

Sammamish SMP Policy and Regulatory Options
Summary Tables – For Planning Commission Discussion

Issue #1	Buffers on Pine and Beaver Lakes
Problem Statement	Lakes face ongoing contamination due to phosphorus and other nutrients. Naturally vegetated buffers help minimize nutrient input and keep existing nutrients trapped at depths where they are less likely to cause algal blooms or other nuisances or health risks.
Existing Policy/ Regulation	Existing SMP requires a 20 ft building setback, but no buffer. Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) requires a 50 ft building setback, but no buffer. CAO requires 25% of significant trees to be retained: 50% of those trees must be within the setback.
Guideline Requirement(s)	Buffer widths not specified.
Proposed Resolution	Establish a 45 ft buffer plus an additional 5 ft building setback from the buffer. Require 80% of all trees within shoreline jurisdiction to be retained; 80% of trees within the buffer must be retained. Allow 15% of the buffer area or a total of 200 SF (whichever is more) to be ‘active use.’ Remainder is natural vegetation. Allow 15% of the vegetated buffer area to be ornamental plantings/landscaping. Allow a small (< 150 SF) water-oriented accessory structure in the buffer. The extent of nonconformity can not be increased (no expansion into the buffer).
Information to Review at Meeting	Aerial photos showing existing development in proximity to the shore, with the 45 ft + 5 ft buffer and setback. Background water quality data from lake management plans.
Implications	Some existing development would become non-conforming (See nonconforming use issue below). Reconstruction or additions involving more than 50% of the existing building square footage would be required to comply with buffer standards per the nonconforming use standards. For reconstruction or additions of less than 50% of the existing building square footage, property owners would need to restore an equivalent portion of the buffer to offset the impact, as follows:

Issue #1	Buffers on Pine and Beaver Lakes
	Area of the reconstruction/addition = area of buffer restoration/enhancement.
Related Issues	None.

Issue #2	Minimum Lot Size
Problem Statement	<p>Many of the remaining undeveloped lots on Lake Sammamish are relatively small; an analysis of shoreline parcels revealed approximately 40 parcels smaller than 3000 SF, with a number of other parcels smaller than 4000 SF; development on these lots creates densities that are greater than would be allowed under R4 zoning.</p> <p>Development on small lots has a disproportionate impact on the natural and human environment. Build-out of small lots in the shoreline environment amplifies potential environmental effects, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher impervious cover. Due to space constraints, residential structures built on small lots inherently require higher percentages of impervious cover than large lots. • Effects associated with higher density. Development on small lots puts increased pressures on infrastructure capacity. • Aesthetic and view impacts. Houses on small lots can create a wall-like effect limiting views of the lake from the trail and other public areas. • More shoreline modifications. Individual parcels along shorelines typically include active space and private shoreline access. Within large parcels with longer shoreline frontages, there is the opportunity to provide for active space and shoreline access and leave a portion of the shoreline intact. Shoreline access within small parcels, in many cases, takes up a larger portion of the shoreline frontage leaving minimal area for natural vegetation. • A higher frequency of docks. The typical residential pattern along Lake Sammamish includes a dock for each single family residential parcel. Development on small parcels could lead to more docks along the shoreline, with docks also occurring closer to each other.
Existing Policy/Regulation	There is no minimum lot size for existing lots on Sammamish, but there is a minimum lot width of 30 ft in the R4 zone. There is also a minimum lot size when subdividing.

Issue #2	Minimum Lot Size
Guideline Requirement(s)	None.
Proposed Resolution	<p>Specify a minimum lot size of 3000 SF on Lake Sammamish. Construction of single family residences on lots below this size threshold would be prohibited. Staff have identified that 3000 SF is roughly the minimum area needed to accommodate a small home and normal appurtenances (driveway, landscaping, etc).</p> <p>Additional Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow lots to be combined/consolidated under one ownership so they can exceed the size threshold. • Create a specific density transfer system so that owners can transfer that density to existing lots outside the shoreline jurisdiction.
Information to Review at Meeting	<p>Maps showing number and location of small lots.</p> <p>Lot size requirements from neighboring jurisdictions (Bellevue, Redmond, Kirkland).</p> <p>Oblique shoreline photos showing development patterns.</p> <p>TDR Program implications (possible participation by CLC staff)</p>
Implications	<p>Mainly affects Lake Sammamish, because lots are quite large on Pine and Beaver Lakes.</p> <p>Approximately < 60 lots affected because of existing size.</p>
Related Issues	Impervious surface coverage limits.

