

Attachment A

Considerations for Amending RZC 21.76.070(J) - the Comprehensive Plan Docketing Process

The following suggestions for amendments to the docketing process are the outcomes of Planning Commission discussion during the following two study sessions.

July 24, 2019 (presentation led by Judy Fani, Principal Planner)

Commissioners' suggestions for proposed revisions:

- Consider language that would allow Council to include non-emergency city-initiated amendments on an already-approved docket. There is an existing policy that allows Council to add city-initiated amendments for emergencies only.
- Consider revisiting the minimum threshold criteria to clarify terms including *time, timely, consistent, concurrent*.
- In developing the docket, consider city priorities, and staff capacity to complete proposed amendments within the docket year.
- Consolidate items for public hearing to strengthen efficiency.
- Redesign the process to include a predictable application period/schedule.
- Restructure the process to achieve a cumulative review of approved proposals.
- Reduce number of carryover items.
- Concurrent review of proposals.
- Truly amend the comprehensive plan no more than once per year.

October 23, 2019 (presentation led by Planning Manager, Beverly Mesa-Zendt)

Commissioners' suggestions for proposed revisions:

- 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" - wherever 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; a fee structure with flexibility to scale fee based on intensity of the proposal; partial fee refunds for undocketed items; fee waivers for Commission or Council sponsored proposals).
- 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....
- Revisit the approved docket 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.