

Status Report Administrative Design Review (ADR)

Draft

as of 1/20/09

History and Overview of Existing ADR Program	1
Expectations and Results of Existing ADR Program	4
Projects and Staffing involved in Existing ADR Program	6
ADR Elsewhere	9
Evaluation of Existing ADR Process	11
Potential ADR Process Revisions	16

Page left intentionally blank.

History & Overview

The Design Review process was established in 1994. Design review is a component of the City of Seattle's Master Use Permit (MUP) process and is required for most new commercial, mixed-use and multifamily developments within the City of Seattle. Design review provides an opportunity in which neighborhoods, developers, architects, and city staff can work together to help ensure that new development is a valuable addition to Seattle's neighborhoods.

Design review is administered by the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and involves public notice as well as an opportunity for comment by the public. Projects subject to design review are brought before a Design Review Board for its recommendations through at least one 'Early Design Guidance' and one 'Recommendation' meeting. A project that is only subject to 'Administrative Design Review' is reviewed by DPD staff. The city is divided into seven areas, each with its own five-member Design Review Board. The board is appointed by the Mayor and Council and represents design professions, development interests, community at-large interests, & local residential and business interests. The final decision on the Design Review and MUP approval is made by the director of DPD, however the decision may be appealed to the Seattle hearing examiner.

Design review's three principal objectives are to encourage better design and site planning with sensitivity to neighborhoods, to provide flexibility in the application of development standards, and to improve communication and participation among developers, neighbors and the city early in the design and siting of new development. In order to ensure a level of consistency in Design Review decision making, the city and many of the neighborhoods have published design guidelines. The guidelines cover the following six elements: site planning, pedestrian environment, height bulk and scale, architectural elements, expression and materials, public amenities, vehicle access and parking, streetscape and landscaping. These guidelines are the fundamental design principles and are the focus for the discussion throughout the Design Review process.

Administrative Design Review

Administrative Design Review was basically derived from the original process rather than created independently and is generally voluntary. In the ADR process, projects are not reviewed by the Design Review Board and therefore do not require a public design review meeting. Alternatively, the review is administered by a DPD land use planner with public input accommodated through notice and a set comment period. Permit applicants typically volunteer for Administrative Design Review in LDT, L1, L2 and L3 zones when the number of proposed units is below the design review threshold. , In these cases, the applicant believes better design can be achieved through seeking development standard departures allowed by Design Review. Furthermore, Administrative Design Review can be required if there is a significant tree on the property or if the applicant proposes telecommunication equipment on new or existing structures.

"A development standard departure allows a project design to achieve flexibility in the application of most of the prescriptive land use code development standards. In order to allow a departure from a

development standard, an applicant must demonstrate that it would result in a development that meets or exceeds the intent of the adopted design guidelines.”

The standard process for a project participating in ADR begins with a Pre-Submittal Conference (PSC) that is held at the DPD by the project planner and attended by the applicant. At this meeting the applicant can elect to submit the Early Design Guidance (EDG) packet for review or they can wait to submit the packet as a drop-off submittal. If the applicant is familiar with the process, they will typically submit the EDG packet at the PSC meeting, unless something discussed at the meeting will significantly modify the information provided in the packet. Others may use the PSC as an informational meeting, and therefore not submit the EDG packet at that time.

Public Notice is sent once the EDG packet has been submitted. This is the responsibility of the DPD staff. Additionally, it's up to them to review the packet and compile the public's comments, should there be any. The planner will write 'guidance' based on the packet review, DPD staff meeting, and the public comments and send that 'guidance' report to the applicant. This step should take approximately 4 weeks, which includes the 2 week public comment period.

The applicant can then submit a Master Use Permit (MUP) application after incorporating the 'guidance' into the building design. The MUP application includes a Design Review Recommendation packet, which is an 11x17 color packet including detailed design information, including colors and materials of the exterior of the building. It could take the applicant anywhere from 2 weeks or more to compile a MUP/DR application, this depends on the owner's desired/perceived schedule.

The Planner and other review staff typically require approximately 4 weeks to review the MUP/DR application and either approve it or issue corrections. It is not uncommon, however, for DPD to alert the applicants of extended review periods due to a large quantity of projects under review. If there are corrections it is up to the applicant to respond to all correction notices and resubmit the plans. A two week turnaround is desirable but a 60 day turnaround is the requirement. There can be numerous review cycles. Once all the reviews have been approved, the planner will generate the MUP Decision which can take up to 4 weeks.

