



ISLAND COUNTY PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Jeff Tate, Director

PHONE: (360) 679-7339 ■ from Camano (360) 629-4522, Ext. 7339 ■ from S. Whidbey (360) 321-5111, Ext. 7339
FAX: (360) 679-7306 ■ 1 NE 6th Street, P. O. Box 5000, Coupeville, WA 98239-5000
Internet Home Page: <http://www.islandcounty.net/planning/>

TRANSMITTAL AND REPORT MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 13, 2008

TO: Island County Planning Commission

REGARDING: CPA 400/07 - Amendments to the Island County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code to designate the Camp Casey Conference Center as the Camp Casey Existing Master Planned Resort and adoption of the Camp Casey Master Plan.

FROM: _____
Anthony Boscolo
Planner

Comprehensive Plan Amendment 400/07 was submitted by Seattle Pacific University to designate parcels R13115-078-0170, R13122-378-0100, R13122-410-0750 and R13122-459-0380, together known as the Camp Casey Conference Center (CCCC), as the Camp Casey Existing Master Planned Resort (CCEMPR). This action would include adoption of the Camp Casey Master Plan pursuant to ICC17.03.180(Y), describing current uses and establishing the vision for future development. This amendment proposes changes to the Urban Element Designations section of the Comprehensive Plan. This report serves as the staff report and is submitted to the Planning Commission in accordance with section 16.26 ICC.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Proposal

Pursuant to ICC 170.03.180(Y), Existing Master Planned Resorts, Seattle Pacific University is requesting the Island County Comprehensive Plan be amended to designate the Camp Casey Conference Center as the Camp Casey Existing Master Planned Resort

and approve the Camp Casey Master Plan establishing standards for all future development of the site.

Currently the Camp Casey Conference Center has a zoning designation of Rural which doesn't generally permit the types of uses which occur on the site or allow an expansion of the current uses or new nonconforming uses. This conflict of uses has been present since the implementation of the County's current zoning and was recognized at that time. Until recently there hasn't been a means, other than through a Variance ICC (17.03.210), or as an Existing Use ICC 17.03.230, to address the activities conducted on the site. SPU is seeking this designation in order to establish a predictable set of land use standards.

On August 21, 2006 the Board of Island County Commissioners adopted Ordinance C-97-06 amending the Comprehensive Plan and Island County Code adding language which allows for the designation of Existing Master Planned Resorts. The goal of the EMPR designation is to recognize and support planned development that is significantly self-contained and which includes short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities in a setting of significant natural amenities. The steps taken to add the EMPR section of code was done to provide an avenue of support for both the county and owners of these types of existing facilities where the County Code didn't previously address.

The CCCC currently runs its operation closely in line with the definition of an Existing Master Planned Resort. Their uses have been in existence prior to July 1, 1990 and are significantly self-contained, including short-term accommodations associated with a range of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities.

The designation of Existing Master Planned Resort requires that future development and specific uses must be approved through the adoption of a master plan. The master plan is intended to address long term protection to environmentally, historically and archeologically significant lands, while allowing uses, activities and development that will enhance, conserve or highlight these features of significance. The master plan should also include an inventory of existing structures and land uses, goals for the facility, planned upgrades to or additions to existing structures, planned expansion of existing land uses, a discussion of any new structures or land uses, time frames for future expansions, and a resource management plan that outlines strategies for timber, agriculture, and sensitive or threatened species. Once a master plan is approved, changes to the plan would be processed either as a Type II decision or as a Type IV, annual review amendment pursuant to Chapter 16.26 and require BICC approval depending upon the type and intensity of the change requested. An approved master plan would serve as a guide to the future use and development of the site, irrespective of ownership.

Approval of a master plan doesn't outright permit the proposed uses and structures outlined in the plan. All new structures and land uses or changes to existing structures and land uses that are approved by the plan must still follow the appropriate permit process and comply with all development regulations in Island County Code. This includes the Island County Critical Areas Ordinance (Chapter 17.02), Land Development

Standards (Chapter 11.01), Clearing and Grading Ordinance (Chapter 11.02), Stormwater Ordinance (Chapter 11.03), and the mitigation conditions resulting from the SEPA threshold determination.

