

Docketing Criteria Analysis

Table 1. Docketing Criteria Analysis Summary.

Item No.	Criterion 1: Appropriately Addressed by Comp Plan or Code	Criterion 2: Necessary Staff and Budget Resources can be Provided by City or Applicant	Criterion 3: Raises an Issue Unrelated to Ongoing Work Program Item	Criterion 4: Serves Public Interest by Implementing Comp Plan Goals or Supports City's Vision	Criterion 5: Has Not Been Considered by the City Council in the Last 3 Years			
27-1	✓	↓	✓	✗	✓			
27-2	✓	—	✗	✗	✓ ₁			
27-3	✓	↓	✓	?	✓			
27-4	✓	↑	✓ ₂	✓	✓			
27-5	✓	↑	✓ ₃	✓	✓			
✓	The proposal could meet this criterion		?	It is unclear or debatable whether the proposal could meet this criterion		✗	The proposal does not meet this criterion	
↑	The proposal is a high priority for staff/budget resources		—	The proposal is a moderate priority for staff/budget resources		↓	The proposal is a low priority for staff/budget resources	

¹ Similar proposal was considered each docket cycle, per 2020-2025. The ADU gross floor area allowance was proposed to be limited to properties smaller than 8,400 sq ft.

² The Shoreline Master Program and Critical Area Ordinance Update are state requirements. This item is not on the existing work plan, compliance with state law is mandatory by June 30, 2029.

³ The Climate Change and Resilience Element Update is a state requirement. This item is not on the existing work plan, compliance with state law is mandatory by June 30, 2029.

Docketing Criteria Analysis

Detailed Docketing Criteria Analysis

The docketing criteria are established in [MICC 19.15.230\(E\)](#), which states:

“E. Docketing criteria. The following criteria shall be used to determine whether a proposed amendment is added to the final docket in subsection D of this section:

1.The request has been filed in a timely manner, and either:

- a. State law requires, or a decision of a court or administrative agency has directed, such a change; or
- b. All of the following criteria are met:
 - i. The proposed amendment presents a matter appropriately addressed through the comprehensive plan or the code;
 - ii. The city can provide the resources, including staff and budget, necessary to review the proposal, or resources can be provided by an applicant for an amendment;
 - iii. The proposal does not raise policy or land use issues that are more appropriately addressed by an ongoing work program item approved by the city council;
 - iv. The proposal will serve the public interest by implementing specifically identified goals of the comprehensive plan or a new approach supporting the city's vision; and
 - v. The essential elements of the proposal and proposed outcome have not been considered by the city council in the last three years. This time limit may be waived by the city council if the proponent establishes that there exists a change in circumstances that justifies the need for the amendment.”

Detailed analysis of each proposal and how it does or does not meet the criteria is provided below.

Docketing Criteria Analysis

Proposal 27-1

MICC Section	Analysis
19.15.230(E)(1)	The proposal was filed in a timely manner between September 1 and October 1 as required by MICC 19.15.230(D)(1)
19.15.230(E)(1)(a)	The proposed amendment is not required by state law, a recent court decision, or administrative agency action. In order to be docketed, the proposal must satisfy the criteria in MICC 19.15.230(E)(1)(b).
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(i)	The proposed amendment would amend the tree code in Chapter 19.10 MICC. This proposal is appropriate to address through a development code amendment.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(ii)	City resources are already committed to other projects required by state law through approximately 2030. The proposed amendment is optional and resources would be unavailable until compliance with state requirements is achieved.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(iii)	The City does not have an existing project to amend Chapter 19.10 MICC on its work plan
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(iv)	The proposal could be inconsistent with some Comprehensive Plan policies directed at retaining tree canopy coverage, including Land Use Element Policy LU 1.7.2, which states: "Manage impacts that could result from new development in residential zones by establishing standards to: [...] 1.7.2 Encourage the retention of landscaped areas and the retention and planting of trees;" and Land Use Element Policy 4.8, which states: "4.8 The City's development regulations should encourage long- term sustainable stewardship of the natural environment. Examples include the preservation and enhancement of native vegetation, tree retention, and rain gardens."
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(v)	The City Council has not considered the proposed amendment in the preceding three years.
Conclusion	The proposed amendment would require resources beyond what will be available in 2027 because the City is already committed to projects necessary to comply with state law.