ADR typically takes anywhere from 3 months, in an ideal situation, to an indefinite period of time, depending on the applicant's time frame. Anything can happen on the applicant's side, from financing issues to designer scheduling conflicts, which would cause a project schedule to be protracted, however DPD attempts to meet schedule goals or deadlines on their end.

Townhomes & Administrative Design Review

The number of townhouse developments has increased significantly in Seattle's low-rise zones over the past decade. A common variety of townhome development has emerged and been duplicated throughout the city. It is characterized by 'packs' of units situated around an access drive court containing first level garages and most living space on upper floors. The housing type has sold well, and varies in its design quality and acceptance in neighborhoods. However, in many cases a level of dissatisfaction with the quality of townhouse design has been expressed in public opinion, and publications.

Many factors, including zoning, typical lot sizes, market forces, etc., shape the form of development, but one noteworthy factor is the level of permitting review townhome projects undergo. Many townhome projects have avoided the Master Use Permit (MUP) process - the city's primary land use review - and therefore forego any Design Review. Many townhome developments are not required to undergo the aforementioned reviews because developers can divide development sites into separate development parcels containing a number of housing units, which fall below thresholds that would trigger MUP, SEPA or Design Review in an effort to speed up the process and reduce costs. Efforts to avoid the threshold are documented, and have been termed 'micro-permitting' by some.

At this time, the City of Seattle is taking steps to update and improve the multifamily code to respond to townhome design and other emerging issues. An update to the multifamily code is prepared and expected to be considered by the City Council in 2009. Mayor Nickels has announced that ADR will be expanded in conjunction with the new multifamily code.

This study is a part of the work to suitably expand and improve Administrative Design Review. The intent is for any expansion or adjustment to the ADR process to meaningfully enhance the design quality of the townhouse and other developments. Recent changes in the economy may affect future production of the townhouse housing type. However, any modifications and adjustments to the ADR process resulting from this effort will be applicable to other similar and emerging forms of development.

Expectations & Results of Existing ADR Program

The following is a compilation of the expectations and results of what the public, applicants and staff expressed during a series of interviews about their experiences through the course of current ADR process.

Public

Expectations	Results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence new development in neighborhoods • Ability to voice opinions and concerns • Better design along street fronts • Mitigate impacts of new development, such as parking, height, traffic, 'loss of trees' and construction issues like noise and dirt • Influence zoning and land use code, such as underlying density • To be notified about a project in the neighborhood with enough time to comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully influence new development for the better • People feel they were heard, but they missed the right opportunity • Frustrated because zoning allowed the development (density, height, bulk, scale) • Frustrated because their influence is limited to design recommendations • Frustrated because buildings continue to be unattractive

Applicant

Expectations	Results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rational process • Staff well-trained and qualified in design • Staff well-trained and qualified in process • Consistency from project to project • Expect staff to be knowledgeable about the zoning code • Expect staff to be well-versed in entire land use code and all relevant processes • Timely/predictable turnaround • Unbiased, impartial analysis • Staff understands design/concepts and leads project in a direction in which the application of design principles is based on project goals • Asked to produce reasonable amount of materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency and unpredictability in process, code analysis, design and what's required • In experienced staff assigned to ADR • Unqualified/unknowledgeable staff assigned • Often protracted decisions • Planners behave like designers, use personal agendas to influence design • Lots of redundant information (ie MUP and DR packet have a lot of the same information) • Unnecessarily expensive project, including materials, process, carrying costs & changes in building design

Staff

Expectations	Results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better built projects • Applicant to be knowledgeable about process • Streamlined process • More qualified staff better trained in design • Expect public comment to be relevant to ADR (train public to comment on what they can affect) • Staff to be fully versed in Land Use Code • Reasonable project loads • Make public, owner and applicant happy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some better projects are created from process • Staff is overloaded, not enough time to focus on each project • Process is not streamlined, it's too cumbersome with too many steps, some redundant • Required protocol make process longer than it needs to be. Redundant? Unnecessary? • Some members of the public, owners and applicants not happy with process

Projects & Staffing Involved in Existing ADR Program

Volume

Based on the 'Design Review Program Stats' provided by the Department for the period between August, 2005 and September of 2008, a total of 37 projects (136 housing units) went through the Administrative Design Review (ADR) process. During the same period 378 projects (14,385 housing units) went through city Design Review (full board and ADR combined) process. A small number of projects may have started under the ADR process but were converted to the Full DR process.