Designation of the CCCC as the CCEMPR and approval of the master plan would provide Island County and Seattle Pacific University and the public with a clear picture for the future of the site including the long term protection of its environmentally and historically significant lands. Additionally, adoption of the Camp Casey Master Plan implements a number of the stated goals of the Island County Comprehensive Plan through the preservation of rural character, economic development, retention of open space, and historic preservation.

Analysis

Attached to this report is a Master Plan that was submitted pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Island County Comprehensive Plan, ICC 17.03.180(Y) and the Site Plan requirements of Chapter 16.15 ICC. The Master Plan describes in full detail the Seattle Pacific University mission, the current use and any potential future uses and structures that are proposed in conjunction with the facility. The Island County Comprehensive Plan and ICC 17.03.180 define the general purpose, goals and policies as they apply to the types of properties and uses that would be eligible for this land use designation. The following analysis describes how this proposal compares to language that is prescribed in the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Regulations.

Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Plan – Urban Element Designations: Existing Master Planned Resorts

Designation Criteria:

- A. *Proposals for Existing Master Planned Resorts must conform to RCW 36.70A.362.*

The requirements found in RCW 36.70A.362 are also found in ICC 17.03.180(Y). Ordinance C-97-06 was adopted as a means to ensure conformity with RCW 36.70A.362. The ordinance was adopted following the process outlined for GMA legislative action in both state statute and County Code. An appeal period followed adoption. It is not an action that is under review. This report combined with the applicant's proposal satisfies the requirement of both sections.

- B. *The proposed resort was in existence on or before July 1, 1990 and met the definition of an Existing Master Planned Resort at that time.*

Camp Casey has been under the ownership of Seattle Pacific University since 1956 when it was acquired and has since served as a conference center and resort.

- C. *No new urban or suburban land uses are allowed in the surrounding vicinity of any Existing Master Planned Resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.362.*

Parcels in the surrounding vicinity the Camp Casey Conference Center have a future land use designation of either Rural or Park, neither of which permit urban or suburban land uses. The only areas in the county that are designated for urban growth are the Municipal Urban Growth Areas of Oak Harbor, Coupeville, and Langley, Non-Municipal Urban Growth Area of Freeland, and Existing Master Planned Resorts which there are none currently. If Camp Casey is designated and EMPR other EMPRs will not be permitted in the surrounding vicinity.

- D. *For an Existing Master Planned Resort that is located on land that would otherwise be designated as forest land or agricultural land under RCW 36.70A.170, the County shall include a finding that the land is better suited, and has more long-term importance, for the existing resort than for the commercial harvesting of timber or agricultural production.*

Although the site does contain forested and open pasture areas none of the land is designated, pursuant to 36.70A.170 as forest land or agricultural land by Island County zoning.

- E. *The resort master plan must be consistent with the development regulations for critical areas.*

Each phase and project of the Master Plan will be reviewed for its compliance with critical area regulations. Further critical area protection is achieved through mitigating conditions established in the SEPA process. This process addressed the impacts that may result from the project as a whole which may get overlooked when a project is developed in phases. The Camp Casey Master Plan has been reviewed and thus far has been found to be consistent with the Island County Critical Areas Ordinance (Chapter 17.02).

- F. *On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts are fully considered and mitigated.*

The proposal has been reviewed by Island County Health, Public Works, and Planning and Community Development for infrastructure impacts. The SEPA Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance includes a number of conditions that must be addressed at the time of development. On and off-site road improvements will be required during the initial phases of development.

- G. *The existing resort is significantly self contained and integrates 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.*

The Background and Existing Conditions section of the Camp Casey Master Plan describes in detail the characteristics that satisfy these requirements.

An existing resort may include other permanent residential uses, conference facilities, and commercial activities supporting the resort, but only if these uses are integrated into and consistent with the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

These uses are also covered in the Background and Existing Conditions section of the Camp Casey Master Plan.

Comprehensive Plan – Goals and Policies: Existing Master Planned Resorts

Goal:

Provide a method to recognize and support the planned development of Existing Master Planned Resorts that are significantly self-contained and have 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.

This goal and its policies have been satisfied through the establishment of ICC 17.03.180(Y) Existing Master Planned Resorts. The designation of the CCCC as an EMPR and adoption of the Camp Casey Master Plan further satisfies this goal by creating a clear plan for the future development of the site.

