development as a significantly self-contained and integrated development that includes short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities within the property boundaries in a setting of significant natural amenities.

27. The Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan specifically identifies policies to guide the development of master planned resorts.

28. The Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan include restrictions that preclude new urban or suburban land uses in the vicinity of the resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.360(1).

29. The subject property is better suited for the master planned resort use than for commercial agriculture production.

30. The development plan for the Spanish Castle MPR is consistent with Douglas County critical area regulations.

31. On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts have been fully considered and are mitigated.

32. The Spanish Castle Master Plan describes the project and provides a framework for project control and operation during and after development. Specifically, the master plan includes an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the following elements of the Master Planned Resort:
   a. A description of the destination resort facilities of the MPR, including short-term visitor accommodations, on-site outdoor and indoor recreational facilities, commercial and supportive services provided. The manner in which these services will support and be integrated into the on-site recreational nature of the resort is discussed in the master plan.
   b. Maps that depict the completed MPR development, showing the full extent and ultimate development of the Resort and its facilities and services.
   c. Additional maps, drawings, illustrations, or other materials, as appropriate, to assist in understanding and visualizing the design and operation of the development and its facilities and services, landscaping, protection of environmentally sensitive areas and other features of the development.
   d. A description, with supportive information, of the design and functional features that provide for a unified development, superior site design and protection of natural amenities, and which further the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The Master Plan explains how landscaping and open space, recreational facilities, road and parking design, capital facilities, and other components of the Master Plan work together in the project.
   e. The Master Plan lists allowable uses and maximum density of the MPR.
f. A description of the intended phasing of the development of the project. The application for the MPR provided sufficient detail for the phases such that the full intended scope and intensity of the development could be evaluated.

g. A description of the environmentally sensitive areas of the project acre, and the measures that will be employed for their protection.

h. A demonstration that sufficient facilities and services which may be necessary or appropriate for the support of the development will be available.

33. The Spanish Castle Master Plan contains an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the use provisions for Master Planned Resorts found in DCC 18.74 as follows:

a. Permitted uses and their locations within the Master Planned Resort are set forth in the Master Plan.

b. A mix of residential densities is established in the Master Plan. The Plan provides that these residential uses will be integrated into and support the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

c. All necessary supportive and accessory on-site urban-level commercial and other services will be contained within the boundaries of the Spanish Castle master Planned Resort, and such services shall be oriented to serve the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort.

33. The Spanish Castle Master Plan contains an appropriate level of detail and adequate discussion of the development standards for Master Planned Resorts as follows:

a. The site size is greater than 160 acres.

b. The Master Plan provides adequate yard and setbacks for building separation, interior required yards and perimeter boundary setbacks. Structures for human habitation will be located at least 100 feet from the boundary of the site in conformance with DCC 18.16.080(F).

c. At least forty percent of the total acreage is dedicated to open space, natural areas or active/passive recreational areas.

d. Commercial and retail uses are located interior to the development but adjacent to the Columbia River in accordance with DCC 18.74.070(B)(1)(a) and sizes and oriented to serve the resort.

e. Landscape standards are established which will preserve and incorporate natural features into the development plan.

f. The Master Plan accommodates required parking. The nature of the development encourages pedestrian access throughout the project to reduce parking demand. The Master Plan accommodates additional parking within satellite parking lots with provisions for shuttle service during periods of peak parking demand.

g. Pedestrian and equestrian facilities are designed to provide access to all areas of the resort. The design of the resort encourages pedestrian or non-motorized access between the residential, commercial and recreational uses.

h. Improvements and activities are located and designed in such a manner as to avoid or minimize adverse effects of the MPR on surrounding lands and property.

i. An archaeological survey of the property was performed that identified archaeological resources. The Master Plan establishes protection measures for the archaeological resources consistent with the survey recommendations.

j. An analysis was performed on the property that assessed the impacts of the property on the commercial agricultural and social-economic structure of the immediate area and of the county as a whole. The analysis determined that only a part of the property has agricultural production potential and that the remote location has had a negative impact on the agricultural operation. The removal of the
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property from production will result in a loss to agriculture but will be replaced by other primary economic activity.
k. The MPR will be appropriately served by a full range of facilities and services. On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts have been fully considered and will be mitigated at the time of development.
34. The Master Plan & Environmental Impact Statement document includes a suitability analysis of the subject property for the proposed master planned resort. The analysis determined that the property is suitable for resort development.
35. DCC Chapter 18.74.140 establishes provisions for the expiration of a master planned resort if the project fails to meet the approved timeframes.
36. DCC Chapter 18.74.150 establishes provisions for amendments to the master planned resort.

Conclusions:

1. Comments received from reviewing agencies and public have been considered and addressed where appropriate.
2. The procedural and substantive requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act have been complied with.
3. Potential impacts to resource lands, critical areas, open spaces and historic archaeological and/or cultural sites have been considered and addressed by mitigation and avoidance measures, as identified by the FEIS.
4. Potential impacts to the environment and necessary mitigation and avoidance measures identified by the FEIS have been incorporated into the project by the applicant, Entezar Group, Eastern Washington LLC.
5. Alternatives to the proposed action were considered with the development and adoption of the FEIS. The proposed action is the preferred alternative, based upon the conclusions of the environmental review and analysis of the FEIS.
6. The proposed amendments to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan are consistent with RCW 36.70A and the Douglas County Regional Policy Plan.
7. Appropriate provisions have been made for the public health, safety and general welfare.
8. The public use and interest will be served by the approval of the proposal.
Attachment C

Spanish Castle Resort
Master Plan
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BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOUGLAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON
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Ordinance establishing the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Planned Pursuant to RCW 43.21.031

LAND SERVICES Action

Notice of Hearing Resolution No. TLS-07-50A.

