

Table II: Table of Permissible Uses By Zones
CHAPTER 14.40 PERMISSIBLE USES
COMPARISON OF NEW CODE AND OLD CODE

New Section	Old Section	Changes	Impact of Changes
Table II: Table of Permissible Uses By Zones	Table II: Table of Permissible Uses		No changes were made to the uses or types of permit required except as described below and related to the new Processing Code. Staff will review entire table as a separate future project to determine if we want significant changes to allowed uses.
		Title	Added “By Zones” to title as removed from header (see below). No impact to use of table.
		Header	Modified header by removing “Zones” and set a header row that will now show up on every page no matter where it breaks. Will make table easier to read.
		Highlighted rows	<p>Rows of higher level use descriptions with use descriptions categories below are highlighted as they will remain with blank boxes.</p> <p>For example, Use Description 1.100 Single-Family Residences has 1.110 and 1.120 and 1.130 below it. Also, 1.110 is an overarching category with 1.111, 1.112, 1.113, 1.114, 1.115, and 1.116 below it. Thus, 1.100 & 1.110 are lightly highlighted and contain all blank boxes as they are headings for specific categories.</p>
		Removed columns	<p>City has no land zoned as SA (Suburban Agriculture), ER (Estate Residential) or CR (Community Recreation). Staff does not feel these will be used in the future as they were old County zones and are no longer used by the County. Community recreation uses are allowed in other zones, so we don’t need a separate zone.</p> <p>Recommend removing these three columns from the table. The Comprehensive Plan does not include discussion of these three zones, so this will keep the code consistent with the Plan.</p>
		Removed rows	<p>The following Use Descriptions were removed because they are not “uses,” but activities or processes. They are allowed in all zones, and permit requirements are consistent among all zones, so having a table with exactly the same thing in all zones does not make sense. These are already contained in code as shown below:</p> <p>27.000 Off-Premise Signs (14.68.030(2) & 14.68.120)</p> <p>28.000 Subdivisions (NEW 14.18)</p> <p>28.100 Major (NEW 14.18)</p> <p>28.200 Short (NEW 14.18)</p>

Table II: Table of Permissible Uses By Zones
CHAPTER 14.40 PERMISSIBLE USES
COMPARISON OF NEW CODE AND OLD CODE

New Section	Old Section	Changes	Impact of Changes
			28.300 Boundary Line Adjustments (NEW 14.18) 29.000 Combination Uses (14.40.080) 30.000 Planned Neighborhood Developments (14.44.030 & 14.36.040) 31.000 Grading, Excavation, or Filling (14.44.100-130)
		Modified footnotes	<p>Many footnotes were placed on every type of permit in a column or row. To simplify the table, those footnotes were moved to the column header or for a row on the Use Description. (For example, Footnote 5 was on header and on each permit under the column. Thus, it was left on the header, but taken off within the table.)</p> <p>Other footnotes only referred to a specific code section, so these were removed and the reference was moved to after the Use Description. (For example, Footnote 10 was in every box of Use Description 15.500 and only referred to 14.44.48, so a reference was added after the Use Description and footnote number removed from row.)</p> <p>This does not affect the allowed uses or permit required, but is just a formatting change to simplify the table.</p>
		Corrected footnotes list (12 & 13)	<p>Looking through old ordinances which included changes to the Permissible Use table, it was discovered Ord No. 676 (2003) added three new footnotes related to wireless communications, but Ord No. 744 (2006) did not have the new footnotes, although the one ordinance in between (No. 682) did not delete the footnotes. Thus, staff reviewed the earlier addition of footnotes and has modified the proposal to include the original footnotes in Ord No. 676.</p>
		New footnotes (2 & 6)	<p>New footnotes were added to state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail or office use in a commercial zones is permitted, but an administrative use or conditional use permit is required if adjacent to or across the street from residential zone. • Industrial or manufacturing use in industrial zones is permitted, but an administrative use or conditional use permit is required if adjacent to or across the street from residential zone. •
		Removed zoning permit	<p>With the proposal to remove the Zoning Permit, the “Z” was changed to “P” so the use is permitted, but they still need to meet the other required code requirements such as SEPA, critical areas, site plan review, building permits, etc.</p>

Table II: Table of Permissible Uses By Zones
CHAPTER 14.40 PERMISSIBLE USES
COMPARISON OF NEW CODE AND OLD CODE

New Section	Old Section	Changes	Impact of Changes
		Changed special use permit name	With the change of Special Use Permit to Administrative Conditional Use Permit, the “S” was changed to “A” throughout the table.
		New allowed uses	<p>Two new allowed uses were added to assist in permit processing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Description 1.320 Multi-family townhouses and allows them as permitted use in the HUR (High Urban Residential zone) column as a “PAC”. This change is proposed due to the annexation of many townhouses in the annexation area that are proposed for an HUR zoning. The County has a Townhouse zone, but staff feel we can accommodate the existing ones and any new ones in the HUR zone. • Use Descriptions 6.410 Privately Owned and 6.420 Public owned over-water structures (docks) are currently allowed in the WR (Waterfront Residential) for both and P/SP (Public/Semi-Public) for public, because at the time of adopting the table there were no commercial zones located on the lake. With the North Lake annexation in 2006, the City annexed commercial property zoned LB (Local Business) on the lake with an existing dock. It was an inadvertent oversight that the Permissible Use table was not reconsidered for the commercial zones on the lake. Staff recommendation is a “P” for privately owned (6.410) and an “A” for public owned (6.420). No other commercial zones are recommended for inclusion of dock use because there are no other commercial zones on the lake and none expected in the future due to the lack of available lakefront property.