

2018 Docket Matrix – Approved by Council 3/6/18

Subject: **2018 Docket of Plan and Code Amendments**

Meeting Date: March 6, 2018

Staff Contacts: Gary Hasseler, Interim Community Development Director
Bruce Blackburn, Senior Planner
Dave Boyd, Senior Planner

Bothell Municipal Code 11.18.030 provides that “Amendments to the comprehensive plan, a subarea plan, or development regulations may be suggested by any person, including applicants, citizens, hearing examiners and staff of other agencies.” (Partial)

BMC 11.18.060 states, “The City Council shall initiate consideration of suggested amendments by motion.” Staff endeavors to bring suggested or requested amendments to the Council during the first quarter of each year. These suggested amendments is known as the “Docket.” Thus, the ‘2018 Docket’.

Within the attached matrix each docket item is assigned a number, a description of the amendment, who requested the amendment, a short analysis of the amendment, the estimated staff hours each docket item will require, a Staff recommendation, whether the amendment supports a Council Goal, is a Federal or State mandate or is optional subject to Council preference.

Work tasks have been categorized as:

- Mandatory – Items that must be completed in 2018 due to federal, state, Court, or other requirements
- Supports a Council Goal – Items that should be completed in 2018 because they are based upon a Council Goal
- Optional - Council Preference 2018 - Items that are assigned a priority based upon Council preference and are recommended for 2018
- Optional - Council Preference 2019 - Items that are assigned a priority based upon Council preference and are recommended for 2019.
- Defer – Defer to future Dockets

2018 Staff Resources

Typically each annual Docket contains more work items than available staff resources. The end result is that over the years Docket items have “piled up”, with some items remaining on the Docket for several years before they are able to be addressed. As part of the annual Docket process, staff has historically asked Council to re-affirm those older Docket items and determine whether they are still warranted for consideration.

Since 1990 the number of FTEs tasked with long-range planning activities has halved, from four to two. In addition, there is no longer a manager assigned to the Long-Range Planning Division. Over that period, the population of the City has increased from 12,345 in 1990 to over 45,000 today. Thus, there has been a direct inverse relationship between the City’s growth and the amount of staff resources devoted to long-range planning activities. The chart below illustrates this history.

Year	Long-Range Planning Positions (and FTE Count)				Total FTEs	City Population
1990	LRP Manager (1)	Associate Planner (1)	Associate Planner (1)	Assistant Planner (1)	4	12,345
2005	LRP Manager (1)	Senior Planner (1)	Senior Planner (1)		3	31,000
2006/2007	Planning Manager (0.5)	Senior Planner (1)	Senior Planner (1)		2.5	31,690
2016 (Sept.)		Senior Planner (1)	Senior Planner (1)		2	43,980

As noted above, the Long Range Planning Division currently consists of two Senior Planners (Bruce Blackburn and Dave Boyd). Currently, the Division reports directly to the Community Development Director. While the Director technically oversees the daily work of the Division, his involvement in Plan and Code amendments is limited to oversight and review. Thus, as shown above, there are effectively two FTEs (Full Time Employees) available to work on Plan and Code amendments.

The time available for the two existing FTEs to work on Plan and Code amendments can be broken down further to exclude items such as vacation, training, administration, regional planning, inter departmental coordination, and other work tasks not directly associated with Plan and Code amendments. Staff has estimated that between the two Senior Planners there are approximately 2,200 staff hours available in the calendar year to work on initiated Plan and Code amendments (i.e. initiated Docket items) because Long Range Planning staff also allocates hours to non-docket activities such as supporting regional cooperation, coordinating with other City Departments, Development Services and assisting the general public.

Further, staff has analyzed the proposed 2018 Docket and estimated that if all of the proposed items were initiated by Council for 2018, the required staff hours would be approximately 3,400 leaving a shortfall of approximately 1,000 staff hours. Staff's estimates are based on approximately 30 years of experience working on such projects. Staff has provided an estimate of the required work hours for each proposed Docket item in the matrix below to assist Council with deciding which Docket items to initiate, and is recommending a proposed priority of those items.