WHEREAS, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and its implementing regulations authorize counties planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to designate planned actions that have had their significant impacts adequately addressed in an environmental impact statement (EIS) prepared in conjunction with a comprehensive plan, sub-area plan or a master planned development; and

WHEREAS, RCW 43.21C.031 and WAC 197-11-164, and -172 allow and govern the application of a Planned Action designation; and

WHEREAS, Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan that includes the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort sub-area plan; and

WHEREAS, designation of a project as a planned action streamlines subsequent review of the project by eliminating the need for preparation of a threshold determination or EIS; and

WHEREAS, adopting a SEPA Planned Action for the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort with appropriate standards and procedures will help achieve permit processing efficiency and promote environmental quality.

WHEREAS, this proposal is a component of the 2007 comprehensive plan review and amendment process for Douglas County. These components are being considered through a phased review process. Once the review process has been completed for all components, the 2007 review and amendment process will have concluded.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of County Commissioners hereby accepts the Findings of Fact and Conclusions adopted by the Douglas County Planning Commission entering those findings into the record as their own as set forth in Attachment A and incorporating them in this resolution by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the purpose of this ordinance is to:
A. Combine environmental analysis with land use planning; and
B. Set forth a procedure designating certain project actions in the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area as “planned actions” consistent with state law 43.21C.031 RCW, and
C. Streamline and expedite the land use permit review process by relying on completed and existing environmental analysis for the Planned Action Area.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the effect of the Planned Action is:
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A. Upon designation by the SEPA Responsible Official or designee that the development proposal within the Planned Action Area qualifies as a Planned Action pursuant to this Ordinance and WAC 197-11-172, the project shall not be subject to a SEPA threshold determination, an environmental impact statement (EIS), SEPA appeal or any other additional review under SEPA.

B. Being designated as a Planned Action or Planned Action Project means that a proposed project has been review in accordance with this Ordinance and found to be consistent with the development parameters and environmental analysis concluded in the integrated document.

C. Planned Action projects will not be subject to further procedural review under SEPA. However in order to qualify as planned actions, these projects will have incorporated applicable mitigating measures identified in the integrated document. Additionally, projects will be subject to applicable local, state and federal regulatory requirements. The Planned Action designation shall not exempt a project from meeting the applicable County Code requirements apart from the SEPA process.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED AND ORDAINED, that the recommendation of the Douglas County Planning Commission is accepted and the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Planned Action is established as depicted in Attachment B and development proposals within the planned action area shall be reviewed as fully set forth in Attachment C.

This ordinance shall be effective immediately.

This ordinance will not be codified. A copy of the approved Master Plan and Development Regulations shall be available to the public for inspection and copying at the Douglas County Transportation and Land Services office.

Dated this 5th day of January 2008 in East Wenatchee, Washington.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOUGLAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Ken Stanton, Chair

Dane Keane, Vice Chair

Mary Hunt, Member

ATTEST:

Dayna Prewitt, Clerk of the Board
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ATTACHMENT A

Findings of Fact:
1. The applicant is Entezar Group Eastern Washington LLC, 110 C St. SW, Quincy WA.
2. **General Description:** An application for a Master Planned Resort. The proposal includes the creation of a subarea plan to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, applicable development regulations and a planned action under WAC 197-11-164 and 172. The proposed project includes the following elements:
   - Mixture of residential uses including single family, multifamily condominium and townhouse residences totaling 1140 units.
   - Commercial uses include retail, office & service space totaling 62,000 sq. feet and a 100 room hotel.
   - Recreation uses include an 18 hole golf course, equestrian center and 20,000 sq. foot wellness/therapy spa.
   - Necessary resort/community support facilities such as water, wastewater, electrical, maintenance, administration, security facilities.
3. **Location:** The subject property is located west of the intersection of Spanish Castle Rd. and SR 28 and may more particularly be described as a portion of Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, Township 20 N, Range 22 E. W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The Douglas County Assessor Numbers for the subject property are 20220430001, 20220900002, 20220910002, 20220920001, 20220920002, 20221030001, and 20221030002.
4. **Site Information:**
   - Total Project Size: 659 acres
   - Domestic Water: New Group A water system
   - Sewage Disposal: New sewage treatment system
   - Power/Electricity: Douglas County PUD
   - Fire Protection: Douglas County Fire District #2
5. **Site Characteristics:** The subject property is characterized as moderately to steeply sloping down in a series of benches from the highway to the Columbia River. The property is bisected by the railroad. There is an existing concrete foundation, a couple of irrigation pumping stations and underground irrigation lines serving an adjoining orchard. There are two unimproved roads that traverse the property; the first is for access to the pumping stations and the other runs adjacent to the railroad and telephone line. The site vegetation is a mix of native grasses, small plants and sagebrush. The site has a prominent ridgeline running parallel to the river with a couple of good size ravines. There are a fairly large number of significant basalt rock outcroppings. These outcroppings vary in size from about the size of a riding lawn mower to the size of a single-family house.
6. **Surrounding Property:** To the north, Vacant Land, Former Feedlot; to the south, Orchard Land, Vacant Land, to the east, Former Feedlot, SR 28, Orchard Land; to the west, Former Feedlot, SR 28, Orchard Land.
7. Douglas County has established and provides opportunities to the public, local and state jurisdictions and agencies for early and continuous public participation in the drafting of amendments for the comprehensive plan. Public involvement included the opportunity for oral and written comment and testimony at during the EIS Scoping Period, following the issuance of the DEIS, public hearings advertised by legal notice, mailed notice to surrounding properties and interested parties, affected agencies and news media.
8. In addition to the comments received and addressed in the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort FEIS, comments were received after the close of the EIS comment period but before the close of the GMA comment period from Dean Taplett and WA State Dept. of Transportation.
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10. The Douglas County Planning Commission conducted a duly advertised public hearing on November 5, 2007. The Planning Commissions entered into the record the files on this amendment, accepted public testimony, and deliberated the merits of the proposal.

