

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. Application Fees/Refunds</p> <p>Could the fee structure include consideration of refunds for an applicant that withdraws?</p> <p>(Shefrin)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></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"> 1. A Comprehensive Plan amendment; 2. A Comprehensive Plan amendment with a zoning map amendment; and 3. A Comprehensive Plan amendment with a zoning text amendment. <p>Staff will keep the Planning Commission informed as we move forward on this issue.</p> <p>7/8/20 The Planning Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 6/24/20 Closed 7/8/20</p>
<p>2. Proposed Criterion 6.e</p> <p>This 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><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>Suggestion for recasting the proposed criterion 6.e:</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 determination, 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>7/8/20 Commissioners also discussed the possibility of amendment proposals being equal or substantially equal in their need for staff resources and budge. Commissioners acknowledged that one of their roles is not only to apply threshold decisions criteria on amendment proposals but to</p>	<p>Opened 6/24/20 Closed 7/8/20</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>also work with staff to prioritize docketed items to get them queued up for review by the Planning Commission.</p> <p>Commissioners identified other considerations that might come into play depending on the scope or the proposal. Not to rule out other valid considerations, the criterion is revised to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u><i>The proposed docket item(s) can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determination the following shall be considered:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u><i>i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;</i></u> <u><i>ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</i></u> <u><i>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</i></u> <u><i>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</i></u> 	
<p>3. Council rationale Can language be included to specify how Council shares their reasoning when proposals are deferred? (Captain)</p>	<p>Staff Response/Recommendation</p> <p>In the proposed new code section 6, it states: <u>Council Review. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u><i>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.</i></u> <u><i>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.</i></u> 	<p>Opened 6/24/20 Closed 7/8/20</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u><i>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.</i></u></p> <p>Staff has indicated that the decision threshold criteria provided in RZC 21.76.070.J are for both the Planning Commission and the City Council to utilize in their evaluation of proposed amendments. If City Council reasoning differs from the Planning Commission – that difference should be provided for in the final findings of fact and legislative intent.</p>	
<p>4. “no net loss” Regarding Criterion iii, which policies in the Comprehensive Plan cite no net loss? (Varadharajan, Shefrin)</p>	<p>A scan of the Comprehensive Plan revealed only one policy that cites “no net loss” and that is policy HO-17 In the Housing Element: <i>Prohibit any rezone that results in a reduction in residential capacity without first approving another rezone or rezones, resulting in at least a replacement of the lost residential capacity elsewhere in the city.</i></p> <p>Other policies in the Economic Vitality, Land Use and other Elements use words such as preserve, encourage, protect...various land designations, uses etc....</p>	<p>Opened 7/8/20</p>
<p>5. What are some options for how to address criteria for land use and rezones (zoning map) changes. (All)</p>	<p>Upon reviewing the codes from surrounding jurisdictions and taking another look at our existing code and policies, staff recommends not adding additional criterion for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>For rezone (zoning map) requests:</u> RZC 21.070 already lays out applicable criteria for rezones as set forth below:</p> <p><i>“Amendment Criteria. The following factors are to be taken into account by the Planning Commission and the City Council when considering a map amendment:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The amendment complies with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, policies, and provisions;</i> 	<p>Opened 7/8/20</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>2. <i>The amendment bears a substantial relation to the public health and safety;</i></p> <p>3. <i>The amendment is warranted because of changed circumstances, a mistake, or because of a need for additional property in the proposed zoning district;</i></p> <p>4. <i>The subject property is suitable for development in general conformance with zoning standards under the proposed zoning district;</i></p> <p>5. <i>The amendment will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property;</i></p> <p>6. <i>Adequate public facilities and services are likely to be available to serve the development allowed by the proposed zone;</i></p> <p>7. <i>The probable adverse environmental impacts of the types of development allowed by the proposed zone can be mitigated, taking into account all applicable regulations or the unmitigated impacts are acceptable”</i></p> <p><u>For land use proposal requests:</u> The Comprehensive Plan already includes criteria to apply for land use amendment proposals. Also, criterion b. mentions designation criteria as one of the factors to evaluate.</p> <p><i>b. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria</i></p> <p>Staff recommends striking though existing language with no further reference.</p> <p><i>Whether the allowed uses are compatible with nearby uses</i></p>	