We're writing in strong opposition to the proposal to allow the School Districts’ 19 existing sites in the Rural Area to be developed under existing policies; exempt from the GMPC-proposed prohibition of sewer extensions to schools sited in the Rural Area (PF-12).

With an 18% decline in rural area school age population over the last 10 years, these schools sites, seven of which are inside or immediately adjacent to our service areas, are intended to serve an urban population. Developing these sites with urban-serving facilities will be permanently devastating to the local rural character, rural-related infrastructure, and rural community plans.

Pressure on rural road infrastructure could easily be impacted by increased bus and car traffic. Since schools are also gathering places for day, after-school, and evening meetings and activities, demands on road capabilities and safety will be further increased over rural requirements.

Large footprint, impervious surface replaces pastureland and other rural uses. This means the sensitive, natural hydrology of the rural area will be altered with practices used in the urban areas.

Urban-serving schools do not align with rural character and local community plans. Winterbrook Farm, for example, an Issaquah School District site, is an 80-acre open area assessed as A-1 Pastureland. Winterbrook Farm was the last of the dairies that existed in May Valley which, like all the others, re-purposed their infrastructure from cattle to horses. Today, May Valley, a fertile valley of the western foothills of the Cascades, includes an obvious equestrian character and economics component.

In support of equine recreation and economics, local community interests include the creation of an intra-valley soft trail system connecting boarding and grazing sites along with connections to the surrounding regional trail systems: the largest concentration of soft trails in King County.

The State Supreme Court has acknowledged the validity of the urge to urbanize being a natural result of placing urban serving facilities in the rural area. Urban-serving schools on the Winterbrook Farm site will easily be the tipping point for the eastern half of May Valley. It wouldn’t be surprising that eventually urban thinking would demand residential development near the school sites justified by walkable-community and youth health policies.

We risk losing the rural area through “creeping normality”. Approving a school site, overflow of facilities for a Master Planned Development, a Transfer Development Right receiving site, a tight-line sewer, a stormwater retention facility, or a number of other examples of land used for urban purposes seem insignificant when viewed individually. But there’s no doubt that current Countywide Planning Policies and King County Comprehensive Plan policies have allowed these uses in the Urban Growth Boundary fringe areas thus creating an urban/rural ecotone intended to eventually expand the Urban Growth Area.

It’s time the county-wide policies move in opposition to the rural area as a “land bank” for urban-related uses. Please reject any proposal to exempt existing Rural Area school district sites from proposed CPP policies and support proposed policies DP-45 through DP-51 intended to protect the Rural Area.

Thank you.

Steve Hiester, Chair Greater Maple Valley Unincorporated Area Council
Pete Eberle, President, Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council
Nancy Stafford, Chair, Upper Bear Creek Unincorporated Area Council
“Enhance opportunities for residents to meaningfully participate in decisions that affect the future of their communities”

“Improve resident access to the information and systems provided by King County”

The three UACs are located along the eastern border of the Urban Growth Area. Collectively serving over 160 square miles of unincorporated King County, including 26% of the Rural Area, and significant percentages of Mining, Open Space, and Urban Unincorporated land uses in the county.

With a combined 42 years of service focused on resident participation, these UACs have front line exposure to issues along the Urban Growth Boundary fringe including Potential Annexation Areas and the Rural Area. We see firsthand the effect of changes on the ground and have a longer-term perspective on growth management.

We share concerns about a number of issues including erosion of the Rural Area and the plight of the Potential Annexation Areas.