11. The Douglas County Planning Commission have reviewed the entire record including the countywide planning policies, written and oral public testimony, and agency comments as they relate to the proposed comprehensive plan amendments.

12. Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans there were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of the adjoining jurisdictions.

13. Douglas County issued a Determination of Significance and Request for Comments of the Scope of the EIS in accordance with WAC 197-11-360 on May 2, 2007. The scoping comment period started on May 2, 2007 and ended on May 23, 2007. A public scoping meeting to solicit comments what issues should be addressed in the EIS was held on May 16, 2007.


16. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement identifies and addresses all significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed planned action.

17. The mitigation measures contained within the environmental impact statement, together with the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Development Regulations and applicable County development standards are adequate to mitigate the significant adverse environmental impacts of planned action development.

18. The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort is not a essential public facility.

19. The Planned Action is consistent with the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area Plan and the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan.

20. The expedited permit review procedures as set forth are and will be a benefit to the public and protect the environment.

Conclusions:

1. Comments received from reviewing agencies and public have been considered and addressed where appropriate.

2. The procedural and substantive requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act have been complied with.

3. Potential impacts to resource lands, critical areas, open spaces and historic archaeological and/or cultural sites have been considered and addressed by mitigation and avoidance measures, as identified by the FEIS.

4. Potential impacts to the environment and necessary mitigation and avoidance measures identified by the FEIS have been incorporated into the project by the applicant, Entezar Group, Eastern Washington LLC.

5. Alternatives to the proposed action were considered with the development and adoption of the FEIS. The proposed action is the preferred alternative, based upon the conclusions of the environmental review and analysis of the FEIS.

6. The proposed amendments to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan are consistent with RCW 36.70A and the Douglas County Regional Policy Plan.

7. Appropriate provisions have been made for the public health, safety and general welfare.

8. The public use and interest will be served by the approval of the proposal.
Procedures and Criteria for Evaluating and Determining Projects as Planned Actions.

A. Planned Action Site. The Planned Action designation shall apply to the approximately 659 acre site generally located between SR 28 and the Columbia River and at the intersection of SR 28 and Spanish Castle Road. A map depicting the location is shown in Exhibit B of this Ordinance.

B. Environmental Document. A planned action designation for a site-specific application shall be based on the environmental analysis contained in the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) completed by the County on October 19, 2007. “EIS means the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Environmental Impact Statement composed of the Draft EIS (August 2007) and the Final EIS (October 2007). The integrated document composed of the EIS, Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Sub-area Plan and Spanish Castle MPR Development Regulations shall provide the basis for the decision by the County to impose conditions on a planned action project.

C. Planned Action Qualifications.

1. The Planned Action designation applies to future development proposals that cumulatively do not exceed:
   - Residential uses including single family, multifamily, condominium and townhouse residences totaling 1140 units.
   - Commercial uses including retail, office and service space totaling 62,000 square feet.
   - A hotel including up to 100 rooms.
   - Recreation uses to include a 18 hole golf course, equestrian center, and 20,000 square foot wellness/therapy spa, including necessary support and accessory uses.
   - Necessary resort/community support facilities such as water, wastewater, electrical, maintenance, administration and security facilities.

2. The project is located within the Planned Action Area.

3. Elements of the Environment Analyzed in the EIS. A project that would result in a significant change in impacts to any of the elements of the environment identified in the EIS would not qualify as a Planned Action.

4. Time Horizon. The Planned Action designation is intended to be applicable until all development shown in Section C1 is constructed or until 2023 whichever occurs first. In addition, should environmental conditions significantly change from those analyzed in the EIS, the SEPA Responsible Official may determine that the Planned Action designation is no longer applicable unless additional, supplementary environmental review is conducted, regardless of the date.
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D. Planned Action Review Criteria

1. Uses and activities described in the integrated document, subject to the qualifications listed in Section C above may be designated planned actions pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031.

2. The SEPA Responsible Official or designee is authorized to designated a project application as a Planned Action pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031(2)(a), if the project meets all of the following conditions:
   a) The project is not otherwise exempt from SEPA; and
   b) The project is consistent with the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan; and
   c) The project falls within the Planned Action qualifications identified in Section C above; and
   d) The SEPA Responsible Official or designee has determined that the project's adverse impacts are able to be mitigated through the application and/or inclusion of mitigation measures identified in the EIS as well as other applicable Local, state or federal requirements and conditions which together constitute sufficient mitigation for the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.
   e) The project complies with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

E. Planned Action Permit Process. The Land Services Director or designee shall review projects and determine whether they meet the criteria as Planned Actions under applicable local, state, and federal laws, regulations, codes, and ordinances. The review procedure shall consist, at a minimum, of the following:

1. Development application will meet the requirements of the Douglas County Code and shall be made on forms provided by the County.

2. The Land Services Director or designee shall determine whether the application is complete as provided in DCC Chapter 14.08.030.

3. After the County receives and reviews a complete application, the SEPA Responsible Official or designee shall determine, utilizing the criteria and procedures contained in Section D above and WAC 197-11-172, whether the project qualifies as a Planned Action. If the project does qualify as a Planned Action, the Land Services Division shall notify the applicant, and the project shall proceed in accordance with the appropriate permit procedures, except that no additional SEPA review, threshold determination or EIS will be required.

4. If a project is determined not to be a Planned Action, the Land Services Division shall notify the applicant and prescribe a SEPA review procedure consistent with County SEPA procedures and state law. The notice to the applicant shall describe the elements of the application that result in disqualification as a Planned Action.

