

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED CODE REVISIONS**

- 1. Revise code to be clear and concise about the intent of the docket process and applicable enabling state legislation.

Proposed Code Revision:

The proposed code includes a revised *Purpose* section. Affirms compliance with GMA by citing exact language in RCW. Specific timelines for consideration and review provides for greater compliance and ensures cumulative effect of proposals are considered simultaneously in accordance with RCW 36.70A.130.

- 2. Require applicants to attend a pre-application meeting. This non-codified requirement is often overlooked by applicants which often results in incomplete applications and amendment proposals that are not actual comprehensive plan amendments.

Proposed Code Revision:

Proposed new code section, *Minimal Application Requirements*. This section communicates clear expectations of applicants. New language provides an early opportunity to refer proposals to more appropriate alternate city processes and ensures more complete applications and an efficient use of applicant and staff resources.

- 3. Require applicants to submit sufficient information and adequate detail. Allow City to request additional information

Proposed Code Revision:

Proposed new code section, *Minimal Application Requirements*. Communicates clear expectations of applicants and staff. To support staff’s ability to do meaningful analysis the applicant is expected to provide additional information, if needed, to assist staff to prepare the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed amendment and to stay within the predetermined schedule for the Annual Review Docket.

- 4. Consider a fee structure to recover staff time and material costs associated with processing proposals.

Proposed Code Revision:

Proposed provision would refer applicants to the Development Services Fee Schedule. Fees are being considered for a Comprehensive Plan amendment, Comprehensive Plan Amendment with Zoning Code Text Amendment, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment with Zoning Code Map Amendment. Adopting new fees would require a separate process with adoption by Council Resolution and possible amendment to RZC 21.76.030, Application Requirements.

- 5. Address ability of Council and Commission to introduce a proposal to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Provide a mechanism for Council and Planning Commissioners to sponsor proposals for further consideration on behalf of applicants who cannot afford to pay the application fee(s).

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED CODE REVISIONS**

Proposed Code Revision:

A new proposed section *Who May Apply*, clearly describes roles of Planning Commission, City Council, and staff in terms of initiating amendment proposals. Includes a provision to allow both Council and Planning Commission to initiate proposals with an affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the total members.

- 6. Redesign the process to include a predictable application period/docketing schedule. Open applications at the same time each year legislatively and include a concurrent cumulative review of approved proposals.

Proposed Code Revision: New code section, *Annual Review Docket Application*, sets annual intake of proposed amendments during first week of April. The new schedule shows major milestones in the annual review docket process and can realistically accommodate a concurrent cumulative review of approved proposals.

- 7. Truly amend the comprehensive plan no more than once per year.

Proposed Code Revision: The proposed code includes two schedules – one for the review of applications, and the second is for final review of each docketed item. The intent is to have all docketed items ready for Council action at the same time, rather than having a serial adoption process as is currently the process where each docketed item is separately considered by Planning Commission and Council.

- 8. Review and revise threshold decision criteria that include terms that are ambiguous or cumbersome to apply when evaluating proposals. (During the 2018-19 docket review process, Councilmembers also identified this as an area of concern).

Proposed Code Revision: Criteria have been revised; references to *timeliness and time consistent* and *concurrent* have been deleted. In striving to be clear of intent, the criteria include phrases such as, “shall consider” or “must meet” whenever possible.

- 9. Revise criteria to consider city priorities, and staff capacity to complete proposals within the docket year.

Proposed Code Revision: New criterion proposed.

- 10. Consider potential efficiencies that may be gained by a streamlined process.

Response:

The proposed docketing process will introduce efficiencies in several administrative and operational procedures related to the docketing process including: consolidating items for public notices, holding public hearings for more than one docketed item during the same Planning Commission meeting, and combining docketed times in one ordinance for final Council action, or two ordinances when there are concurrent zoning amendments. The

**EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED CODE REVISIONS**

proposed process will reduce and potentially eliminate “carry overs”, creating more predictability and transparency for the interested public.

- 11. Reaffirm Council’s legislative discretion over decisions about which proposals get onto the docket, and which docketed proposals get approval as a comprehensive plan amendment

Response: The Planning Commission introduced language that reaffirmed the City Council’s legislative authority over the final docket of proposed amendments.