Policies:

- A. The Island County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations shall define and create a process for the designation of Existing Master Planned Resorts. The approval of an Existing Master Planned Resort shall be processed as a Type IV decision pursuant to Chapter 16.19 ICC.*
- B. Existing Master Planned Resorts shall be recognized by the County, provided that the facility meets County development standards and an approved master plan for the facility is approved by the Board of Island County Commissioners.*
- C. Designation of an Existing Master Planned Resort must preclude new urban or suburban development in the surrounding vicinity of the existing resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.362, as per RCW 36.70A.362, the state code governing Existing Master Planned Resorts.*
- D. The designation process for Existing Master Planned Resorts must comply with all conditions stipulated in RCW 36.70A.362.*

ICC 17.03.180.Y Existing Master Planned Resorts

Existing Master Planned Resorts. *Through the Type IV decision process, Existing Master Planned Resorts may be designated provided that future development and specific uses have been approved through the adoption of a master plan. The*

purpose and intent of the master plan is to provide long term protection to environmentally, historically and archaeologically significant lands, while allowing uses, activities and development that will enhance, conserve or highlight these features of significance. This section is established for the purpose of allowing Existing Master Planned Resorts to be recognized in the Island County Code thereby enabling existing resorts to carry out future development plans. In the absence of this section of County code, uses that now qualify as an Existing Master Planned Resort were regulated under the provisions of the underlying zoning designation. Uses that qualify as an Existing Master Planned Resort do not conform to the underlying zoning designation and would therefore be subject to the Existing Uses section of this Chapter found in 17.03.230. The urban nature of Existing Master Planned Resorts as defined by RCW 36.70A.362 was not acknowledged or accommodated before the establishment of this section.

1. Existing Master Planned Resorts must adhere to the standards defined in RCW 36.70A.362.

a) The master plan must show that the land is better suited, and has more long term importance, for the existing resort than for the commercial harvesting of timber or agricultural production, if located on land that would otherwise be designated as forest land or agricultural land under RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.170.

The site does not contain lands designated as forest land or agricultural land as those terms are used in RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.170.

b) A resort that was in existence on July 1, 1990 and that met the definition of an Existing Master Planned Resort at that time. The resort is developed, in whole or in part, 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.

This site has been in SPU ownership since 1956 and has met the definition of Existing Master Planned Resort since July 1, 1990 when they ran Alumni and church retreats, soccer camps, and outdoor educational programs.

c) An existing resort may include other permanent residential uses, conference facilities, and commercial activities supporting the resort, but only if these other uses are integrated into and consistent with the on-site recreational nature of the resort.

The CCCC does have a staff family who resides on-site. In the past there have been two staff families who resided on-site. The CCCC has conference facilities including classrooms, auditoriums and recreational facilities. All of these uses are integrated into site and are consistent with the recreation nature of the resort.

- d) *No new urban or suburban land uses shall be allowed in the surrounding vicinity of the existing resort, except in areas otherwise designated for urban growth under RCW 36.70A.110 and 36.70A.362.*

See the Comprehensive Plan Section above. Other than a ferry terminal and some long standing residential development, there are no existing urban or suburban uses present in the surrounding vicinity. The zoning will not allow new uses to be established.

- e) *The master plan for the Existing Master Planned Resort shall be consistent with Chapter 17.02 ICC, the County Critical Areas Ordinance.*

The submitted master plan has been reviewed by the County and has been determined to be consistent with Chapter 17.02 at this phase of conceptual review. Although the site does contain regulated critical areas, none of the proposed development appears to be in those areas. Future applications that are required when implementing the plan will require CAO review.

- f) *On-site and off-site infrastructure impacts shall be fully considered and mitigated.*

As stated above, the proposal has been reviewed by Island County Health, Public Works, and Planning and Community Development for infrastructure impacts. All impacts not addressed at the time of development are addressed through mitigating conditions established in the SEPA process.

- g) *The County may allocate a portion of its twenty year population projection, prepared by the office of financial management, to the master planned resort corresponding to the projected number of permanent residents within the master planned resort.*

The County recognizes this option and may choose to utilize it during the next population update, however, there is very little permanent or seasonal residency associated with this use so it is unlikely that there will be much affect on population allocations.