5. Projects disqualified as a Planned Action may use or incorporate relevant elements of the environmental review analysis in the EIS prepared for the Planned Action, as well as other environmental review documents to assist in
meeting SEPA requirements. The SEPA Responsible Official may choose to limit the scope of the SEPA review to those issues and environmental impacts not previously addressed in the EIS.
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOUGLAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON
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Ordinance Adopting Spanish Castle  )
Master Planned Resort Development  )        LAND SERVICES
Regulations and Subdivision Review  )
Procedures.  )

Notice of Hearing Resolution No. TLS-07-50A.

WHEREAS, Douglas County has adopted a subarea plan within the Douglas County
Countywide Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA),
RCW Chapter 36.70A, for the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort; and

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.360 authorizes Douglas County to designate "Master
Planned Resorts"; and

WHEREAS, under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) a Determination of
Significance and Scoping Notice was issued on May 2, 2007; a scoping workshop
was held May 16, 2007; a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was issued
August 17, 2007 and a final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was issued on
October 19, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Douglas County Planning Commission has transmitted a
recommendation to this Board regarding the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort
development regulations; and

WHEREAS, notice of all public hearings and public meetings on this matter have
been published according to law.

WHEREAS, this proposal is a component of the 2007 comprehensive plan review
and amendment process for Douglas County. These components are being
considered through a phased review process. Once the review process has been
completed for all components, the 2007 review and amendment process will have
concluded.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of County Commissioners hereby accepts the
Findings of Fact and Conclusions adopted by the Douglas County Planning
Commission, entering those findings into the record as their own as set forth in
Attachment A and incorporating them in this resolution by this reference as though
fully set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the recommendation of the Douglas County
Planning Commission is accepted and the Spanish Castle MPR development
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regulations are adopted amending the Douglas County Code as set forth in Attachment B and incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.

This ordinance shall be effective immediately.

This ordinance will not be codified. A copy of these approved procedures shall be available to the public for inspection and copying at the Douglas County Transportation and Land Services office.

Dated this 8th day of January 2008 in East Wenatchee, Washington.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOUGLAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Ken Stanton, Chair

Dane Keane, Vice Chair

Mary Hunt, Member

ATTEST:

Dayna Prewitt, Clerk of the Board
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ATTACHMENT A

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant is Entezar Group Eastern Washington LLC, 110 C St. SW, Quincy WA.

2. General Description: An application for a Master Planned Resort. The proposal includes the creation of a subarea plan to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, applicable development regulations and a planned action under WAC 197-11-164 and 172. The proposed project includes the following elements:
   - Mixture of residential uses including single family, multifamily condominium and townhouse residences totaling 1140 units.
   - Commercial uses include retail, office & service space totaling 62,000 sq. feet and a 100 room hotel.
   - Recreation uses include an 18 hole golf course, equestrian center and 20,000 sq. foot wellness/therapy spa.
   - Necessary resort/community support facilities such as water, wastewater, electrical, maintenance, administration, security facilities.

3. Location: The subject property is located west of the intersection of Spanish Castle Rd. and SR 28 and may more particularly be described as a portion of Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, Township 20 N, Range 22 E. W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The Douglas County Assessor Numbers for the subject property are 20220430001, 20220900002, 20220910002, 20220920001, 20220920002, 20221030001, and 20221030002.

4. Site Information:
   - Total Project Size: 659 acres
   - Domestic Water: New Group A water system
   - Sewage Disposal: New sewage treatment system
   - Power/Electricity: Douglas County PUD
   - Fire Protection: Douglas County Fire District #2

5. Site Characteristics: The subject property is characterized as moderately to steeply sloping down in a series of benches from the highway to the Columbia River. The property is bisected by the railroad. There is an existing concrete foundation, a couple of irrigation pumping stations and underground irrigation lines serving an adjoining orchard. There are two unimproved roads that traverse the property; the first is for access to the pumping stations and the other runs adjacent to the railroad and telephone line. The site vegetation is a mix of native grasses, small plants and sagebrush. The site has a prominent ridgeline running parallel to the river with a couple of good size ravines. There are a fairly large number of significant basalt rock outcroppings. These outcroppings vary in size from about the size of a riding lawn mower to the size of a single-family house.

6. Surrounding Property: To the north, Vacant Land, Former Feedlot; to the south, Orchard Land, Vacant Land, to the east, Former Feedlot, SR 28, Orchard Land; to the west, Former Feedlot, SR 28, Orchard Land.

7. Douglas County has established and provides opportunities to the public, local and state jurisdictions and agencies for early and continuous public participation in the drafting of amendments for the comprehensive plan. Public involvement included the opportunity for oral and written comment and testimony at during the EIS Scoping Period, following the issuance of the DEIS, public hearings advertised by legal notice, mailed notice to surrounding properties and interested parties, affected agencies and news media.

8. In addition to the comments received and addressed in the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort FEIS, comments were received after the close of the EIS comment period but before the close of the GMA comment period from Dean Taplett and WA State Dept. of Transportation.
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10. The Douglas County Planning Commission conducted a duly advertised public hearing on November 5, 2007. The Planning Commissions entered into the record the files on this amendment, accepted public testimony, and deliberated the merits of the proposal.

11. The Douglas County Planning Commission have reviewed the entire record including the countywide planning policies, written and oral public testimony, and agency comments as they relate to the proposed comprehensive plan amendments.

12. RCW Chapter 36.70 authorizes the adoption of comprehensive plans.

13. Douglas County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA). RCW Chapter 36.70A, which covers all unincorporated areas within Douglas County, through a series of planning area Comprehensive Plans there were found to be consistent with each other and with the adopted GMA plans of the adjoining jurisdictions.