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
Mandatory - Items required by Federal or State law or Court decisions					
1	<p>Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Periodic Update (New)</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable, including specific text and/or map to be amended: Sammamish River, North Creek, Swamp Creek (within MUGA) and lands within 200 feet of those water bodies</p> <p>Requested amendment: This is a State-mandated update of the City's SMP with the primary emphasis being updating the SMP to reflect new RCW and WAC amendments and to address changed local circumstances and to improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the SMP. See also #2 for related item.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Initiate this Code amendment as a Mandatory priority in 2018. Completion must be no later than June 30, 2019.</i></p>	Initiated 3/6/18	SB	250	Mandatory (State) 2018 and 2019
2	<p>Code amendments to the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO):</p> <p>1) Align with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) guidelines regarding floodplain management;</p> <p>2) Clarify regulations concerning fish and wildlife habitat (stream), within the critical areas regulations; and</p> <p>3) Adopt the latest version of the Department of Ecology Wetlands Rating System. These three items will be processed together with the SMP Update (see #1 above).</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City-wide</p> <p>Requested amendment, including specific text and/or map to be amended, or other action.</p> <p>A. FEMA has requested revisions to the City's critical areas regulations to i) update definitions within Chapter 14.04), and ii) revise critical areas reports requirements to align with FEMA habitat assessment and mitigation guidance.</p> <p>B. Bothell Municipal Code 14.04.900 designates which areas comprise fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. However, while the definitions for the critical areas regulations define the terms "stream" and "watercourse", BMC 14.04.900 does not use the terms at all (the term "habitat" is used almost exclusively). This</p>	Council initiated these items in 2015 and again in 2016, 2017 and 2018	BMC 14.04 changes - refer to the PC SMP changes – refer to SB	150	Mandatory because it can be linked with SMP Update above (Federal and State) 2018

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
	<p>has led to confusion and difficulty in interpreting the entire section relating to fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas (i.e. BMC 14.04.900 through 14.04.930).</p> <p>C. 3. The Washington State Department of Ecology is responsible for providing technical guidance for classifying wetlands and issuing a wetland rating system. In 2014 Ecology amended its wetland rating system which needs to be reflected in BMC 14.04.500(B)</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Re-affirm work on these Code amendments as a mandatory item in 2018, with SMP amendments assigned to the new Shorelines Board, once convened.</i></p>				
3	<p>Code amendment to 12.11 to Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF) regarding 'small cell' facilities (New)</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff/Legal</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: Entire Planning Area.</p> <p>Requested amendments: The Federal Commination Commission (FCC) has mandated that communities adopt WCF regulations which permit small cell facilities. Small cell facilities are small antennas and equipment placed upon individual light and street poles, the sides of buildings and other locations which can be used to cover gaps in coverage. This amendment would incorporate small cell facilities into the City's WCF regulations of BMC 12.11</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Initiate this Code amendment as a mandatory item in 2018.</i></p>	Initiated 3/6/18	PC	50 Legal will have consider- able hours devoted to this task	Mandatory (Federal and State) 2018

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
Supporting Council Goals					
4	<p><i>Plan and Code Amendments for Updating the Canyon Park Regional Growth Center (CPRGC) – Second Phase which involves Subarea Plan and Code amendments</i></p> <p><u>Person or organization making request:</u> Staff</p> <p><u>Subject property, if applicable, including specific text and/or map to be amended.</u> Property within the Canyon Park Regional Growth Center, and potentially other parcels.</p> <p><u>Requested amendment:</u> This would be the second phase of this effort. The first phase was the visioning project. The second phase will be the Subarea Plan and Code amendments needed to implement the vision. The second phase will also include detailed transportation analysis, identification of capital projects, investigation of funding sources, and other details needed to update the Canyon Park RGC including how to incorporate housing, and affordable housing.</p> <p>A community visioning process has been completed (February 2018) and Staff will brief the Council and Planning Commission in the first quarter of 2018.</p> <p>The second phase has major budget implications because of the need for extensive consultant assistance. Staff estimates that the total budget could be \$500,000 or more.</p> <p>Options: This project could be divided into individual components to match funding realities. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Craft new or different Plan Designations / Zoning Classifications /regulations (\$100K); B. Item 1 plus hire a consultant to conduct traffic modeling and identification of improvements (\$250K) ; C. Items 1 and 2 plus hire a consultant to assist with creation of urban design standards (\$350K); D. Items 1, 2, and 3 plus, hire a consultant to craft a 'planned action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (\$500K)); E. Do all of the above (\$ 500K) <p><u>Staff recommendation:</u> <i>Re-affirm initiation of this Plan and Code amendment as a Council Goal to be commenced this year (2018).</i></p>	Council initiated this item in 2016	Visioning Project complete	800 with consultant support (depends on funding). Other Departments will also devote many hours to this task	<p>Council Goal</p> <p>2018</p> <p>This item will likely extend into 2019</p>