Docketing Criteria Analysis

Proposal 27-2

MICC Section	Analysis
19.15.230(E)(1)	The proposal was filed in a timely manner between September 1 and October 1 as required by MICC 19.15.230(D)(1)
19.15.230(E)(1)(a)	The proposed amendment is not required by state law, a recent court decision, or administrative agency action. In order to be docketed, the proposal must satisfy the criteria in MICC 19.15.230(E)(1)(b).
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(i)	The proposed amendment would amend the ADU code in Chapter 19.02 MICC. This proposal is appropriate to address through a development code amendment.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(ii)	City resources are already committed to other projects required by state law through approximately 2030. The proposed amendment is optional and resources would be unavailable until compliance with state requirements is achieved.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(iii)	The City already has a project docketed to adopt permanent regulations for ADUs that complies with the state law.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(iv)	The City's comprehensive plan includes several policies directed at ADUs and their role in addressing the City's housing needs such as Housing Element Policy 1.10, which states: "Encourage accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as a housing form that can help to meet housing needs for moderate to low-income households." And Housing Element Policy 5.4, which states: "Consider amending ADU development standards to add flexibility and expand options for developing this type of housing to help meet housing needs for moderate to low-income households." And Housing Element Policy 5.5, which states: "Consider restructuring existing ADU incentives, such as the gross floor area bonus, to require affordable housing." The proposed amendments would affect the ADU incentives, including the gross floor area bonus and so the proposed amendments may need to be modified to be consistent with the City's comprehensive plan.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(v)	The City Council has not considered the proposed amendment in the preceding three years.
Conclusion	The City already has a project on its work plan to adopt permanent regulations for ADUs to comply with the state law. The proposed amendment can be provided as a public comment when the City takes up that project in 2027.

Docketing Criteria Analysis

Proposal 27-3

MICC Section	Analysis
19.15.230(E)(1)	The proposal was filed after October 1, 2025, and must be considered during the following year's docket as required by MICC 19.15.230(D)(1)
19.15.230(E)(1)(a)	The proposed amendment is not required by state law, a recent court decision, or administrative agency action. In order to be docketed, the proposal must satisfy the criteria in MICC 19.15.230(E)(1)(b).
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(i)	The proposed amendment would amend the tree code in Chapter 19.10 MICC. This proposal is appropriate to address through a development code amendment.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(ii)	City resources are already committed to other projects required by state law through approximately 2030. The proposed amendment is optional, and resources would be unavailable until compliance with state requirements is achieved.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(iii)	The City does not have an existing project to amend Chapter 19.10 MICC on its work plan.
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(iv)	The proposal is consistent with some Comprehensive Plan policies directed at retaining tree canopy coverage, including Land Use Element Policy LU 1.7.2, which states: "Manage impacts that could result from new development in residential zones by establishing standards to: [...] 1.7.2 Encourage the retention of landscaped areas and the retention and planting of trees;" and Land Use Element Policy 4.8, which states: "4.8 The City's development regulations should encourage long- term sustainable stewardship of the natural environment. Examples include the preservation and enhancement of native vegetation, tree retention, and rain gardens."
19.15.230(E)(1)(b)(v)	The City Council has not considered the proposed amendment in the preceding three years.
Conclusion	The proposed amendment would require resources beyond what will be available in 2027 because the City is already committed to projects necessary to comply with state law.

Docketing Criteria Analysis

Proposal 27-4

MICC Section	Analysis
19.15.230(E)(1)	The proposal was filed in a timely manner between September 1 and October 1 as required by MICC 19.15.230(D)(1)
19.15.230(E)(1)(a)	The proposed amendment is required by state law, a recent court decision, or administrative agency action.
Conclusion	The proposed amendment is consistent with the criterion in 19.15.230(E)(1)(a) because it is required by state law and must be completed by 2029.

Proposal 27-5

MICC Section	Analysis
19.15.230(E)(1)	The proposal was filed in a timely manner between September 1 and October 1 as required by MICC 19.15.230(D)(1)
19.15.230(E)(1)(a)	The proposed amendment is required by state law, a recent court decision, or administrative agency action.
Conclusion	The proposed amendment is consistent with the criterion in 19.15.230(E)(1)(a) because it is required by state law and must be completed by 2029.