14. Douglas County Planning Commission is responsible for long range planning matters and providing implementation recommendations to assure compliance with the growth management act for unincorporated areas of Douglas County. These measures include updates and amendments to the comprehensive plan; development regulations, environmental regulations, and any other rules, actions or regulations deemed necessary to implement the Growth Management Act.

15. Pursuant to RCW 58.17.095, the County can adopt an ordinance authorizing administrative review of plats without a public hearing.

16. DCC Chapter 18.74.140 establishes provisions for the expiration of a master planned resort if the project fails to meet the approved timeframes.

17. DCC Chapter 18.74.150 establishes provisions for amendments to the master planned resort.

Conclusions:
1. Comments received from reviewing agencies and public have been considered and addressed where appropriate.
2. The procedural and substantive requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act have been complied with.
3. Potential impacts to resource lands, critical areas, open spaces and historic archaeological and/or cultural sites have been considered and addressed by mitigation and avoidance measures, as identified by the FEIS.
4. Potential impacts to the environment and necessary mitigation and avoidance measures identified by the FEIS have been incorporated into the project by the applicant, Entezar Group, Eastern Washington LLC.
5. Alternatives to the proposed action were considered with the development and adoption of the FEIS. The proposed action is the preferred alternative, based upon the conclusions of the environmental review and analysis of the FEIS.
6. The proposed amendments to the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan are consistent with RCW 36.70A and the Douglas County Regional Policy Plan.
7. Appropriate provisions have been made for the public health, safety and general welfare.
8. The public use and interest will be served by the approval of the proposal.
ATTACHMENT B

Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort Development Regulations and Application Review Procedure

A. The development regulations that shall be applicable for review of project proposals within the Spanish Castle MPR are found in the Design and Development Manual section and the Landscape Standards section of the Spanish Castle Resort Master Plan & Environmental Impact Statement, dated October 2007 as adopted by Douglas County Resolution TLS-08-01

B. Project Review. Projects determined to be consistent with the Spanish Castle MPR Development Plan shall be subject to the following levels of review:
- Commercial and/or Multi-family Building Permits, Short Subdivisions, Binding Site Plans – Full Administrative Review pursuant to DCC 14.10.030
- Major Subdivisions – Reviewed per the following procedure

1. **Notice.** Within 10 days of the filing of a complete application for a major subdivision, notice of the application shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the county. Additionally, at least ten days after the filing of the application notice shall both be a) Posted on or around the land proposed to be subdivide in at least five conspicuous places designed to attract public awareness of the proposal; and (b) mailed to the owner of each lot or parcel located within at least three hundred feet of the site.

   The notice shall include notification that no public hearing will be held on the application except as provided for in this section. The notice shall set out the procedures and time limitations for persons to require a public hearing and make comments.

2. Any person shall have a period of 20 days from the date of the notice to comment on the proposed preliminary plat. All comments received shall be provided to the applicant. The applicant has seven days from receipt of the comments to respond.

3. A public hearing on the proposed subdivision shall be held if any person or agency files a request for a hearing with the County within 21 days of the publishing of such notice. Notice requirements for the public hearing shall be in conformance with DCC 14.10.040(B)(3) and the hearing shall be conducted by the Douglas County Hearings Examiner in accordance with DCC 14.10.040 Quasi-judicial Review and DCC 2.13 Hearing Examiner. If any person or agency files a request for a hearing, that person shall be responsible for paying all costs associated with the hearing. Such costs shall include but are not limited to: hearing notice, staff time to draft staff reports, and hearing examiner costs.
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4. If no person requests that a public hearing be held on the proposal, the application shall be processed accordance with DCC 14.10.030 Full Administrative Review and Title 17 Subdivisions.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Douglas County Planning Commission
FROM: Douglas County Transportation and Land Services
DATE: February 26, 2015
SUBJECT: Draft revisions to the Town of Waterville Municipal Code

The Town of Waterville has initiated amendments to Sections 17.10 Definitions, 17.40 Use Chart, 17.44 Landscaping and Section 17.52 Conditional Uses of their Municipal Code. Pursuant to the Regional Policy Plan, the Town has submitted the draft amendments to the County for review prior to adoption. A representative of the Town will not be in attendance to answer any questions that you might have. Land Services will present to you the amendments and gather any questions you may have and forward them to the Town of Waterville.

If you have any questions, please call Stephen or Suzanne at 609-884-7173.
**Department of Commerce**

**Innovation is in our nature.**

**Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment**

**60 Days Prior to Adoption**

Indicate one (or both, if applicable):

- [ ] Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- [x] Development Regulation Amendment

Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106, the following jurisdiction provides notice of intent to adopt a proposed comprehensive plan amendment and/or development regulation amendment under the Growth Management Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction:</th>
<th>Town of Waterville and Douglas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>P.O. Box 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterville, WA 98858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>February 11, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Marsha Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Position:</td>
<td>Clerk/Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>(509) 745-8871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:waterville@nwi.net">waterville@nwi.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Description of the Proposed/Draft Amendment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If this draft amendment is provided to supplement an existing 60-day notice already submitted, then please provide the date the original notice was submitted and the Commerce Material ID number (located in your Commerce acknowledgement letter.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proposed amendments to Town of Waterville development regulations; Waterville Municipal Code Sections 17.10 Definitions, 17.40 Use Chart, 17.44 Landscaping and Section 17.52 Conditional Uses. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this action part of the periodic review and update? GMA requires review every 8 years under RCW 36.70A.130(4)-(6).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: ___ No: X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Hearing Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board/Commission: City Council has a tentative Public Hearing date of April 20, 2015 Council/County Commission:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Adoption Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. 2015 - 758

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF WATERVILLE AMENDING TITLE 17 OF THE WATERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE TO UPDATE AND CHANGE CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ZONING CODE.