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
5	<p>A) Review and update of the Housing Strategy; and B) Potential Plan and Code Amendments for Affordable Housing</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City-wide</p> <p>Requested amendment, including specific text and/or map to be amended: This item consists of two parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Council review of a Planning Commission recommended update to the City's Housing Strategy B. Potential Code amendments to require affordable housing provisions when the development capacity of a property is increased (whether through an upzone, changes to development regulations or otherwise) <p>Staff recommendation. <i>Re-affirm initiation of this process and related Code amendments as a Council Goal in 2018</i></p>	Council initiated this item in 2016, 2017 and 2018	PC The PC completed its recommendation October 2017	150 with support from ARCH Staff. Hours needed may increase depending on Council action 5/1/18.	Council Goal 2018 Public hearing on 5/1/18
Optional - Council preference 2018					
6	<p>LEAN Process as it is applied to Development Services Initiative (DSI)</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City-wide</p> <p>Requested amendments: Code amendments that will assist staff in applying LEAN management principals as part of the on-going Development Services re-organization to improve processing and review of development applications.</p> <p>Initial code amendments identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. <u>Establish a Site Plan Review Process.</u> Consider creating a site plan entitlement process where the City reviews and approves an applicant's site layout, parking, building placement, critical areas buffering, and other site features prior to submitting for detailed building or grading plans. B. <u>Increase the number of lots through the short plat process - up to 9 lots.</u> Chapter 15.08 limits the number of lots allowed to be approved through the administrative- 	Initiated in 2017 and 2018	PC C, D, E and G should be finished by PC 3/21/18	A – 250 B – 150 C – 50 D – 50 E – 50 F- 100 G - 50 All – 700 550 w/o B	Optional - Council Preference 2018 but defer item B to 2019 – Other items could also extend into 2019 Please note that some of these tasks can be done in either

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
	<p>approved short subdivision process to 4 or fewer. State law allows jurisdictions to approve up to 9 lots via the short subdivision process (most surrounding jurisdictions have adopted this higher number) which would considerably reduce processing time for both applicants and staff for these smaller-scale subdivisions.</p> <p>C. <u>Remove the 'sign' noticing requirement for Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF).</u> Currently, the WCF provisions of Chapter 12.11 require that new WCFs post a public notice sign for even small antennas or control boxes. Because the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) has authority over WCFs the City of Bothell cannot prohibit the installation of a WCF leading to confusion for citizens who may desire to provide comments.</p> <p>D. <u>Expand the list of 'minor modifications' allowed to an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to include minor expansions.</u> The current modification criteria do not allow an increase in the square footage of any non-residential building meaning that even a minimal expansion is required to go through the full CUP Public Hearing process. Staff should have authority to allow minor expansions of existing CUPs.</p> <p>E. <u>Housekeeping Code amendments.</u> These minor housekeeping amendments correct internal inconsistencies, better align with State law, and correct references.</p> <p>F. <u>Amend Title 20 (Building Code).</u> To clarify a number of provisions to better align with the International Building Code, better organize the Title, and identify staff roles and responsibilities for the different types of permits</p> <p>G. <u>Amend the Rezone Chapter of 12.38 to better align with City practices.</u> Comprehensive Plan designations and zoning classifications are the same, which means, before a rezone can occur there first must be a Comprehensive Plan amendment. In other words, there are no stand-alone rezones. However, this Chapter infers there are such rezones and should be amended to remove this confusion.</p> <p><u>Staff recommendation.</u> <i>Re-affirm initiation of Code amendments to implement improvements to Development Services through the LEAN Process as an Optional - Council Preference, but establish these as important Code amendments to be accommodated in 2018 as resources allow. Assign Task 'B' as a 2019 item.</i></p>				2018 or 2019.