On an annual basis 12 ADR applications were submitted in 2006, 18 in 2007, and 8 to date in 2008. The ADR projects in this time period ranged from 2 units to 12 units, with the bulk of the projects containing 4 or 8 units, while only one project had 12 units.

Of the 37 total ADR projects, 24 have received a MUP decision at the time of this report.

It should be noted that 11 of the ADR decisions in 2006 were projects located in the master planned development located within West Seattle's High Point Neighborhood.

Note that a relatively small number of projects (37 in nearly 4 years) are currently entering Seattle's ADR process. In the context of the city's overall design review program, and when compared to the total number of housing units being created in townhome housing types, a comparatively small percentage are currently covered by ADR.

Process Time

Over the full period of collected data, ADR projects averaged a total of 360 days in process, from Early Design Guidance submittal to Decision. Total process time for the 2006 ADR projects ranged from 117 to 351 calendar days, with an average of 288 days to receive a decision. In 2007 process time ranged from 105 to 409 calendar days, with an average of 249 days to receive a decision. The data lead to an estimation of 9-12 months of total process time to receive an ADR decision.

Total process time includes time attributable to both city review, as well as applicant delay and project development. Breaking total process time into parts helps to illustrate this point. For the tracked projects, process time averaged approximately four months from the time of Early Design Guidance submittal to the Master Use Permit submittal, and 7.5 months between Master Use Permit submittal and Master Use Permit Decision.

Staff Review Time

Only a portion of the total process time associated with a design review is attributable to actual staff review time. DR staff track the number of hours spent on actual project review. Review time beyond a certain base amount is billed to the applicant.

In 2006, billable hours for all 15 ADR projects with a decision ranged from 19 to 50 hours, with an average of 23 hours per project. In 2007, billable hours for all 14 ADR projects with a decision ranged from 35 to 93 hours, with an average of 50 hours utilized per project.

It can be reasonably concluded that under the current ADR process, staff review time can be estimated in the range of 25-50 hours per project (average 37.5 hours).

Staff Capacity

Currently, the department has 18 trained staff members capable of managing full design review projects, thirteen of which have been assigned Administrative Design Review projects. Reports by management and staff indicate that the most senior DR staff members are not typically assigned to ADR projects. Senior staff members are often directed to the projects with the largest scale and highest level of complexity. There is currently no specialized or pre-assigned ADR staffing unit.

Fees

Applicants pay permit fees for both Early Design Guidance and MUP for each project. The base fee for Early Design Guidance is \$1,500, which includes the first six planner review hours. The base MUP Fee is \$2,500 and covers the first ten planner review hours. Assuming 37 average billable planner hours per project, after subtracting the 16 hours the initial fees cover, an additional 21 hours of billable planner time can be assumed. The hourly rate for planner review time is \$250/hour. Therefore the average permitting cost to the applicant for entering the ADR process in fees alone can be estimated at \$5,250 (billable planner review hours) + \$1,500 (base EDG fee) + \$2,500 (base MUP fee) = \$9,250 per project.

Most projects in townhome and similar building forms do not currently undergo design review, and do not submit for MUP. So, the estimated \$9,250 in permit fees for ADR is an entirely additional cost to the applicant should the existing ADR system be applied to more development projects.

It's important to note that DPD's permitting system is for "Billable Hours" and base fees to cover the full cost of employing the review planner on a project. There is no subsidy from the general fund or other sources.

Geographic Distribution

In reviewing the previous Administrative Design Review projects it is apparent that the bulk of the ADR projects fall within the Queen Anne/Magnolia (8), Capitol Hill/First Hill/Central District (9), and Southwest (10) regions. Although the bulk of the Southwest region ADR projects are linked to master planned High Point. The Downtown area didn't contain any Administrative Design Review projects.

Townhome Unit Volumes

In addition to tracking actual ADR project reviews, it is important to consider townhome projects that have not undergone ADR, but might be considered candidates for future ADR. An estimation of total townhome projects must be pulled from various sources. The department collected data on construction permits for townhome units as well as applications for unit lot subdivisions (ULS). Neither is a perfect indicator of total townhomes, but together the measures provide an estimation of total townhome volumes over the past few years, and can therefore help predict the project volume increase due to mandatory ADR.