Issue #3	Residential Dock Dimensions
Problem Statement	<p>Docks and other overwater structures on Lake Sammamish shade the shallow nearshore areas used by migrating juvenile salmon forcing them into deeper water where they are preyed upon by bass and other species. Bass also congregate under docks and around pilings. As the density of docks and overwater structures increases, the quality of habitat for young salmon declines. Docks on Pine and Beaver lakes can cause issues in terms of water access to property and small craft navigation.</p>
Existing Policy/Regulation	<p>Under the current SMP, residential docks are permitted with demonstrated need and at least 50 ft of waterfront. The total SF for all piers, docks and floats may not exceed 600 SF (150 SF for individual floats) per lot in both Conservancy and Rural</p>

Issue #3	Residential Dock Dimensions
	<p>Environments. Minimum distance between docks is 200 ft in Conservancy environments.</p> <p>In Conservancy environments, recreational piers (aka public docks) up to 120 ft in length and 1,350 SF surface area are permitted.</p> <p>In Rural environments, recreational docks, piers, floats, launches are not subject to specific size limits.</p> <p>The Corps of Engineers regulates docks on Lake Sammamish. The Corps has dimensional standards and requirements</p>
Guideline Requirement(s)	<p>Local governments can limit docks to prevent impacts on navigation. Pier and dock construction shall be restricted to the minimum size necessary to meet the needs of the proposed water-dependent use.</p> <p>Where new piers or docks are allowed, master programs should contain provisions to require new residential development of two or more dwellings to provide joint use or community dock facilities, when feasible, rather than allow individual docks for each residence.</p> <p>Piers and docks, including those accessory to single-family residences, shall be designed and constructed to avoid or, if that is not possible, to minimize and mitigate the impacts to ecological functions, critical areas resources.</p>
Proposed Resolution	<p>Dock length must be less than or equal to the average length of the two nearest docks on either side.</p> <p>Maintain 200 ft distance between docks in Urban Conservancy.</p>
Information to Review at Meeting	Dock graphics.
Implications	Property owners would still need to comply with Corps of Engineers standards.
Related Issues	None.

Issue #4	Nonconforming Uses
Problem Statement	<p>Local governments periodically update laws and codes to reflect the latest information on environmental protection, public health and safety, and other topics and to achieve specific planning goals. Current state policy is to encourage existing uses and developments to come into compliance with updated codes as opportunities present themselves. Effects of regulatory changes on existing uses must be</p>

Issue #4	Nonconforming Uses
Existing Policy/ Regulation	<p>balanced with the goal of achieving full conformity over time.</p> <p>Current SMP requires that a use or development, not conforming to existing regulations, which is destroyed, deteriorated, or damaged more than 50 percent of its fair market value at present or at the time of its destruction by fire, explosion, or other casualty or act of God, may be reconstructed only insofar as it is consistent with existing regulations.</p>
Guideline Requirement(s)	<p>WAC 173-27 says: If a nonconforming development is damaged to an extent not exceeding seventy-five percent of the replacement cost of the original development, it may be reconstructed to those configurations existing immediately prior to the time the development was damaged, provided that application is made for the permits necessary to restore the development within six months of the date the damage occurred, all permits are obtained and the restoration is completed within two years of permit issuance.</p>
Proposed Resolution	<p>If a nonconforming development is damaged by fire, explosion, or other casualty/natural disaster or if the structure is voluntarily modified, it may be reconstructed to those configurations existing immediately prior to the time the damage occurred provided that all of the following criteria are met:</p> <p>The damage or voluntary reconstruction is less than 50 percent of the structure area or the cost for repairing the damage is less than 50 percent of the fair market value of the original structure.</p> <p>Application is made for the permits necessary to restore the development within six months of the date the damage occurred.</p> <p>All permits are obtained and the restoration is completed within two years of permit issuance.</p>
Information to Review at Meeting	<p>Buffer information.</p> <p>Information from neighboring jurisdictions.</p>
Implications	<p>Effects on existing uses.</p>
Related Issues	<p>Buffers.</p>

Issue #5	Impervious Surface Limits
Problem Statement	<p>Impervious surfaces have been implicated as a major cause of increased stormwater runoff, decreased infiltration, and degradation of aquatic habitat. Runoff from impervious surfaces can carry</p>

Issue #5	Impervious Surface Limits
Existing Policy/Regulation	<p data-bbox="505 264 1312 296">pollutants such as nitrogen, phosphorus and metals to the lakes.</p> <p data-bbox="505 321 1312 394">City zoning code limits impervious surface to 55% in R4 zone. Current SMP has no impervious surface limits.</p>
Guideline Requirement(s)	<p data-bbox="505 415 1382 594">WAC 173-27 says: Scientific studies support density or lot coverage limitation standards that assure that development will be limited to a maximum of ten percent total impervious surface area within the lot or parcel in a Rural Conservancy environment. Guidelines do not identify a threshold for other environments.</p>
Proposed Resolution	<p data-bbox="505 625 1352 699">Establish limits on impervious surface and/or set a minimum open space threshold as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="505 705 1325 737">Shoreline Residential – 40% impervious and/or 20% open space</p> <p data-bbox="505 747 1305 779">Urban Conservancy – 12% impervious and/or 45% open space</p> <p data-bbox="505 789 842 821">Natural – 10% impervious</p>
Information to Review at Meeting	<p data-bbox="505 856 1062 888">Information from neighboring jurisdictions.</p>
Implications	<p data-bbox="505 982 813 1014">Effects on existing uses.</p>
Related Issues	<p data-bbox="505 1045 597 1077">See all.</p>