Discretionary Review Reform

Planning Commission Policy for Two-Year Trial and Public Evaluation

November 2, 2009





DR REFORM

Implemented Strategies to Improve the Discretionary Review Process

- Improve the internal review process through mandatory Residential Design Team review and written documentation (February 09);
- Define "exceptional and extraordinary circumstances" (June 09);
- Ensure that cases heard by the Commission are identified by them either as one-of-a kind, or a representative of a policy issue that should be incorporated into Design Standards (June 09);
- Adopt a process for updating Design Standards (June 09);
- Adopt timeline for review (June 09);
- Improve the pre-application process through a standardized preapplication packet (July 09); and
- Improve public information through website and provide public access to project-specific information (October 09).



DR REFORM **Remaining Strategies to Improve the Discretionary Review Process** (pending legislative action)

- Require that the DR Requestor demonstrate exceptional and extraordinary circumstances to proceed to a Commission hearing;
- Eliminate option for project sponsors to file DR;
- Offer interested parties the option of "Reconsideration";
- Change name of Design Guidelines to Design Standards; and
- Initiate 24-month trial period for reforms.



DR

Questions from the public hearing on October 19, 2009

- Why should the Commission's Discretionary Review Reform proposal be implemented in full, instead of waiting to first review the elements of the proposal already underway?
- How can we ensure continued public access to and participation in the development review process?





The Importance of Implementing the Entire Proposal

- The Commission wishes to more effectively schedule its time to resolve the City's land-use policy issues
- Setting a definition of exceptional and extraordinary gives the public a more consistent and predictable permit process
- Setting standards will significantly reduce or eliminate inappropriate financial exchanges
- Department resources do not allow for enforcement of pre-application and improved internal review processes and continued work on DR requests that are not exceptional and extraordinary





DRAFT ACTION PLAN 2008-2010

Proposed Internal Review Procedures





Opportunities for Public Input

- Pre-application meeting
- Reconsideration request
- Face-to-face meetings with planner
- All review materials, including RDT decision-making, available to the public
- Public inclusion in the reporting procedures: weekly updates, quarterly reports, and complete evaluation
- Appeal options







DR

Reporting Procedures: Each aspect includes public comment

Interim period review: time between Planning Commission adoption & effective date of legislation

- Ensure that staff's application of "exceptional and extraordinary circumstances" is aligned with the Commission's past decisions.
- Inform the Commission, for each DR heard, if the case meets the "exceptional and extraordinary" threshold.

24-month trial period: time after effective date of legislation

- DR Decisions included in Commission packets
- Weekly updates about DR under Director's Report
- Quarterly update hearings on policy-related topics





Revisions to the Design Standards: All with public outreach and engagement, and public comment

- Identify emerging planning issues and elements of the Design Standards that require clarification (quarterly reports),
- Use precedent-setting Commission decisions on DR as policy guidance for review of future projects (ongoing),
- Have brown-bag discussions with Commissioners, neighborhood groups, and design professionals to shape amendments to Design Standards (two or more during trial period),
- Amend the Design Standards via Zoning Administrator bulletins, to reflect the Commission's policy guidance as individual policies are identified (as needed), and
- Prepare global amendments to Design Standards.





Intended Benefits of DR Reform

- Early community engagement and improved communication
- Realistic expectation setting
- Stronger internal review procedures resulting in higher quality development
- Commission review and resolution of policy issues resulting in improved Design Standards
- A more consistent and predictable permit process





Notes

