

## **22.84.060 Project permit review.**

### *A. Consistency with Applicable Regulations and Plans.*

1. When the city receives a project permit application, consistency between the proposed project and the applicable regulations in this title and the policies set out in the Monroe comprehensive plan shall be determined through staff review of the project and the issuance of a permit or the preparation of a staff report to the decision body.
2. During project permit application review, the city shall determine whether the items listed in this section, as defined in the development regulations, are applicable to the proposed project and if the proposed project meets the development regulations. In the absence of applicable development regulations, the city shall determine whether the items listed in this section are defined in the city's adopted comprehensive plan and if the proposed project meets the comprehensive plan policies. This determination of consistency shall include, but is not limited to, the following:
  - a. The type of land use permitted at the site, including uses that may be allowed under certain circumstances, if the criteria for their approval have been satisfied;
  - b. The density and applicable bulk requirements of the development; and
  - c. Availability and adequacy of infrastructure and public facilities identified in the comprehensive plan, if the plan or development regulations provide for funding of these facilities, as required by Chapter [36.70A](#) RCW; and
  - d. Character of the development, such as development standards.
3. The project permit application shall be reviewed for consistency with all criteria set out in this title for the project permit application type(s).

*B. Project Permit Applications.* The following tables (Table 22.84.060(B)(1): Project Permit Types, Table 22.84.060(B)(2): Decision-Making and Appeal Authorities, and Table 22.84.060(B)(3): Required Procedures for Project Permit Applications) set out the required project permit decision-making and appeal processes.

### **Table 22.84.060(B)(1). Project Permit Types**

<b>Type I</b>	<b>Type II</b>	<b>Type III</b>	<b>Type IV</b>
Administrative Departure (Chapter <a href="#">22.42</a> MMC)	Accessory Dwelling Unit	Administrative Approval  (when a Conflict of Interest Exists)	Comprehensive Plan Amendment
Administrative Interpretation		Binding Site Plan (10+ Lots) – Preliminary	
Binding Site Plan – Final		Conditional Use	Unified Development Regulations Amendment
Boundary Line Revision  (SEPA exempt)	Binding Site Plan (<10 lots – Preliminary	Reasonable Use Exception	Area-Wide Zoning Map Amendment  (Area-Wide Rezone)
Development Permit  (SEPA exempt)	Boundary Line Revision  (not SEPA exempt)	Removal of a Six-Year Development Moratorium	Preannexation Zoning <sup>3</sup>
Land Clearing/Forest Practices  (SEPA exempt)	Development Permit  (not SEPA exempt)	Shoreline Conditional Use Permit <sup>2</sup>	
Short Subdivision – Final	Land Clearing/Forest Practices  (not SEPA exempt)	Shoreline Variance <sup>2</sup>	
Site Plan Review	SEPA Threshold Determination/EIS	Site-Specific Zoning	

Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV
	Adequacy <sup>1</sup>	Map Amendment (Site-Specific Rezone) <sup>4</sup>	
Subdivision – Final	Shoreline Substantial Development	Subdivision – Preliminary	
Temporary Use	Short Subdivision – Preliminary	Variance	
	Single-Family Dwelling Exception to Development Moratoria	Variance from Flood Hazard Regulation	
<u>Unit Lot Subdivision - Final</u>	<u>Unit Lot Subdivision - Preliminary</u>		

**Table Notes:**

**1** Appeals based on the substantive authority of SEPA for conditions imposed outside the threshold determination process are appealable to the city council, as required by RCW [43.21C.060](#). Otherwise, appeals of SEPA threshold determinations and EIS adequacy are considered procedural determinations and therefore appealable to the hearing examiner per WAC [197-11-680\(3\)\(iv\)](#).

**2** Shoreline conditional use permits and variances require final approval by the Department of Ecology per Chapter [22.82](#) MMC, Shoreline Management.

**3** City council shall hold two public hearings for a prezone application, as consistent with RCW [35A.14.340](#).

**4** The hearing examiner will hold the open record public hearing and forward a recommendation to the city council. The city council is the final decision-making body, appealable to superior court.