Most townhome projects that have been built in the past several years have participated in the ULS process. This land division process allows an underlying lot to be subdivided into individual platted lots, creating individual lots for each townhome unit. Developers often choose to phase construction of townhome units in 'packs' of 4 or 8 units. Then multiple 'packs' are combined in a single ULS process. In order to understand the real number of townhome development projects we must look at both the number of townhome units constructed, and the number of total unit lot subdivisions, and make an educated assumption.

The number of total townhome units and construction projects (based on construction permits) over a 3 year period—2006, 2007 and a projection for full year 2008—were tracked. In 2006 473 units in 167 projects were constructed, in 2007 429 units in 148 projects, and in 2008, 217 units in 74 projects. The three year average was 373 total units within 130 projects, per year. Separating out just the construction projects in the 3-8 unit range, there were 241 Townhome units within 65 projects.

Over the same time period Unit Lot Subdivisions (ULS) were tracked. Unit Lots are the individual tax parcels on which a townhome unit sits. In 2006, 370 unit lots were created, in 2007 463 unit lots were created, and in 2008, 216 Unit Lots were created. The three year average yields 350 unit lots.

Based on the documented numbers of townhome units constructed and unit lot lots created over the three year period, as well as assuming a relatively consistent year over year production total, we may estimate that for the 3-8 unit townhome building type a range of approximately 50-100 annual projects can reasonably be expected, yielding approximately 200 to 400 annual units.

ADR Elsewhere

ADR Program?

- Tacoma Yes, in special districts.
- Portland Yes, (Minor) Smaller projects in downtown and select districts, and review of all projects within other DR districts.
- Eugene Yes, Permitted C/MF uses.
- Bellevue Yes, All permitted uses w/in special districts and if required by the conditions of a rezone. Review for MF projects (as low as 3 units) if w/in 300' of a SF zone. Referred to as a 'transitional area'.
- Kirkland Yes, Full DR Board review for projects over 1 story or 10,000 gross square feet, major additions and w/in Market St. historic district. ADR for all other projects except minor exemptions. If a departure is requested it goes to board review.
- Minneapolis Yes, ADR for less than 4 units and other small projects, by zoning administration
- Denver Yes, Within overlay zones, specifically high density such as R-4X (not for small residential)
- Oakland ADR for developments of 3+ units where building is at least 75% residential. Special DR for 1&2 unit developments.
- San Francisco Simple vs. complex classification system. Planning Commission 'discretionary review' upon request for DR (by neighbors, sponsors or staff) for SF-MF residential. As a pre-requisite, projects must be zoning code compliant as determined by zoning staff.

Board Makeup

- Tacoma Staff Planners
- Portland Staff Planners
- Eugene Director approved decision, Some decisions made by hearing officer, historic review board, planning commission or city council.
- Bellevue There is a whole 'urban design' division of current planning staff. Arch/L-arch w/ 7-10 years experience.

Kirkland Staff Planners, Generally no special design expertise, but a couple of Larch on staff. More senior planners review projects where more complexity and design issues are present.

Oakland Review by staff or commission

San Francisco Staff planners. No special design expertise.

Level of Discretion & Role of Planner

Tacoma Director approved decision

Portland Modifications/adjustments to proposal can be made when fails to meet a design guideline

Eugene Director-approved decision. Some decisions made by hearing officer, historic review board, planning commission or city council

Bellevue There is quite a bit of latitude for design conditions. Support of conditions through policy and intent statements.

Kirkland Decision by planning official. Only minor latitude on some setback and buffers through admin review. For departure issues, the projects are usually bumped to full board.

Minneapolis Zoning administrator reviews for design criteria

Denver Schematic design phase review & design development phase review. Approval/disapproval and conditional approval at each stage. Appealable

Oakland High Level of Discretion. Approve/disapprove or condition. Only appealable in special cases.

San Francisco Staff categorizes DR request as 'simple or complex' according to criteria. Simple cases have 1-page report/recommendation. Complex has more extensive report.

Public Involvement

Tacoma Public notice required at ADR

Portland Public notice required at Minor Review (ADR)

Eugene Public notice required at ADR

Bellevue Public notice required at ADR, packaged with SEPA notice

Kirkland Public notice NOT required at ADR

Minneapolis Project is appealable to Public Council

San Francisco At least one 'community outreach' meeting prior to permit application, a sign in sheet must come with permit submittal. Application is Noticed.