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
7	<p>Code amendments to the Downtown Subarea regulations.</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property: Downtown Subarea</p> <p>Requested amendment: The proposed Code amendments would continue to refine the Downtown Subarea regulations as staff and applicants work with the regulations and discover areas for improvement. .</p> <p>A. Possible revision of parking requirements (related to the parking management plan).</p> <p>B. Initiate amendments to the provisions regarding public open space to achieve better outcomes and better coordinate those requirements with park impact mitigation.</p> <p>C. Rezone lands with GC zoning to SR 522 Corridor as recommended by PC in 2015. Having a citywide zoning classification inside the Downtown Subarea has been problematic and confusing to staff and property owners who must navigate between two different Codes.</p> <p>D. Consider amendments to clarify and improve design review process in BMC 12.64.505.A.3 (Added by Council on 3/6/18, with possible Title 22 amendments).</p> <p>Staff recommendation. Staff recommends that Council authorize work on this Code amendment as an <i>Optional - Council Preference</i> to be completed in 2018.</p>	<p>Council initiated A in 2016, 2017 and 2018</p> <p>B, C and D initiated 3/6/18</p>	<p>Council retained A for itself in 2016</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>Optional - Council Preference 2018</p>
8	<p>Code amendments to Title 22, Landmark Preservation, specifically sections regarding Historic District regulations and reports for demolitions</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: Concerns have been raised regarding the need to streamline some of the structure demolition rules of Title 22, and to address some issues with regard to establishing historic districts.</p> <p>Requested amendments:</p> <p>A. Streamline requirements for demolition of properties on the historic inventory that pose life safety issues and/or have little potential historic value.</p> <p>B. Address issues that have arisen with the establishment of historic districts.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Re-affirm initiation of these Code amendments as an Optional - Council Preference, to be completed in 2018.</i></p>	<p>Council initiated this item in 2017 and 2018</p>	<p>LPB</p>	<p>50 (hours reduced since LPB has completed work)</p>	<p>Optional - Council Preference 2018</p>

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
Optional - Council preference 2019					
9	<p>Amend BMC 12.06.140.B.12 so that “Residential Care Facility” actually reads “Assisted Living Facility”, consistent with the definition and state regulations (could be combined with DSI amendments or other housekeeping items)</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City-wide</p> <p>Requested amendment: Proposed amendments to BMC 12.06.140.B.12 so that “Residential Care Facility” actually reads “Assisted Living Facility”, consistent with the definition and revising current code language to be consistent with other state regulations for such facilities as detailed in RCW 18.20. Having different terms and regulations in the BMC than the state creates confusion for staff, applicants and the public.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Re-affirm initiation of this Code amendment as an Optional - Council Preference to be completed in 2019</i></p>	Council initiated this item 2016, 2017 and 2018	PC	100	Optional - Council Preference 2019
10	<p>Review of BMC Chapter 12.22: Signs and potential Code amendments in light of the US Supreme Court ruling in <u>Reed vs Town of Gilbert, Arizona</u> in June, 2015</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City-wide</p> <p>Requested amendment: The U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling in <i>Reed vs Town of Gilbert, Arizona</i> in June, 2015 has ramifications for Bothell sign regulations. The February, 2016 issue of <u>Zoning Practice</u> noted: “While the sign code provisions challenged in <i>Reed</i> involved only the regulations of temporary noncommercial signs, the Court’s 6-3 majority decision... likely applies to the regulation of permanent signs, business signs, and possibly, on-site versus off-site signs.” The Court’s decision essentially concerns the regulation of signs based on sign content, and while the issue is obvious with relation to some signs, it is more subtle and may have farther reaching consequences for the City’s sign regulations. The proposed Code amendments would review the City’s sign regulations with respect to <i>Reed vs Town of Gilbert, Arizona</i> and recommend revisions to be consistent with the decision, as necessary.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Re-affirm initiation consideration of this Code amendment as an Optional – Council preference in 2019.</i></p>	Council initiated this item in 2016, 2017 and 2018	PC	100 Legal Department will be heavily involved in this work task	Optional - Council Preference 2019