WHEREAS, Waterville Municipal Code Title 17, ZONING regulates development within the City; and

WHEREAS, the Town, for several years has been experiencing increasing water use and decreasing water production; and

WHEREAS, the Town’s ability to address issues related to water supply, including rights and sources of production may take a number of years; and

WHEREAS, the Town desires to see continued residential and commercial development; and

WHEREAS, the Waterville Planning Commission, staff and planning consultant have review and recommended revisions to portions of the Zoning Code as a means to limit large water consumers.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WATERVILLE DO ORDAIN as follows:

Section 1 Amendment.

A. The following definitions are hereby added to WMC 17.10 Definitions:

“17.10 Definitions.

1) 17.10.XXX Agriculture, Irrigated.
“Agriculture, Irrigated” means agricultural products production is dependent on water supplied by the Town.

2) 17.10.XXX Agricultural Equipment and Agricultural Facilities.
“Agricultural Equipment” and “Agricultural Facilities” includes, but is not limited to: (i) The following used in commercial agricultural operations: Equipment; machinery; constructed shelters, buildings, and ponds; fences; water diversion, withdrawal, conveyance, and use equipment and facilities including, but not limited to, pumps, pipes, tapes, canals, ditches, and drains; (ii) Corridors and facilities for transporting personnel, livestock, and equipment
to, from, and within agricultural lands; (iii) Farm residences and associated equipment, lands, and facilities; and (iv) Roadside stands and on-farm markets for marketing fruit or vegetables.

3) **17.10.XXX Agricultural products.**

“Agricultural products” includes, but is not limited to, horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, vegetable, fruit, berry, grain, hops, hay, straw, turf, sod, seed, and apiary products; feed or forage for livestock; Christmas trees; hybrid cottonwood and similar hardwood trees grown as crops and harvested within 20 years of planting; and livestock including both the animals themselves and animal products including, but not limited to, meat, upland finfish, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products.

4) **17.10.XXX Agriculture-Related Industry.**

“Agriculture related industry” means:

A. Packaging plants that may include but are not limited to the following activities: washing, sorting, milling, crating, canning, freezing and other functional operations such as drying, field crushing or other preparation in which the chemical and physical composition of the agricultural product remains essentially unaltered. Processing activities such as slaughterhouses, animal reduction yards, and tallow works shall not be considered packaging plants.

B. Processing plants that may include but are not limited to those activities which involve the pasteurization, fermentation or other substantial chemical and physical alteration of agricultural products. Activities such as slaughterhouses, animal reduction yards and tallow works shall not be considered processing plants.

C. Storage facilities that may include those activities which involve the warehousing (dry, cold and/or wet) of processed and/or packaged agricultural products.

5) **17.10.XXX Agriculture-Related Industry, Water Dependent.**

“Agriculture-related industry, water dependent” means an agriculture-related industry that requires Town supplied water for the packaging, processing or storage of agricultural products.”

B. The definition in **WMC 17.10.058** is amended as follows:

“**17.10.058 Agriculture.**

“Agriculture” means the tilling of soil, raising of crops and horticulture, except that vegetable gardens occupying less than 5,000 square feet and up to 10 fruit trees are exempt from this definition.

Be amended to read:

**17.10.058 Agriculture.**
“Agriculture” and “agricultural activities” means agricultural uses and practices including, but not limited to: producing, breeding, or increasing agricultural products; rotating and changing agricultural crops; allowing land used for agricultural activities to lie fallow in which it is plowed and tilled but left unseeded; allowing land used for agricultural activities to lie dormant as a result of adverse agricultural market conditions; allowing land used for agricultural activities to lie dormant because the land is enrolled in a local, state, or federal conservation program, or the land is subject to a conservation easement; conducting agricultural operations; maintaining, repairing, and replacing agricultural equipment; maintaining, repairing, and replacing agricultural facilities; and maintaining agricultural lands under production or cultivation.

Agriculture and agricultural activities are divided into two general categories:
A. Commercial – agriculture on a commercial scale as the primary source of income for the landowner, that may or may not require a license from state and/or federal governments; and
B. Hobby – agriculture conducted on a small scale as a supplement to the landowner’s income that does not require a license from state and/or federal governments.”

C. The following text in **WMC 17.40 District Use Chart** be repealed which reads:

**17.40 District Use Chart.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGRICULTURAL USES**

| Agriculture buildings, commercial | PRM |
| Nursery, commercial/retail/wholesale | PRM | PRM | PRM | PRM |
| Paper products manufacture/assembly | CUP |

D. The following text be added to **WMC 17.40 District Use Chart** which reads:

**17.40 District Use Chart.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGRICULTURAL USES**

| Agricultural equipment and agricultural facilities | PRM |
| Agriculture, irrigated |
| Agriculture-related industries, water |
E. The following text in **WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping** which reads:

"17.44.140 A.

A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this section is to use landscaping and buffering concepts to promote compatibility between land uses by reducing the visual, noise, lighting and impacts of development on users of the site and abutting uses; and to unify development and enhance the overall appearance of the town of Waterville."

Be amended to read:

"17.44.140 A.

A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this section is to use drought tolerant landscaping and buffering concepts to promote compatibility between land uses by reducing the visual, noise, lighting and water consumption impacts of development on users of the site and abutting uses; and to unify development and enhance the overall appearance of the town of Waterville."

F. The following text in **WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping** which reads:

"17.44.140 C. 2.

2. An irrigation plan or specified watering method on the landscape plan;"

Be amended to read:

"17.44.140 C. 2.

2. An irrigation plan or specified watering method including an estimation of water use on the landscape plan;"

G. The following text in **WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping** which reads:

"17.44.140 D. 1.