- 2. *A master plan shall demonstrate how the existing resort meets the requirements of ICC 17.03.180.G(1) AND include the following:*

ICC 17.03.180.G (1) is an incorrect reference. It should read ICC 17.03.180.Y (1). Given the correct reference this is satisfied above.

- a) *An inventory of the existing structures and land uses on the property where the proposed Existing Master Planned Resort exists.*

The information found in section III, Background and Existing Conditions, of the Camp Casey Master Plan satisfies this requirement.

- b) *The goals that the owner(s) of the facility has for the Existing Master*

Planned Resort, including:

- (i) The owner's vision statement for the resort*
- (ii) The owner's future development goals and plans for the resort, including a statement on how the development goals and plans meet the vision statement for the resort.*

The information found in section II, Vision and Goals, of the Camp Casey Master Plan satisfies this requirement.

- c) A comprehensive discussion of any planned upgrades or additions to existing structures on the property.*

The information found in section IV, Proposed Master Plan Elements, satisfies this requirement.

- d) A comprehensive discussion of any planned expansion of existing land uses on the property.*

The information found in section IV, Proposed Master Plan Elements, satisfies this requirement.

- e) A comprehensive discussion of any new structures or land uses planned for the property. New structures and land uses shall be indicated on a site plan of the property.*

The information found in section IV, Proposed Master Plan Elements, and Figure 5, Illustrative Development Plan, of the CCMP highlights the new structures on the site and satisfies this requirement.

- f) A site plan using the criteria of Chapter 16.15 ICC.*

The Application, and Figures, Tables, and body of the Camp Casey Master Plan satisfy the site plan criteria for Chapter 16.15 ICC. Some items which will be required and reviewed when an application for development is submitted were waved at this time pursuant to 16.15.050 ICC

- g) A phasing plan that describes anticipated time frames for future expansions and/or redevelopment.*

The information found in section IV, Proposed Master Plan Elements, satisfies this requirement.

- h) A resource management plan that outlines management strategies for timber or agriculture lands and sensitive or threatened species as identified in Chapter 17.02 ICC.*

The information found in section V, Designated Open Space and Natural Resources Preservation Areas and the included Forest Management Plan satisfies this requirement.

3. *A resort seeking status as an Existing Master Planned Resort must have at least fifty (50) acres within the planning area.*

The CCMP encompasses approximately 82 acres which meets this requirement.

4. *Approval of a master plan in no way shall be interpreted as final approval for a specific project. New structures and land uses, or changes to existing structures and land uses that are approved through the master plan must still follow the appropriate permit process and comply with all Island County development regulations in the Island County Code.*

Approval of the CCMP provides the County, Public and the Applicant with a plan of future development of the site. It allows for the recognition of this sites unique characteristics and provides an avenue for future financial stability, removing the pressures from residential development. All new uses, structures and modifications to existing uses and structures will require permit review and approval.

5. *Permitted Uses within the Existing Master Planned Resort are for the purpose of serving the users of the resort. All existing and proposed uses shall be set forth in the master plan. Uses that support the operations of the facility that are required per RCW 36.70A.362, such as infrastructure necessary for the support and/or mitigation of the on-site and off-site impacts of the Existing Master Planned Resort, are implicitly allowed and do not require specific approval through this subsection. Examples of permitted uses within a master plan include the following:*

- a) *Staff housing;*
- b) *Retreat housing;*
- c) *Group housing;*
- d) *Multi-use building;*
- e) *Cabin;*
- f) *Classroom;*
- g) *Meeting space;*
- h) *Recreation building;*
- i) *Cafeteria;*
- j) *Teaching laboratory;*
- k) *Offices;*
- l) *Storage;*
- m) *Bathhouse;*

- n) *Restrooms;*
- o) *Swimming pool;*
- p) *Sports fields;*
- q) *Sports courts;*
- r) *Campground;*
- s) *Picnicking areas;*
- t) *Amphitheater;*
- u) *Trails;*
- v) *Scenic viewpoints;*
- w) *Interpretive shelter;*
- x) *Parking;*
- y) *Water tower, not to exceed 40 ft. in height;*

The CCCC currently provides its users with nearly all of the permitted uses described above. The CCMP provides details of these uses, whether they are to be expanded or condensed and describes a verity of uses that currently exist on the site. The CCMP also references the potential for two small commercial uses which would include a commissary and a coffee shop. These uses, which are not referenced above, would be permitted but are required to be for the sole purpose of serving the users of the resort. Signage and other forms of advertising for these uses would be limited to avoid attracting non-users to the site.

