



**Meeting Summary**  
**October 23, 2019 7:00 p.m.**  
**City Hall, 15670 NE 85th Street**  
**Redmond, Washington 98073**

**Planning Commissioners in Attendance:**

Chair Roy Captain; Vice-Chair Sherri Nichols; Judy East, Vanessa Kritzer; Vidyanand Rajpathak; Aparna Varadharajan

**Staff in Attendance:**

Beverly Mesa-Zendt, Planning Manager, Human Services and Planning; Judy Fani, Planning Commission Liaison

**1. Call to Order:**

Chair Captain called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda:**

The agenda was approved by a unanimous vote.

**3. Approval of Meeting Summary:**

Motion to approve Meeting Summary for October 9, 2019, made by Commissioner Kritzer and seconded by Vice-Chair Nichols, and approved by a unanimous vote.

**4. Items from the Audience:**

There were no items from the audience.

**5. Study Session,** Beverly Mesa-Zendt, Planning Manager, followed up on a July 24, 2019, staff presentation to the Planning Commission about amending the current codified comprehensive plan docketing process (RZC 21.76.070). At that meeting, the Commission provided staff guidance to ensure that proposed amendments improve implementation and predictability of the docketing process and that the resulting process is compliant with the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Ms. Mesa-Zendt provided a study sheet and a presentation that covered the following topics to assist in developing appropriate revisions to RZC 21.76.070.

- Current issues and concerns:
- State regulatory context
- Local regulatory context
- Benchmark study of the following jurisdictions: Bellevue, Kirkland, Issaquah, and Sammamish

Commissioners' input on the proposed revisions included the following:

- Redesign the process to include a predictable application period/schedule. Set annual intake of proposed amendments at the same time each year legislatively.
- Cite the RCW provisions, rather than list all the exemptions to the docket process allowed under the RCW.
- Codify the requirement for a pre-application conference. This will provide an opportunity for staff to ensure more complete applications and redirect applicants to a more appropriate mechanism when needed.
- Consider language that would allow Council to include non-emergency, city-initiated amendments on an already-approved docket.
- Eliminate where possible ambiguous criteria. Threshold criteria should be clear and unambiguous including the terms: *time*, *timely*, *consistent*, *concurrent*.
- Re-write criteria to include phrases such as, “shall consider” or “must meet” - where ever possible.
- Consider a list of criteria that are *required* and then another list of *other considerations*.
- Consider city priorities, and staff capacity to complete proposed amendments within the docket year.
- Consolidate items for public hearing to strengthen efficiency.
- Restructure the process to achieve a cumulative review of approved proposals.
- Reduce the number of carryover items to items that are truly ready for Planning Commission review in the docket year.
- Amend the comprehensive plan no more than once per year.
- Consult City Council. Council should weigh in on the criteria too – perhaps a briefing to solicit input as Planning Commission is developing a new process.
- Consider weighting applications at the pre-application stage to demonstrate how an application meets the criteria.
- Consider an online workflow application process where the application cannot advance if the applicant does not take certain steps.
- Consider two different processes – one of privately-initiated and another for businesses/organizations
- Develop an FAQ sheet to explain process, and intent of minimum threshold criteria, useful examples like “Neighborhood plans address policies such as....”
- Continue exploring application fee options (flat fee, minimum “gate” fee plus hourly fee, flexible fee)
- Revisit the schedule – is a two-month period enough time for the Planning Commission to review a scaled down docket?
- Consider options for deferring an application for the next docket if, for instance, the item has merit but there is insufficient staff capacity.
- Consider a fee structure with flexibility to scale fee based on intensity of the proposal.
- Consider partial fee refunds for undocketed items.
- Provide provisions for Planning Commission to introduce or “sponsor” items for the docket. Develop process to address inclusion – item has majority of Commissioners' support; abides by the minimum threshold criteria, no fee....

Staff indicated that this item will be brought back for further development when the current docket process is complete with an anticipated completion date of summer 2020.

**6. Reports and Scheduling.**

There were no discussion or announcements under this agenda item.

**8. Communications with Staff**

There were no items for discussion.

**9. Adjourn.**

Motion to adjourn made by Vice-Chair Nichols, seconded by Commissioner Kritzer. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

**Summary prepared by:** Judy Fani, Planning Commission Staff Liaison