

| Issue  | Discussion Notes  | Status                    |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| <p><b>Application Fees/Refunds</b></p> <p>Could the fee structure include consideration of refunds for an applicant that withdraws?</p> <p>(Shefrin)</p>   | <p><b><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Adopting new fee policies require a separate process outside this docketing process amendment work. It requires adoption by Council Resolution and possible amendment to RZC 21.76.030, Application Requirements.</p> <p>Staff will continue its research on fees and will investigate how refunds are handled in the City currently as well as among neighboring jurisdictions. Currently, staff is considering a fee structure to recover time and material costs associated with processing amendment proposals. Fees are being considered for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Comprehensive Plan amendment;</li> <li>2. A site-specific map amendment; and</li> <li>3. A site-specific zoning text amendment</li> </ol> <p>We will keep the Planning Commission informed as we move forward on this issue.</p> | <p>Opened<br/>6/24/20</p> |
| <p>Proposed Criterion # seems subjective and could be perceived as lacking transparency. What are the guidelines that could be applied to this criterion so that applicants don't think their proposals are simply cast aside using this criterion?</p> <p>(Captain/East/Knopff)</p> | <p><b><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Suggestion for recasting the proposed criterion:</p> <p>The proposed docket item(s) can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determining the following shall be considered: The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal; the potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of the comprehensive plan and or zoning code, the amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments, and if consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</p>  | <p>Opened<br/>6/24/20</p> |

| Issue   | Discussion Notes  | Status                    |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| <p>Can we include language to specify how Council shares their reasoning when proposals are deferred? (Captain)</p> | <p><b>Staff Response/Recommendation</b><br/>                     In the proposed new code section 6, it states:<br/> <u><b>Council Review.</b> The City Council shall review the recommendation of the Planning Commission and consider whether any proposed amendment should be included in, or excluded from the annual review docket, or be deferred Council has three options in deciding how to treat proposals once they are docketed:</u></p> <p><u>a. Include. The City Council’s decision to include an application in the annual docket is procedural only and does not constitute a decision by the City Council as to whether the proposed amendment will ultimately be approved.</u></p> <p><u>b. Exclude. The City Council’s decision to exclude an application from the docket terminates the application. Proposals excluded from the annual review docket may not be considered again for a period of two years.</u></p> <p><u>c. Defer. The City Council’s decision to defer an application means the application may be considered, as specified by the Council, for the next annual docket cycle, neighborhood plan review and update, a previously established work program, or the next periodic review cycle.</u></p> <p>Staff is researching what criteria would be consistent with the authority provided to the City Council under RCW 35.18. and will share our findings at an upcoming meeting.</p> | <p>Opened<br/>6/24/20</p> |