6. *The following shall be considered Conditional Uses and processed as a Type II decision:*
 - a) *Any Use or Structure that exceeds the thresholds defined in the master plan, but is below the thresholds that trigger a master plan amendment per ICC 17.03.180.G (8);*
 - b) *Any Use that is not specifically listed as a Permitted Use in the master plan but is consistent with the goals and policies of the master plan and will have no significant environmental impacts;*

Nothing in this section is required of the applicant at this time. These situations only arise following the adoption of the CCMP and designation of CCCC as the CCEMPR and then only if the standards set in (a) or (b) are met.

7. *Existing Master Planned Resorts that fall within the Ebey's Landing Historical Reserve must comply with the special development requirements set forth in Chapters 16.18 and 17.04 ICC;*

The Ebey's Trust Board provided comments during SEPA review which have been addressed in the mitigating conditions. All future development will have to be reviewed by the Historic Review Committee as described in Chapter 17.04 ICC.

8. *Amendments To The Master Plan. The following variations to the approved master plan shall be processed as annual review amendments pursuant to Chapter 16.26 ICC;*
 - a) *A variation that exceeds fifty (50) percent of the gross square-footage of any building approved in the master plan;*
 - b) *Any Structure that is not specifically identified in the master plan and that is not consistent with the goals and policies of the approved master plan;*
 - c) *A variation that exceeds ten (10) percent of the aggregate gross square-footage of all buildings approved in the master plan;*
 - d) *A Variation that exceeds ten (10) percent of the aggregate gross square-footage of all impervious surfaces approved in the master plan;*
 - e) *Any Use that is not specifically listed as a Permitted Use in the master plan which would not be consistent with the goals and policies of the master plan;*
 - f) *Removal of timber in areas not identified in the master plan, except for timber identified by a certified arborist as diseased, dead or a threat to an approved structure or improvement;*
 - g) *Changes in use, addition of new uses or other actions that generate significant traffic impacts not previously addressed in the master plan;*
 - h) *Changes to the boundaries of the facility; and*
 - i) *Any other type of amendment to the master plan.*
9. *Site Development and Use Standards. The following site development and use standards, as provided in the master plan, shall apply to all development within an Existing Master Planned Resort:*
 - a) *Building architectural style and envelope standards;*
 - b) *Street and road standards;*
 - c) *Parking standards;*
 - d) *Tree retention standards;*
 - e) *Buffer and use separation standards;*
 - f) *Setback and height limits;*
 - g) *Site coverage and development standards;*

- h) View preservation standards; and*
- i) Utility standards.*
- 10. Variances. Variances from the standards established in the master plan may be granted pursuant to the variance process provided in this Chapter.*
- 11. Any use for which a definition already exists in this Chapter shall not be designated as an Existing Master Planned Resort. For example, Country Inns are already defined within this Chapter and therefore may not be designated as an Existing Master Planned Resort. This Chapter is intended to support significantly self contained and integrated development that include short-term visitor accommodations associated with a range of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities within the property boundaries as per ICC 17.02.180.G, that until the establishment of this section have not been fully recognized or supported by the Island County Code or Comprehensive Plan.*
- 12. Existing Master Planned Resorts shall not be located in the RC, RV, RS, LM, AP, or RR Zones.*

Conclusions

Pursuant to Section 16.26.060.E.1-7 ICC, the Planning Department is required to provide the Planning Commission a report that reviews the proposed amendment. This staff report satisfies this requirement.

Upon review of the proposed amendment and submitted master plan the Planning Department finds them to be consistent with the Development Regulations and all elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The designation of Camp Casey Conference Center as an Existing Master Plan Resort is supported by the Comprehensive Plan and meets the stated designation criteria. The approved master plan would be the guiding document for the size, location, standards, and policies of the site. Limitations to development beyond those stated in the master plan are still required through compliance with all Development Regulations.

The Department recommends approval of the application.