ADR Evaluation by Stakeholders

The twelve stakeholders that were interviewed included developers, architects, builders, DPD planners and neighborhood representatives. All had participated in design review processes as applicants or their representatives or as members of the community where projects were being built. Community members included those who had responded with comments to ADR project. The interview list was selected to reflect a range of perspectives about the process. Since there have been a relatively small number of Administrative Design Review projects completed, many respondents also included views about their experience with the board Design Review process as well. Experience with Design Review ranged from one project to an organization representative who indicated that the membership had been involved in hundreds of projects. The following information reflects the views and perceptions of the interviewees.

Benefits

Creates Developable Sites

The ADR process creates flexibility in the code to adapt to given site conditions. Through the departures allowed by ADR, developers were able to create logical, achievable projects on challenging sites that would otherwise be difficult to develop.

Improved Design

Through use of the departures made available through the ADR process, building designs could be improved by taking better advantage of the site opportunities. Individual developers noted that the higher quality of design resulted in an improved financial return on the development.

Better Neighbors

The ADR process enabled architects to encourage clients to develop townhomes as the best return for sites rather than “boxes” that typically emerged from current zoning. In the transition zones between single-family zoning and “L” zones, the townhome scale of project is viewed as a better neighborhood fit and provides a better transition between single family and larger scale multifamily and mixed-use projects.

Issues

Required Time

The unpredictability of the amount of time that design review will require was perhaps the greatest concern for all applicants—developers, builders, permittees and designers. It was noted as a significant risk in considering whether or not to use the ADR process to achieve departures that could improve the design and performance of a project but potentially subject it to significant delays. Added time in general was also a concern, given that it adds to project holding costs but respondents were fairly accepting provided the timeframes were of reasonable duration and predictable in length. From a community perspective, interested neighbors valued the notifications when they received them about planned new development. Concerns were expressed about projects that were fully designed or already under construction before community members were aware of the plans.

Staffing

Many views were expressed about the staff planners. All noted the varying capabilities of staff and recounted both successful and disappointing experiences. Stronger design knowledge was identified by most as a necessity for good planners. Lack of staff oversight by a seasoned advisor was felt to contribute to the sometimes slow responses and unclear or confused guidance that was received. There seemed to be indecision on what constituted “good design” that could lead to a back and forth that ultimately resulted in arbitrary decisions from the applicant’s view. Some felt that planners applied personal aesthetics rather than design principles or design guidelines.

Process Clarity & Coordination

Many comments were made about the lack of coordination between divisions within DPD as well as other city departments. This was particularly challenging with SDOT and SPU, both of which can require changes that are in conflict with the agreements reached in design review. Also a concern were projects that voluntarily initiate the ADR process, then evolve into a Design Review process with the public—it feels like the rules are being changed. There is a sense by some that design review from the city and neighborhood perspective is about what you can get from the developer rather than a constructive and fair dialog.

Added Cost

ADR added costs to projects in several ways. The additional time and therefore holding costs was noted above. Added design time for architects or designers and the expense for preparation of materials and submittals were all referenced. Some developers weighted those against the improved outcomes and therefore greater value of the projects that were developed. When the process ran smoothly—a good planner, no major issues, timely reviews—the investment was worthwhile. The added cost also makes projects more expensive, which means affordability is affected, therefore there is a conflict with stated city goals. General costs identified by several respondents were \$50,000 to \$60,000 for projects without serious issues. The potential financial “black hole” creates avoidance.

Lack of Developer Understanding

Some developers didn't pursue ADR's because they were not aware it was an option. When they changed to architects skilled in both Design Review and ADR, they benefited from using the program.

Community Participation

Community members valued the opportunity to comment on projects. As a goal, design review can mediate public concerns into a constructive design format that results in better projects. Some community members expressed frustration at both the design and what they viewed to be very poor construction quality of projects which they felt diminished the value of their neighborhoods. A neighbor concerned about adjacent development, noted that they had no opportunity to comment on the negotiated agreement for a critical area setback that caused changes in the site development that were viewed as negatively affecting their property. Also noted was that issues often of importance to community members such as parking are not part of design review. There were several respondents who positively describe the unusual and beneficial openness of the design review process in Seattle and saw that as an asset of the process.