1. **Sight-obscuring landscaping shall be required when a use or activity enumerated in subsection A of this section abuts a residential district or other uses that are not compatible as determined by the review authority. Sight-obscuring landscaping is intended to provide a very dense sight barrier to significantly separate incompatible uses. Plantings shall generally consist of a mix of predominantly evergreen planting, including trees, shrubs and ground covers. Evergreen trees shall be a minimum height of four feet at the time of planting. Plantings shall be chosen and spaced in a manner that is sufficient to obscure sight through the barrier within seven years. Planting strips shall be a minimum of eight feet wide."

Be amended to read:

“17.44.140 D. 1.

1. Sight-obscuring landscaping shall be required when a use or activity enumerated in subsection A of this section abuts a residential district or other uses that are not compatible as determined by the review authority. Sight-obscuring landscaping is intended to provide a very dense sight barrier to significantly separate incompatible uses. Plantings shall generally consist of a mix of predominantly drought tolerant evergreen planting, including trees, drought tolerant shrubs and ground covers. Evergreen trees shall be a minimum height of four feet at the time of planting. Plantings shall be chosen and spaced in a manner that is sufficient to obscure sight through the barrier within seven years. Planting strips shall be a minimum of eight feet wide.”

H. The following text in WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping which reads:

“17.44.140 D. 2.

2. Perimeter landscaping is intended to create a visual separation between uses from roads and adjoining properties, and to create visually aesthetic features between neighborhoods and within commercial, industrial and recreation areas. Plantings shall consist of a mix of evergreen/deciduous trees, shrubs and groundcovers. Trees shall be a minimum of four feet high at the time of planting and shall have a minimum spacing of 50 feet.”

Be amended to read:

“17.44.140 D. 2.

2. Perimeter landscaping is intended to create a visual separation between uses from roads and adjoining properties, and to create visually aesthetic features between neighborhoods and within commercial, industrial and recreation areas. Plantings shall consist of a mix of drought tolerant evergreen/deciduous trees, shrubs and groundcovers and/or xeriscape. Trees shall be a minimum of four feet high at the time of planting and shall have a minimum spacing of 50 feet.”

I. The following text in WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping which reads:

“17.44.140 D. 3. d.

d. At least 50 percent of the required landscaping site shall be landscaped with a combination of shrubs, and living ground cover. The landscape plan shall be approved by the director and meet the applicable sections of this chapter;”

Be amended to read:

“17.44.140 D. 3. d."
d. At least 50 percent of the required landscaping site shall be landscaped with a combination of drought tolerant trees, shrubs, and living ground cover or xeriscape. The landscape plan shall be approved by the director and meet the applicable sections of this chapter;

J. The following text in WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping which reads:

"17.44.140 D. 4.

4. Parking lot landscaping is intended to provide visual relief and shade in parking areas. Up to 100 percent of the landscaping shall be deciduous. Parking areas having 20 or more spaces shall provide at least 15 square feet of landscape area per parking space. One shade tree shall be planted within the interior of the off-street parking area for every 15 parking spaces."

Be amended to read:

"17.44.140 D. 4.

4. Parking lot landscaping is intended to provide visual relief and shade in parking areas. Up to 100 percent of the landscaping shall be drought tolerant deciduous species. Parking areas having 20 or more spaces shall provide at least 15 square feet of landscape area per parking space. One drought tolerant shade tree shall be planted within the interior of the off-street parking area for every 15 parking spaces."

K. The following text in WMC 17.44.140 Landscaping which reads:

"17.44.140 D. 5. d.

d. A permanently installed irrigation system shall be provided with adequate water pressure and coverage to serve all landscaped areas, except for areas with existing native species that are incorporated into the approved design."

Be amended to read:

"17.44.140 D. 5. d.

d. A permanently installed irrigation system shall be provided, where required, with adequate water pressure and coverage to serve all landscaped areas, except for xeriscaped areas or areas with existing native species that are incorporated into the approved design."

L. The following text in WMC 17.52 Conditional Uses which reads:

"17.52.010 Purpose.

Conditional uses, because of public convenience and necessity and their effect upon the neighborhood shall be permitted only upon the approval of the hearing examiner, after due notice and public hearing, and a finding that they will not be detrimental to the general comprehensive plan, or to adjacent and surrounding
property. The purpose of this chapter is to establish the minimum criteria for evaluating conditional use permit applications, and to establish general as well as specific standards that must be met by conditional use permit proposals.”

Be amended to read:

“17.52.010 Purpose.

Conditional uses, because of public convenience and necessity and their effect upon the neighborhood and/or Town water supply, shall be permitted only upon the approval of the hearing examiner, after due notice and public hearing, and a finding that they will not be detrimental to the general comprehensive plan, or to adjacent and surrounding property, or on the Town’s water supply. The purpose of this chapter is to establish the minimum criteria for evaluating conditional use permit applications, and to establish general as well as specific standards that must be met by conditional use permit proposals.”

M. The following text in WMC 17.52 Conditional Uses which reads:

“17.52.030 B. Conditions Imposed.

B. Landscaping, clearing, planting, fencing and screening;”

Be amended to read:

“17.52.030 B. Conditions Imposed.

B. Landscaping, clearing, planting, fencing and screening requirements in compliance with 17.44.140;”

N. The following text be added to WMC 17.52 Conditional Uses which reads:

“17.52.030 X. Conditions Imposed.

X. Limitations on usage of Town water;”

Section 2: Severability.

If any section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is declared unconstitutional or invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining parts of this ordinance.

Section 3: Savings Clause.

Any portions of the Municipal Code which are repealed by this ordinance shall remain in force and effect until the effective date of this ordinance.