**Table 22.84.060(B)(2). Decision-Making and Appeal Authorities**

	Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV

	<b>Type I</b>	<b>Type II</b>	<b>Type III</b>	<b>Type IV</b>
<b>Final Decision Authority</b>	Zoning Administrator	Zoning Administrator	Hearing Examiner	City Council
<b>Recommending Authority</b>	N/A	N/A	Zoning Administrator	Planning Commission
<b>Appeal Authority</b>	Hearing Examiner	Hearing Examiner	Snohomish County Superior Court, Shoreline Hearings Board	Snohomish County Superior Court, Growth Management Hearings Board

**Table 22.84.060(B)(3). Required Procedures for Project Permit Applications**

<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Type I</b>	<b>Type II</b>	<b>Type III</b>	<b>Type IV</b>
<b>Preapplication Meeting</b>	No	No	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>
<b>Notice of Completeness</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>
<b>Notice of Application</b>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>
<b>SEPA Determination <sup>1</sup></b>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Notice of Hearing</b>	No	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Notice of Decision</b>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with MMC [22.78.100](#), Use of exemptions, SEPA review is not required for projects that are deemed categorically exempt pursuant to WAC [197-11-800](#).

<sup>2</sup> This requirement only applies to project-specific proposals.

C. *Third Party Review.* The zoning administrator or their designee shall route project permit applications to consultants as the zoning administrator determines necessary. All costs of consultant review shall be billed to the project applicant.

D. *Final Decision.* The final decision of the council or other decision body shall be effective on the date stated in the decision, motion, resolution, or ordinance. The date from which appeal periods shall be calculated is the date of issuance of the decision, as defined in MMC [22.12.040](#).

E. *Project Permit Approval Expiration.* The project permit shall be valid as outlined below in Table 22.84.060(E): Project Permit Approval Expiration from the date of issuance of the decision. The project is required to have development permits issued, or have final approval for preliminary and short subdivisions, prior to the end of the approval period.

**Table 22.84.060(E). Project Permit Approval Expiration**

Permit Type	Approval Period	One Extension Allowed
Conditional Use Permits	5 years	1 year
Shoreline Permits	2 years	1 year
Preliminary Short Subdivisions <b>and Preliminary Unit Lot Subdivisions</b>	3 years	1 year
Preliminary Subdivisions	5 years	1 year
All Land Use Project Permits Not Otherwise Listed	2 years	1 year
Building Permit	Per Chapter <a href="#">15.04</a> MMC	Per Chapter <a href="#">15.04</a> MMC

F. *Extensions.* Extensions to the approval expiration may be granted by the zoning administrator, provided one or more of the following criteria are met:

1. The construction permits can or will be issued within thirty days of the approval expiration; or

2. The city and/or other public agency's capital project needs to be completed ahead of the required improvements to allow for logical sequence of construction to prevent damage or disruption to the improvements being made; or
3. Expiration of the approval will create an unnecessary and unusual hardship to the applicant that is not self-created.
4. An extension to the approval expiration shall not be granted by the zoning administrator unless all of the following criteria are met:
  - a. The need for the extension is not the result of deliberate actions of the applicant; and
  - b. The public health, safety, and welfare are not endangered by allowing the extension.

*G. Substantial Revisions or Modifications to Proposal.*

1. A revision or modification to the contents of an application before or after issuance of the permit, either voluntarily or to conform with applicable standards and requirements, shall be deemed a new application for the purpose of vesting when the revision or modification would result in a significant increase in a project's impacts, as determined by the zoning administrator. In reaching a decision on whether a revision is significant, the zoning administrator's consideration shall include, but not be limited to, the magnitude of the revision and the effect on the environment; the environmental sensitivity of the site; any changes in location of significant elements of the project and their relationships to public facilities; the impact of the revision on the review clock; and impacts to surrounding lands and land uses.
2. Written notice of such determination of substantial revision or modification shall be provided to the applicant and to all parties of record.
3. Any revision or modification deemed by the zoning administrator to be substantial shall conform to the time periods set forth in MMC [22.84.040\(G\)\(4\)](#). The review cycle for the revised project application shall begin with the date the revised project application is determined to be complete. The revised project application shall be subject to all laws, regulations, and standards in effect on the date of receipt of a complete, revised project application. (Ord. 001/2025 § 3 (Exh. B); Ord. 005/2019 § 10 (Exh. B))

**The Monroe Municipal Code is current through Ordinance 001/2025, passed January 14, 2025.**

Disclaimer: The city clerk's office has the official version of the Monroe Municipal Code. Users should contact the city clerk's office for ordinances passed subsequent to the ordinance cited above.

[City Website: www.monroewa.gov](http://www.monroewa.gov)

[Hosted by General Code.](#)