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
11	<p>Code amendments to revise the current adult entertainment regulations</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Individuals attending the 2015 Docket Public Hearing.</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: Would apply City wide.</p> <p>Requested amendment, including specific text and/or map to be amended: This item was added to the Docket after an individual petitioned the Council to initiate proposed Code amendments regarding adult entertainment as it pertains to two espresso stands in the City (Beehive Espresso and Paradise Espresso).</p> <p>Following input from the City Attorney, Council initiated Code amendments to clarify the current regulations pertaining to adult entertainment.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Re-affirm initiation of this Code amendment but defer to 2019.</i></p>	Council initiated this item in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018	CC	50 Legal Department will be the lead with assistance from CD	Optional - Council Preference 2019
12	<p>Nike Hill / Shelton View and Queensborough Plan and Code amendments</p> <p>Person or organization making request: MC Coast Equities and Bashir Malik</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: Lands surrounding the Intersection of Meridian Avenue and 228th Street plus two DNR parcels, and the FEMA/Army Reserve Center</p> <p>Requested amendment: Create zoning to implement the neighborhood activity center as identified within the <i>Imagine Bothell...</i> Comprehensive Plan including the MC Coast and Bashir Malik properties.</p> <p>This Plan amendment also involves the Army Reserve/FEMA Federal Facility (former Nike Missile Site), two Department of Natural Resources (DNR) properties of 26 and 7 acres and the Shelton View Elementary school.</p> <p>Planning Commission Recommendation: Apply three story (35 feet) Residential Activity Center and mixed use zoning classifications around the intersection of Meridian Avenue and 228th Street SE/SW, but retain the existing zoning classifications for the majority of the study area, including the MC Coast parcel and the 26 acre DNR-1 parcel, and acquire both of those parcels as parkland at the earliest opportunity. A mandatory affordable housing requirement for the lands proposed for upzoning was part of the PC recommendation, but has been moved to Item 5 for consideration before individual upzones.</p> <p>This Plan and Code amendment implements an existing Comprehensive Plan Policy, involved considerable public input and led to a renewed effort to acquire the 26 acre</p>	Council initiated this item in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018	PC PC has completed its recommendation	50	Optional - Council Preference 2019

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
	<p>DNR parcel and MC Coast properties, as well as applies Plan designations more suitable for the busy intersection of Meridian Avenue and 228th Street.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Re-affirm initiation as an Optional Council Preference and consider these Plan and Code amendments in 2018 if time allows, but defer to 2019.</i></p>				
13	<p>South Riverside Plan and Code amendment</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Rob Fuhriman – Council adopted the applicants initial request and authorized potential expansion of the rezone to include consideration of all R 9,600 properties between I-405 and the current limits of the Specialized Senior Housing Overlay (SSHO) zone and whether expansion of the SSHO should be considered.</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: The R 9,600 land south of East Riverside Drive.</p> <p>Requested amendment: Re-designate to R 7,200, with a possible expansion of the SSHO</p> <p>Planning Commission Recommendation: The Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation to assign an R 7,200 Plan designation to the area with a mandatory affordable housing component at certain thresholds.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Re-affirm initiation as an Optional Council Preference and consider these Plan and Code amendments in 2018 if time allows, but defer to 2019.</i></p>	<p>Council initiated this item in 2015, 2016 and 2017.</p> <p>In 2018, Council removed this item from the Docket.</p>	<p>PC completed its recommendation</p>		<p>Do Not Consider Further</p>
14	<p>Comprehensive Update to the Landscape Regulations of BMC 12.18 (New): While updating tree retention requirements, it was observed that the current landscaping regulations are geared primarily toward a suburban style of development. Further, these regulations have not been comprehensively updated since the early 1990s.</p> <p>While a comprehensive review of the landscape regulations is warranted, this item is not time-critical as is true of other items which have a higher priority.</p> <p>Person or organization making request: Staff</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City-wide.</p> <p>Requested amendments: Update the regulations to reflect the many different types of development patterns now established within the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: <i>Initiate this item for 2019</i></p>	<p>Initiated 3/6/18</p>	<p>PC</p>	<p>250</p>	<p>Optional - Council Preference</p> <p>2019</p>

