



# City of Wichita Testimony on House Bill 2088

January 29, 2025

The City of Wichita is strongly opposed to HB 2088 and requests the legislature not to approve House Bill No. 2088. Below is a listing of concerns related to this bill.

- Definition of an application is overly broad and can apply to many different activities that local governments are responsible for and all of them would be required to meet the 60-day shot clock. Would processes such as annexation; development incentives; zoning; platting; site plan review; construction document review for services; and construction document review for buildings in the development be included? Many of these processes have statutorily required deadlines and due process proceedings inconsistent with or not addressed by this bill.
- HB 2088 doesn't allow for proper consideration of zoning cases, because it does not account for complex cases that are deferred for additional information and/or sent back to the Planning Commission pursuant to KSA 12-757(d). The 60-day deadline appears to apply regardless of circumstances and the complexity of the case. Cases can be complex, especially for infill or redevelopment in an urban environment – with possible lighting, noise, traffic, and other impacts to nearby properties. As a result, project applications can change during the review process and specific conditions tailored to an individual case might be crafted.
- The 60-day deadline imposed by HB2088 would be difficult to make workable for the City of Wichita. This is because the timeline is too stringent and not realistic. Most zoning cases have State of Kansas requirements for public notices and involvement. Attached to this document is a table with timelines for activities during review of a zoning application for the City of Wichita. It shows that 71 days is the general timeframe for a case to be reviewed and completed (assuming it needs to go to the governing body for review).
- In addition, the City of Wichita shares a joint approval process for subdivision and zoning cases, and building permitting, which creates a much larger volume of cases to manage, which often require review of several departments of both governmental entities. Consequently, the impact of this reduced deadline has a particularly significant effect on the joint program shared by the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County.

Imposing a 60-day shot clock would likely adversely impact the quality of staff reports and analysis, it would likely require additional Planning Commission meetings (in addition to the 24 meetings per year currently); and would likely have financial impacts because additional staff

would be needed to carryout existing functions. The additional mandate for a 60-day shot clock would likely also increase stress levels for staff and increase burn out of staff, when planning positions are already difficult to fill. It may also decrease trust levels with the public because of the perceived rush to get development applications through the system.

Scott Wadle

Planning Director, City of Wichita