

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SB 5026

---

---

As of January 21, 2019

**Title:** An act relating to the placement of planning boundaries in conjunction with parcel boundaries.

**Brief Description:** Concerning the placement of planning boundaries in conjunction with parcel boundaries.

**Sponsors:** Senators Honeyford and Fortunato.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Local Government: 1/17/19.

**Brief Summary of Bill**

- Requires urban growth area boundaries to follow existing parcel boundary lines.

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

**Staff:** Greg Vogel (786-7413)

**Background:** Growth Management Act. The Growth Management Act (GMA) is the comprehensive land use planning framework for counties and cities in Washington. The GMA sets forth three broad planning obligations for those counties and cities who plan fully under its scope:

- the county legislative authority must adopt a countywide planning policy;
- the county, and the cities within the county, must designate critical areas, agricultural lands, forestlands, and mineral resource lands, and adopt development regulations accordingly; and
- the county must designate and take other actions related to urban growth areas.

Urban Growth Areas. Counties that fully plan under the GMA must designate Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), within which urban growth must be encouraged and outside of which growth may occur only if it is not urban in nature. Planning jurisdictions must include within their UGAs sufficient areas and densities to accommodate projected urban growth for the succeeding 20-year period. In addition, cities must include sufficient areas to accommodate

---

*This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not a part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.*

the broad range of needs and uses that will accompany the projected urban growth, including, as appropriate, medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail, and other nonresidential uses.

**Summary of Bill:** The UGA boundaries are required to follow existing parcel boundary lines, and reasonable efforts should be made to avoid unnecessary divisions in designating urban growth area boundaries. Any changes required to implement this directive must be made as part of the jurisdiction's next periodic comprehensive plan update and must not result in a finding of noncompliance before that time.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Creates Committee/Commission/Task Force that includes Legislative members:** No.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Staff Summary of Public Testimony:** PRO: Pasco School District has a parcel of land with a housing development in the UGA, suitable for siting a school. However, the boundaries of the UGA cut the parcel in half, so it is of no use to them. Adding a consideration of existing parcel lines would be a good requirement, since currently, cities are not required to adjust the UGA boundary for existing parcel lines. This is a good piece of legislation, advising reasonable efforts to avoid unnecessary divisions—a good addition to the GMA.

CON: It makes sense sometimes for boundaries to follow natural areas as opposed to parcel lines, for example, parcels with steep slopes or within flood areas. The directive in this bill would conflict with current law that requires UGA boundaries be based on population projections and development regulations.

**Persons Testifying:** PRO: Senator Jim Honeyford, Prime Sponsor; Jan Himebaugh, Building Industry Association of Washington.

CON: Bryce Yadon, Futurewise.

**Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying:** No one.