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
15	<p>Code amendments regarding Safe Injection Sites (New)</p> <p>Person or organization making request: City</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City wide.</p> <p>Requested amendment: Heroin and Opioid addiction is an increasingly dangerous public health epidemic resulting in hundreds of deaths in King and Snohomish County each year. Health officials have identified that safe injection sites may be one of many strategies needed to address this epidemic. Safe injection sites have been approved for this region (but not opened): one to be located within the City of Seattle and another to be located within unincorporated King County. There are many different types of safe injection site facilities ranging from simple drug consumption rooms to supervised injection sites offering counseling, nurses, and other services.</p> <p>Currently, the City's zoning regulations do not directly address safe injection sites, meaning safe injection sites are not permitted. Accordingly, not initiating this Code amendments maintains the status quo - safe injection sites are not permitted.</p> <p>However, Council may choose to initiate the item to explore the policy implications of such uses, or the Council may choose to explicitly state in the Zoning Code that whether or not such uses are permitted.</p> <p>Initiating this Code amendment only directs staff to begin an investigation and analysis of these facilities. Initiation does not commit the City to a future action and does NOT authorize safe injection sites in any manner whatsoever. If initiated, the public would have many opportunities to provide input regarding this issue.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Because this is a Council policy issue, staff has no formal recommendation.</i></p>	Initiated 3/6/18	PC	150 Legal Department will have considerable time into this effort	Optional - Council preference 2019
16	<p>Code amendments to create a Design Review Board</p> <p>Person or organization making request: City</p> <p>Subject property, if applicable: City wide.</p> <p>Requested amendment, including specific text and/or map to be amended: This amendment would explore creation of a new City Board/Commission that would be known as the Design Review Board (DRB). Design review involves the evaluation of a proposed development's appearance, architectural design, setting, and consistency with established City Standards. Design review is most commonly applied to larger projects such as multiple family or commercial developments and is rarely applied to single family residential (though it does happen in some jurisdictions).</p>	Not Initiated, pending review of Downtown Development at a Council Study Session and	Not initiated (see left)	350 Not initiated. This action would also require review of the City's existing design	Optional - Council preference Not initiated

No.	Suggested Plan and/or Code amendment or other proposed activity with staff recommendation	Status/ Initiated/ When initiated	Refer to PC, LPB, SB, or retained for CC	Estimated CD Staff Hours	Proposed Priority
	<p>A DRB could be either advisory (providing a recommendation to the decision body) or could have decision authority (approval or denial of a building design). If advisory, the Board's recommendation would be taken into consideration by the decision body whether that was the Hearing Examiner or the Director. If the Board has approval or denial authority, such an action would be considered quasi-judicial.</p> <p>Either choice would require the creation of rules of procedure, but quasi-judicial hearings require a much higher level of legal proceeding including testimony under oath, exacting findings, and conclusions that are based upon the Code. Whether, an advisory or decision making body, a DRB would place a significant burden on development review staff who would be responsible for creating these documents and guiding the Board through the process. DRBs are usually comprised of design professionals such as architects, landscape architects, urban designers, and other similar professionals.</p> <p>Note: A DRB can only apply the City's adopted design regulations as they exist. Whether the Board is advisory or quasi-judicial, recommendations or decisions made by the Board must be based upon the City's adopted design regulations. Requiring an architectural element that is not in the regulations, or limiting a development to a smaller scale or footprint than that allowed by Code could result in legal claims against the City.</p> <p>Options: If the Council is concerned with the appearance or design of buildings another option would be to revise the City's adopted design standards of BMC 12.14, or those established within, for example, the Downtown Plan. Even with a DRB such design code amendments would likely be required.</p> <p>Staff recommendation: <i>Defer at this time. This action would have measurable long-term impacts upon staff resources – particularly to Development Review Staff. Current staff resources are not sufficient to absorb this type of added review procedure.</i></p>	amendments to Design Review Process (Item 7.D)		<p>regulations which may have a budget implication (hiring a consultant to assist: ~\$150K)</p> <p>This action would also have a long-term impact on development review resources</p>	
	Total estimated Long Range Planning work hours in this Matrix			3,150	
	Estimated Long Range Staff Hours available in 2018			2,136	
	Mandatory priorities – Long Range Planning hours proposed for 2018			450	
	Council Goals - Long Range Planning hours proposed for 2018			950	
	Optional – Council preferences – Long Range Planning hours proposed for 2018			700	
	Total 2018 Work Tasks proposed for Long Range Planning			2,100	