

RCW 36.70A.470 Project review—Amendment suggestion procedure—

Definitions. (1) Project review, which shall be conducted pursuant to the provisions of chapter 36.70B RCW, shall be used to make individual project decisions, not land use planning decisions. If, during project review, a county or city planning under RCW 36.70A.040 identifies deficiencies in plans or regulations:

(a) The permitting process shall not be used as a comprehensive planning process;

(b) Project review shall continue; and

(c) The identified deficiencies shall be docketed for possible future plan or development regulation amendments.

(2) Each county and city planning under RCW 36.70A.040 shall include in its development regulations a procedure for any interested person, including applicants, citizens, hearing examiners, and staff of other agencies, to suggest plan or development regulation amendments. The suggested amendments shall be docketed and considered on at least an annual basis, consistent with the provisions of RCW 36.70A.130.

(3) For purposes of this section, a deficiency in a comprehensive plan or development regulation refers to the absence of required or potentially desirable contents of a comprehensive plan or development regulation. It does not refer to whether a development regulation addresses a project's probable specific adverse environmental impacts which the permitting agency could mitigate in the normal project review process.

(4) For purposes of this section, docketing refers to compiling and maintaining a list of suggested changes to the comprehensive plan or development regulations in a manner that will ensure such suggested changes will be considered by the county or city and will be available for review by the public. [1995 c 347 § 102.]

Findings—Intent—1995 c 347 § 102: "The legislature finds that during project review, a county or city planning under RCW 36.70A.040 is likely to discover the need to make various improvements in comprehensive plans and development regulations. There is no current requirement or process for applicants, citizens, or agency staff to ensure that these improvements are considered in the plan review process. The legislature also finds that in the past environmental review and permitting of proposed projects have been used to reopen and make land use planning decisions that should have been made through the comprehensive planning process, in part because agency staff and hearing examiners have not been able to ensure consideration of all issues in the local planning process. The legislature further finds that, while plans and regulations should be improved and refined over time, it is unfair to penalize applicants that have submitted permit applications that meet current requirements. It is the intent of the legislature in enacting RCW 36.70A.470 to establish a means by which cities and counties will docket suggested plan or development regulation amendments and ensure their consideration during the planning process." [1995 c 347 § 101.]

Finding—1995 c 347: "The legislature recognizes by this act that the growth management act is a fundamental building block of regulatory reform. The state and local governments have invested considerable resources in an act that should serve as the integrating framework for all other land-use related laws. The growth management

act provides the means to effectively combine certainty for development decisions, reasonable environmental protection, long-range planning for cost-effective infrastructure, and orderly growth and development." [1995 c 347 § 1.]

Severability—1995 c 347: "If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected." [1995 c 347 § 901.]

Part headings and table of contents not law—1995 c 347: "Part headings and the table of contents as used in this act do not constitute any part of the law." [1995 c 347 § 902.]