Program Expansion

Some expressed concern about the expansion of the program—"discourage the city from doing this." The fear is that the added time and expense, particularly coupled with a very difficult lending situation, will make it difficult to impossible to build housing in the city.

Neighborhood Design Guidelines

Design review is a communication between neighborhood residents and business owners and the community's aspiration. Well prepared neighborhood design guidelines would help articulate community interests for consideration in design review. One of the things Design Review has done is to create a validity of the permitting process within the community and having specific guidelines, agreed to by the community, could further strengthen that confidence.

Opportunities

Standard Plans

Significant interest was expressed in having approved standard plans created that could be used by developers. They could add predictability, reduce risk and meet at least some neighborhood concerns. There would need to be sufficient numbers of choices to respond to the variety of sites and conditions in Seattle. Approved plans that have been through ADR could potentially be reused—or sold to other users. Development of the plans would need participation by a range of interests in order to develop viable (permit-able and constructible) options.

Amenities Menu

Suggestions included creation of an extensive menu of amenities that could be applied by developers to enhance a project. They could include building materials, trim details, porches, landscape, etc.

Meeting the Community

Meeting with neighbors in advance was viewed as an opportunity to problem-solve and respond to concerns and misperceptions. Direct contact achieved design changes in response to needs and could provide materials to correct misperceptions. Working directly with the neighbors reduced the risk of time delays. It also made for projects that were more responsive neighbors. Community members valued having their perspective and concerns as part of the permitting process.

Specialized Staffing

Applicants noted that when they actually have an opportunity to talk with skilled planners, it is possible to problem solve, explore possibilities and make good progress on projects. Responsive planners, timely efforts, net improved design and positive outcomes.

Focus on planner development including code knowledge, design training and consistency was noted by several. Other suggestions

- Have a method for circulating planners to different projects/developers
- Identify ADR staff with geographic areas (perhaps even where they live and interact with other residents).
- ADR staff should assist citizens in updating Neighborhood Design Guidelines, then serve 2 year terms reviewing projects in the same areas of the city. Then they should be off duty to avoid developing overly close ties to particular developers and designers.
- ADR staff should periodically attend community council land use related committee where active.
- ADR staff should review and make recommendations on landscape design and other site treatments, including the authority to save trees.

Anticipate the Surge / On Call Staffing

Tap young design professionals—maybe a list of 150, offer contract positions, train them and create a certificate program. It could be a good opportunity for young design professionals to learn the code, the design review process and more about city processes. Make it a status to be selected, so that it is good for firms to have “certified” professionals on their staffs. Use as a staffing pool to accommodate an overflow of projects.

Mandatory Timeframes

Establish specific time frames—like SEPA—where a decision has to be made in a specified amount of time.

Consistently Prepared Applicant

Enhance the frequent user program for applicants who are familiar and successful with the process. Provide good information on what is required to be in the program so that applicants have the opportunity to access the program. Consideration could also be given to creating a hierarchy for sorting applicants—it may be based on level of experience or a set of identified steps—a credit for good performance would be desirable.

Stakeholder Summit

Bring in all of the stakeholders together or call in a cross section group. Participants could include representatives for groups—neighborhood council, realtors, designers, developers, etc. Set of 12 players—want a discussion, an exchange of ideas and views that results in some sort of agreement. The agreement needs to result in a better product. The real salvation for a developer would be to make the process predictable and the neighborhood would gain amenities that would approve the appearance of a project.

Multifamily Code Flexibility

Instead of expanding the ADR program, add more flexibility to the multifamily code. Create a checklist that would enable developers to respond to special site conditions and provide planners with authority to grant some departures. More flexibility would create better responses and more variety. Look at FAR flexibility.

Potential ADR Process Revisions

Desired Outcomes

The interviews conducted with DPD staff and with outside stakeholder interests identified some common themes. The following “desired outcomes” have been developed from those themes.

Performance:

- ADR expansion should be supported by staff
- ADR expansion should be supported by stakeholders
- Streamline the ADR and permitting processes
- Ensure consistency of the processes from project to project
- Staff skills should include design knowledge
- Use rigorous staff training and organization to create a qualified ADR team
- Preserve, and potentially improve the public comment opportunity

Design:

- Improve project design
- Achieve better site design by considering development standard departures
- Explore development of standard plans
- Create a multi-level system of review that tailors to project complexity

Financial:

- Reduce costs

Community:

- Preserve, and potentially improve the public comment opportunity