

7

Peter Harris
LEG Comp Plan docket criteria RES
August 1, 2012
Version #1

CITY OF SEATTLE
RESOLUTION 31402

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

A RESOLUTION relating to the Comprehensive Plan; amending the criteria by which proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are selected for analysis and possible adoption, and repealing versions of the criteria adopted in Resolutions 30662, 30766, 30860, 30976, 31049, 31117, 31146, 31233 and 31313.

WHEREAS, Resolution 30662 in 2004 established criteria for selecting proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for analysis and possible adoption, a process known as setting the Comprehensive Plan docket; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 31146, which set the Comprehensive Plan docket for 2010, revised these criteria, but this revision included a conjunction implying that an amendment would be appropriate if it met any of five criteria, when the actual intent was to require that an amendment meet all five; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 31313, which set the Comprehensive Plan docket for 2012, also revised the criteria, by adding a conjunction implying that an amendment would be practical if it met any of four criteria, when the actual intent was to require that an amendment meet all four; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 31146 referred to the criteria as guidelines, and Resolution 31313 referred to them as guidelines and factors, and the intent and practice has been and is that they serve as criteria; and

WHEREAS, City of Seattle representatives to the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) General Assembly have voted in favor of the PSRC's Vision 2040 strategy, and therefore Seattle's Comprehensive Plan amendments should be consistent with the multi-county policies contained in the Vision 2040 strategy;

WHEREAS, the efficient use of the public resources required to develop, review, select and incorporate Comprehensive Plan amendments and the quality of the Comprehensive Plan itself would be enhanced if amendments were required to meet an additional criterion, namely, that the amendment is likely to make a material difference in a City regulatory or funding decision; and

WHEREAS, the criteria can be otherwise clarified without changing their intent;

NOW, THEREFORE,



1 **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE**
2 **MAYOR CONCURRING, THAT:**

3
4 Section 1. The criteria for selecting proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments for
5 analysis and possible adoption most recently adopted in Resolution 31313 are amended as
6 follows:

7 ((Guidelines)) Criteria for Amendment Selection. The City Council considers a variety of
8 ((factors)) criteria in determining whether a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment will be
9 placed on the amendment docket for a given year. Among those ((factors)) criteria are the
10 following((-:)):

11 A. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:

12 1. ((The amendment)) It is consistent with the role of the Comprehensive Plan under the
13 State Growth Management Act;

14 2. ((The amendment)) It is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the
15 multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy;

16 3. ((The)) Its intent ((of the amendment)) cannot be accomplished by a change in
17 regulations ((only)) alone;

18 4. ((The amendment)) It is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision;
19 ((or)) and;

20 5. ((The amendment)) It is not better addressed through another process, such as
21 neighborhood planning.

22 B. The amendment is legal ((-the amendment meets existing state and local laws)) under
23 state and local law.

24 C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:



1 1. The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient
2 information ~~((necessary))~~ to make an informed decision;

3 2. ~~((Within the time available))~~ City staff will be able to develop within the time available
4 the text for ~~((the amendments to))~~ the Comprehensive Plan and, if necessary, amendments to the
5 Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review;

6 3. The ~~((proposed))~~ amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the
7 Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council
8 ~~((is interested in significantly))~~ wishes to consider changing the vision or ((existing)) established
9 policy; ((or)) and

10 4. The amendment has not been recently rejected by the City Council.

11 D. ~~((There has been a neighborhood review process to develop any proposed change to a~~
12 ~~neighborhood plan, or a neighborhood review process can be conducted))~~ If the amendment
13 would change a neighborhood plan, it either is the result of a neighborhood review process or
14 can be reviewed by such a process prior to final Council consideration of the amendment.

15 E. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or
16 funding decision.

17
18 Section 2. Consistent with the procedures for amending the Comprehensive Plan defined
19 in Resolution 31117, the Council requests that the Department of Planning & Development
20 (DPD) and the Seattle Planning Commission apply the criteria in Section 1 when recommending
21 amendments for future Comprehensive Plan dockets. The Council also requests that DPD update
22 the form for proposing Comprehensive Plan amendments accordingly.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Section 3. Versions of the criteria for selecting proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments for analysis and possible adoption that were adopted in Resolutions 30662, 30766, 30860, 30976, 31049, 31117, 31146, 31233 and 31313 are repealed.

Adopted by the City Council the ____ day of _____, 2012, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this _____ day of _____, 2012.

President _____ of the City Council

THE MAYOR CONCURRING:

Michael McGinn, Mayor

Filed by me this ____ day of _____, 2012.

Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

(Seal)



FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Legislative	Peter Harris / 684-8368	n.a.

Legislation Title:

A RESOLUTION relating to the Comprehensive Plan; amending the criteria by which proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are selected for analysis and possible adoption, and repealing versions of the criteria adopted in Resolutions 30662, 30766, 30860, 30976, 31049, 31117, 31146, 31233 and 31313.

Summary of the Legislation:

This resolution amends the criteria for placing proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments on the docket for possible adoption in the subsequent year. It makes two corrections in logical conjunctions within the criteria so that the criteria correspond to the original intent and current practice, adds a reference to the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy, adds a new criterion requiring that amendments be likely to make a material difference in City action, and makes some minor stylistic improvements.

Background:

The background for the resolution is described in the recitals.

x This legislation does not have any financial implications.

(Please skip to "Other Implications" section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?

The resolution potentially reduces the number of amendments the Executive and Council will consider, which would reduce the time required to analyze and consider such amendments.

b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

None.

c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?



The resolution asks the Department of Planning & Development and the Seattle Planning Commission to apply the criteria.

- d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?**

None.

- e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

No.

- f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**

No.

- g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

No.

- h) Other Issues:**