Section 4: This Ordinance shall become effective after its passage by the Council, approval by the Mayor and five days after publication of this Ordinance, or a summary, as provided by law.
PASSED BY THE WATERVILLE CITY COUNCIL this ___ day of ____________, 2015.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Royal Devaney, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
Marsha L. Peterson, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
Steve Smith, Town Attorney

Filed with Town Clerk: ______________
Passed by Town Council: ______________
Date Published: ______________________
Date Effective: ______________________

On the ______ day of ________________, 2015, the Town Council of the Town of Waterville passed Ordinance No. ______.

DATED this ___ day of ________________, 2015.

__________________________
Marsha L. Peterson, City Clerk
WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
Amendments to Town of Waterville development regulations; Waterville Municipal Code Sections 17.10 Definitions, 17.40 Use Chart, 17.44 Landscaping and Section 17.52 Conditional Uses.

2. Name of applicant: Town of Waterville
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
Attn: Erica Stoddard
104 E. Locust Street
PO Box 580
Waterville, WA 98858
(509) 745-8871

4. Date checklist prepared: February 9, 2015
5. Agency requesting checklist: Town of Waterville
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
This is a non-project action – no phasing, adoption of amendments planned in May 2015.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
Not at present, however, as the community resolves water supply issues, the change in regulations proposed by the amendments may be revisited.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
None, specific to the proposal but the Town has identified water supply limitations through studies and ongoing analysis.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

*Not at present although the Town is working with engineers and the Department of Ecology on water supply issues.*

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

*Adoption by the Town Council.*

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

*A copy of the proposed ordinance amending Title 17 Zoning of the Waterville Municipal Code is included as Attachment A. The amendments to Section 17.10 Definitions include repealing the existing definition of agriculture and replacing it with several new definitions for agriculture and related uses, amendments to Section 17.40 Use Chart include repealing of several uses and adding new lines related to agriculture, amendments to Section 17.44 Landscaping are intended to and Section 17.52 Conditional Uses.*

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

*This regulation would be effective within the entire town limits of Waterville, along with its UGA.*
B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

This is a non-project action dealing with the regulation of land uses that could have an impact on the Town's limited water supply. The only impact to Environmental Elements would be related to the Town's groundwater withdrawals which are already subject to regulation by the Department of Ecology.

1. Earth – Items not applicable to proposal
   a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other . . . . . .
   b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
   c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.
   d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
   e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
   f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
   g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
   h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

2. Air – Items not applicable to proposal
   a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.
   b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
   c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

3. Water
   a. Surface:
      1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? There is a small intermittent stream along the Town's eastern border.
         If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
      2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans. No work is proposed.
      3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material. Not applicable.
4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. No.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? No. If so, note location on the site plan.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge. No.

b. Ground:

1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. A result of the proposal may be reduced groundwater withdrawals for certain types of land uses. No estimate available. The Town’s water system is operated under the regulations of the Departments of Ecology and Health.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage, industrial, containing the following chemicals...; agricultural; etc.). None.

3) Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve. None.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe. Not applicable.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. Not as a result of the proposal.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any: None.

4. Plants – Items not applicable.

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

________ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
________ evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
________ shrubs
________ grass
________ pasture
________ crop or grain
________ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
________ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
________ other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.
d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

5. Animals – Items not applicable.

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:
   - birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
   - mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
   - fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

6. Energy and natural resources – Items not applicable.

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

7. Environmental health – Items not applicable.

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

   1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

   2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

b. Noise – Items not applicable.

   1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

   2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

   3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? *The Town consists of a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, parks, open space and some agriculture and related land uses.*
b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe. The community is situated within a large grain growing area with portions of the community used for agricultural related activities.

c. Describe any structures on the site. Structures of all types existing in the Town.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? No.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? The Waterville Municipal Code defines 2 residential, 3 commercial, 1 industrial and 1 public use zones in the community.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? The Town's Comprehensive Plan has the same number of land use designations.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? Not applicable.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify. No.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? Not applicable.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? Not applicable.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: None.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: The proposed amendments were reviewed for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and were found to be consistent.

9. Housing — Items not applicable.

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

10. Aesthetics — Items not applicable.

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

11. Light and glare — Items not applicable.

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:
12. **Recreation – Items not applicable.**

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

13. **Historic and cultural preservation – Items not applicable.**

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

14. **Transportation – Items not applicable.**

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

15. **Public services**

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.  
   No.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.  None.

16. **Utilities**

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.  - internet

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.  No new utilities are proposed.
C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: .................................................................

Date Submitted: .............................................................

February 12, 2015
D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise? Not applicable

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: None

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life? Not applicable

   Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are: None

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources? Not applicable

   Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: None

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands? Not applicable

   Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: None

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans? Not applicable

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: None

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities? Not applicable

   Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: None

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. The operates its water system under the rules and regulations of the State and Federal governments, the proposal is not in conflict with any know laws.
WAC 197-11-970 Determination of Non-Significance (DNS).

**DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE**

**Description of proposal:** Amendments to Town of Waterville development regulations; Waterville Municipal Code Sections 17.10 Definitions, 17.40 Use Chart, 17.44 Landscaping and Section 17.52 Conditional Uses.

**Location of proposal, including street address, if any:** Town of Waterville, Washington

**Lead agency:** Town of Waterville, 104 E. Locust Street, PO Box 580, Waterville, WA 98858

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

☐ There is no comment period for this DNS.

☐ This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

XX This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 21 days from February 18, 2015. Comments must be submitted by 5:00 PM, March 11, 2015.

**Responsible official:** Marsha Peterson

**Position/title:** Town Clerk **Phone:** (509) 745-8871

**Address:** 104 E. Locust. P.O. Box 580, Waterville, WA. 98858

**Signature:**

**Date:** February 10, 2015