

F. ACTION ITEMS.

F1. Presentation on proposed Ordinance amendments to Inactive Projects (County Staff, Bronwyn Brown). Chairman Riggs introduced County Planning Manager Bronwyn Brown, and invited her to make her presentation regarding Ordinance Amendments for Inactive/Idle Projects. Ms. Brown provided everyone a printed handout of slides (used ordinarily in a projected presentation), to which she referred while explaining a number of issues regarding the County's management of the planning process for proposed discretionary projects that have become inactive or idle during the ordinary permit approval process. During her presentation and discussion of questions she mentioned that currently the County's on-going management of 120 inactive projects is expensive and inefficient for County staff; that she was not aware of any currently inactive/idle project applications pending from the Subregion, but she could determine the status regarding activity of any project previously reviewed by the Group on request; that the intent of the proposed amendments is to alter the current process and make it simpler to keep a project active, to reactivate it when necessary, to withdraw it from further consideration, and to replace the current County denial process for closing out an inactive/idle project with an automatic withdrawal process that could be modified by certain specific extenuating circumstances.

Planning Group member Tim Lucas expressed concerns about the potential for an inactive/idle project application to be given extensions of time amounting to more than 7 years of ineffective planning process; and also that a project proposed, and reviewed by the community 7 years in the past, if reactivated after 7 years of inactivity to begin progress towards approval, may now in the current circumstances have significant impacts not previously reviewed and considered by the community or the County. Other concerns were raised about the time and costs invested by project applicants for County project planning services; and about the possibility that there has been inadequate community review of the proposed amendments.

Ms. Brown requested that the Planning Group provides any comments it may have as soon as possible, to include them in the documents being prepared for a Planning Commission hearing in January.

Tim Lucas moved that the Planning Group proposes certain changes or additions to the proposed amendments to the ordinance governing Inactive/Idle Projects. Following discussion of various possible wordings of the motion, Lucas accepted friendly amendments to his original motion so that:

Tim Lucas moved that the Planning Group recommends and requests that the proposed Ordinance Amendments for Inactive/Idle Projects include: 1) changing, and shortening to less than 7 years, the cumulative total time a project can remain inactive/idle, before it is finally withdrawn by County action; and 2) addition of the requirement that, if a project which has been inactive for more than 2 years is considered for reactivation, the Community Planning Group must be notified that it may need to provide additional review if the reactivated project has changed significantly from the project plans previously reviewed by the Group.

The motion passed (9 yes; 2 no: Lutz-Partain, Jones; 0 abstain).