

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>Commission Discussion, 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><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>Commission Discussion, 7/8/20 Commissioners also discussed the possibility of amendment proposals being equal or substantially equal in their need for staff resources and budget. Commissioners acknowledged that one of their roles is not only to apply threshold decisions criteria on amendment proposals but to also work with staff to prioritize docketed items to get them queued up for review by the Planning Commission. Commissioners identified other considerations that might come into play depending on the scope or the</p>	<p>Opened 6/24/20 Closed 7/8/20</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
(Captain/East/Knopff)	<p>proposal. Not to rule out other valid considerations, the criterion is revised to read:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;</u> <u>ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</u> <u>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</u> <u>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</u> 	
<p>3. Council rationale Can language be included to specify how Council shares their reasoning when proposals are deferred? (Captain)</p>	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> In the proposed new code section 6, it states: <u>Council Review.</u> <u>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>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> <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>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>Commission Discussion, 7/22/20 The Planning Commission was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>4. “no net loss” Regarding criterion 9c which policies in the Comprehensive Plan cite <i>no net loss</i>? (Varadharajan, Shefrin)</p>	<p>A scan of the Comprehensive Plan revealed two policies that cite <i>no net loss</i>:</p> <p>HO-17 In the Housing Element: 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.</p> <p>NE-113 in the Natural Environment Element: Maintain no net loss of significant trees within the City over the long term.</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>Commission Discussion, 7/22/20</p>	<p>Opened 7/8/20 Closed 7/22/20</p>
<p>5. What are some options to address criteria for land use and rezones (zoning map)</p>	<p>Existing Criterion 3f states, <i>Whether the allowed uses are compatible with nearby uses</i>;</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Upon reviewing the codes from surrounding jurisdictions and taking another look at our existing code and policies, staff recommends striking existing criterion 3.f with no further</p>	<p>Opened 7/8/20 Closed 7/22/20</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>changes?</p> <p>(All)</p>	<p>reference for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Comprehensive Plan (PI-16) already includes criteria applicable to comprehensive plan amendments and land use designation changes. 2. Existing criterion b in the same section already addresses designation criteria. <p style="margin-left: 40px;">“b. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria”</p> 3. For rezone (zoning map) requests: RZC 21.070 already lays out applicable criteria for rezones as set forth below: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><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> 2. <i>The amendment bears a substantial relation to the public health and safety;</i> 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> 4. <i>The subject property is suitable for development in general conformance with zoning standards under the proposed zoning district;</i> 5. <i>The amendment will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property;</i> 6. <i>Adequate public facilities and services are likely to be available to serve the development allowed by the proposed zone;</i> 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>Commissioner Discussion, 7/22/20 Commissioners discussed the staff recommendation and decided to</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	recommend removal of existing criterion 3.f with the change to be reflected in the 7/17/20 redline draft discussed at the 7/22/20 Commission meeting.	