



TO: City Council

FR: Mike Thomas, Director

Date: July 21, 2009

Re: Harkness Annexation Proposals

---

- 1) Background: In April of this year, the City Council let lapse the decade long annexation moratorium. Given the anticipated completion of the wastewater treatment plant in November, and the recently completed fiscal impacts of annexation study<sup>1</sup>, the Council believed it was time once again to consider the question of annexation. The annexation proposal contained herein is the first annexation request received since the moratorium ended.
- 2) Annexation Process: State law sets forth a number of annexation methods. Traditionally, most cities rely on the petition form of annexation. In short, the owners of real property in a proposed annexation area sign a petition requesting annexation. A majority (60%) must sign the petition in order for the jurisdiction, and if applicable, the boundary review board to take action. Although the City by policy has not stated a preference for type of annexation method to be used, Community Development in its recent effort to establish annexation administrative procedures, selected in part due to ease of understanding and administration, the "Sixty Percent Annexation Method<sup>2</sup>." The following generally characterizes the steps of this method:
  - a) Pre-Application Meeting with Proponent
  - b) Circulation of 10% petition
  - c) Council Meeting – 60 days post submittal of 10% petition
    - i) Purpose of Council meeting is to determine whether to accept, modify or reject proposal. And to determine whether assumption of bonded indebtedness will be assumed by prospective property owners.
  - d) If accepted, Council authorizes circulation of 60% petition.
  - e) 60% petition is reviewed by King County Assessor and Records and Elections
  - f) Notice of Intent is filed with King County Boundary Review Board – Board may approve, modify or reject proposal. Review Board has 120 days to act on proposal.

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Enumclaw Fiscal Impacts of Annexation, Berk & Associates, 2009

<sup>2</sup> RCW 35A.14.120

- g) Assuming Boundary Review Board approval as proposed or modified, City Council passes, assuming concurrence with Review Board decision, an ordinance affecting annexation.

It is important to note, that the annexation process includes a number of steps which involve other governmental agency review and/or approval (read: the City does not have full control of the process). Consequently, it is not uncommon for an annexation proposal to take six months or longer to process post submittal of the petition. This assumes no appeals of the City or Boundary Review Board decision.

- 3) Annexation Proposal: The City received on May 21, 22, 2009 two 10 percent annexation petitions from proponent Jason Harkness. **Petition A** is for property located within the City’s North Annexation Area, and **Petition B** is for property located within the 244<sup>th</sup> Annexation Area, and the southern portion of the Big West Annexation Area.<sup>3</sup> Staff has verified that the signatures collected due in fact represent at least 10% of the assessed value of the subject areas.

- a) Petition A – North Annexation: The annexation area is located in the middle portion of the North Annexation Area (exhibit A) and is generally bounded by McHugh Avenue to the south, Harding Street to the west, Urban Growth Boundary to the north, and McHugh Place to the East.

<b>Land Area</b>	41 Acres
<b># KC Assessor Parcels</b>	30
<b>Total Assessed Value (2008)</b>	\$7,652,040
<b>% Signatures Submitted</b>	31.5

- b) Petition B -244<sup>th</sup> Expanded: The annexation area includes the entirety of the 244<sup>th</sup> Annexation Area and a portion of the Big West Annexation Area south of Roosevelt Avenue.

<b>Land Area</b>	259
<b># KC Assessor Parcels</b>	74
<b>Total Assessed Value (2008)</b>	\$24,329,100
<b>% Signatures Submitted</b>	22.5

- 4) Land Use & Zoning: The City’s Comprehensive Plan establishes the land use designations for the entirety of the urban growth area. In this instance the subject areas designated land use is Single Family. Zoning is primarily R-2 (minimum lot size, 8,400 square feet) though in the Big West portion there is an area of R-1. The purpose of the R-1 (minimum lot size, 15,000 square feet) zoning is to create a buffer between the City and adjacent rural and agricultural uses. It should be noted that the Planning Commission is currently reviewing land use/zoning in the urban growth area. It is likely that the Planning Commission will recommend the elimination of a small area in the 244<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The Annexation Area reflect the names used in Exhibit 1, Fiscal Impact of Annexation Study,

Annexation Area that is designated as PUD<sup>4</sup>. As was done with the Holdener PUD, the Planning Commission believes that any PUD designation should be done concomitant with an active PUD proposal.

<b>Annexation Area</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Zoning</b>
<b>North</b>	Single Family	R-2
<b>244<sup>th</sup></b>	Single Family	R-2
<b>Big West (portion)</b>	Single Family	R-1, R-2

---

<sup>4</sup> The PUD designation along with a much large one was established in the 1995 Comprehensive Plan. Apparently at that time it was thought the city needed dense pockets of residential development in the western portion of its urban growth boundary.