

TO: TOWN COUNCIL
FROM: TOWN MANAGER 
RE: DEVELOPMENT PROJECT PROCESSING

ISSUE

Council Member Ucovich asks that the Council consider how development projects are processed.

RECOMMENDATION

Discuss and give direction.

CEQA

There are no CEQA issues at this time however there could be depending on how the Council wishes to proceed.

MONEY

There are no money issues at this time however there could be depending on how the Council wishes to proceed.

DISCUSSION

At the January 2011 meeting Council Member Ucovich asked that Council discuss how development projects are processed. Mr. Ucovich later advised staff that this was in answer to Park, Recreation and Open Space Committee Member Tom Seth's question as to when and how something gets referred to the PROS Committee.

The Park, Recreation and Open Space Committee is not in a direct line of decision making on development projects. They are a recommending body that comments on projects as needed. Specifically they evaluate projects for park, recreation and open space matters. Not all projects include such matters. Projects that do are referred to the PROS Committee by the Council, Planning Commission or Staff as needed.

Ostensibly the Council, Planning Commission and Staff could refer any project to the PROS Committee with or without a reason to do so. Where there has been some confusion is when the PROS Committee has strayed from the yearly Committee work plan, as approved by Council, and when the Committee has been included in matters that are not a part of their tasks or a part of the development review process as specified in the Town Codes. The PROS Committee does not wish to function as another Planning Commission or another Council. Again, the Committee works on

defined projects (Council approved yearly work plan) and on such matters as may be referred by the Council, Planning Commission or Staff.

The review process for development projects is found in the Town Zoning Code at section 13.60.03 Table 6-1 as follows.

| TYPE OF DECISION | ROLE OF REVIEW AUTHORITY (1) | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|----------|
| | Director | Planning Commission | Council |
| Administrative & Legislative | | | |
| Interpretation | Decision (2) | Appeal | Appeal |
| General Plan Amendment | Recommend | Recommend | Decision |
| Specific Plan | Recommend | Recommend | Decision |
| Zoning Map Amendment | Recommend | Recommend | Decision |
| Zoning Ordinance Amendment | Recommend | Recommend | Decision |
| Land Use Permit / Development Approval | | | |
| Zoning Clearance | Decision (2) | Appeal | Appeal |
| Master Development Plan | Recommend | Recommend | Decision |
| Master Sign Plan | Decision (2) | Appeal | Appeal |
| Minor Use Permit (MUP) | Decision (2) | Appeal | Appeal |
| Use Permit (UP) | Recommend | Decision | Appeal |
| Minor Variance | Decision (2) | Appeal | Appeal |
| Variance | Recommend | Decision | Appeal |
| Design Review - Permitted use or MUP | Decision | Appeal | Appeal |
| Design Review - UP use | Recommend | Decision | Appeal |
| Limited Term Prmit | Decision | Appeal | Appeal |
| Sign Permit | Decision (2) | Appeal | Appeal |

NOTES

(1) "Recommend" means that the review authority makes a recommendation to a higher decision-making body; "Decision" means that the review authority makes the final decision on the matter; "Appeal" means that the review authority may consider and decide upon appeals to the decision of an earlier decision-making body, in compliance with Chapter 13.74

(2) The director may defer action and refer the request to the commission, so that the commission may instead make the decision.

Council Member Liss asks that Council also have a general discussion about Council adopting a policy to ensure that major projects come forward for public and Council discussion in a workshop setting before all the plans are drawn up for final approval by PC or TC, like was done for Patterson property and the dentist project at SCB + Taylor.