

Spokane Plan Commission

September 28, 2016

Meeting Minutes: Meeting called to order at 2:00pm

Attendance:

- Board Members Present: Dennis Dellwo, FJ Dullanty, John Dietzman, Christy Jeffers, Jacob Brooks, Patricia Kienholz, Michael Baker, Christopher Batten, Todd Beyreuther, Greg Francis; Community Assembly Liaison, Lori Kinnear; City Council Liaison
- Board Not Members Present: None.
- Staff Members Present: Lisa Key, Amy Mullerleile, JoAnne Wright, Omar Akkari, Nathan Gwinn, Shauna Harshman, Alicia Ayars, Tami Palmquist, Jolie Eliason, James Richmond, Tirrell Black, Heather Trautman

Public Comment:

None.

Briefing Session:

Minutes from the September 14th & September 21st, 2016 meeting approved unanimously.

1. City Council Liaison Report-Lori Kinnear
 - Monday September 26th Mayor Condon selected Police Chief Meidl to City Council after four (4) panels interviewed four (4) candidates. Three panels chose Chief Meidl and the fourth (4th) panel was 50/50 between Meidl and the Chief from Yakima. City Council will be voting on this topic on October 14th.
2. Community Assembly Liaison Report– Greg Francis
 - None.
3. Presidents Report-Dennis Dellwo
 - Provided a brief overview the procedures for today's Comprehensive Plan Amendment deliberations.
4. Secretary Report-Lisa Key
 - Last Comprehensive Plan Open house will be held on Thursday, September 29th at 4:00 PM-8:00 PM at West Central Community Center
 - The next Plan Commission Transportation Subcommittee will be held on Tuesday, October 4th at 9am. The Committee will be discussing LINK Spokane and WSDOT Projects.
 - The next Plan Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 12th ; there will be hearings on Infill Housing Recommendations and Citywide Capital Improvement Program at 4 pm.
 - The City of Spokane is hosting the Planning Association of Washington's Land Use Boot Camp on Friday, October 14th; Plan Commissioners need to reserve a seat with Lisa Key.
5. Transportation Subcommittee Report – John Dietzman
 - None.

Workshops:

1. Infill Housing Recommendations – Nathan Gwinn
 - Presentations and overview given.

- Questions asked and answered.
2. Countrywide Addressing Ordinance-Tami Palmquist, Bobby Williams & Joe Sacco
 - Presentation and overview given.
 - Questions asked and answered.
 3. Mayor’s Quality Housing Report
 - Presentations and overview given.
 - Questions asked and answered.

Hearings:

1. Comprehensive Plan Annual Amendment Deliberations

- **Queen B Radio Z1500085COMP**

- **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- Todd Beyreuther moved to open the discussion of the findings of fact for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500085COMP applied for by QueenB Radio. Motion seconded by Michael Baker.
- Discussion ensued.
- FJ Dullanty moved to approve the findings of fact for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, findings A through V, as discussed. Motion seconded by John Dietzman
- **Vote by roll call was 9/0: FINDINGS OF FACT ADOPTED**

- **CONCLUSIONS:**

- Todd Beyreuther moved to discuss the conclusions for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500085COMP applied for by QueenB Radio. Motion seconded by FJ Dullanty.
- Discussion ensued.
- **FJ Dullanty moved to approve conclusions 1 through 4 at the same time. Seconded by Christy Jeffers. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statements:**
 - Conclusion 1: The proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan **IS** consistent with any recent state or federal legislative actions, or changes to state or federal regulations, such as changes to the Growth Management Act, or new environmental regulations.
 - Conclusion 2: The proposed change **IS** consistent with the goals and purposes of the state Growth Management Act.
 - Conclusion 3: Infrastructure implications of the proposed comprehensive plan amendment **IS** reflected in the relevant six-year capital improvement plan(s) approved in the same budget cycle.

- Conclusion 4: The proposed amendment **IS** internally consistent with development regulations, capital facilities program, shoreline master program, the downtown plan, critical area regulations, and any neighborhood planning documents adopted after 2001. In addition, amendments should strive to be consistent with the parks plan, and vice versa.
- **Vote by roll call was unanimous 9/0**
- **Plan Commission proceeded with conclusions 5 through 8:**
 - Conclusion 5: The proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan **IS** consistent with the countywide planning policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the regional transportation improvement plan, and official population growth forecasts.
 - Conclusion 6: The 2015/2016 proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments **HAVE** been reviewed concurrently in order to evaluate their cumulative effect on the comprehensive plan text and map, development regulations, capital facilities program, neighborhood planning documents, adopted environmental policies and other relevant implementation measures.
 - Conclusion 7: Adverse environmental impacts association with this proposed amendment **HAVE NOT** been identified. If adverse environmental impacts have been identified, adequate mitigation measures **HAVE NOT** been identified as requirements for incorporation into a decision on the proposed amendment
 - Conclusion 8: A SEPA review **HAS** been completed on the requested amendment.
 - **FJ Dullanty makes a motion to amend conclusion seven (7) to delete the phrase: “Adverse environmental impacts association with this proposed amendment HAVE NOT been identified”. Motion seconded by John Dietzman. Motion passes unanimously.**
 - **Vote by roll call to approve conclusions 5-8 was unanimous 9/0**
- Christy Jeffers moved to approve conclusions 9 through 16 at the same time. Motion seconded by John Dietzman. The Plan Commission voted to approve the Statements:
 - Conclusion 9: The proposed amendment **DOES NOT** adversely affect the City’s ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services citywide at the planned level of service, or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies.

- Conclusion 10: The proposed land use designation **IS** in conformance with the appropriate location criteria identified in the comprehensive plan (e.g., compatibility with neighboring land uses, proximity to arterials, etc.).
- Conclusion 11: The proposed map amendment and site **ARE** suitable for the proposed designation.
- Conclusion 12: The map amendment **DOES** implement applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.
- Conclusion 13: The proposed amendment **IS** consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.
- Conclusion 14: The applicant **HAS** presented enough evidence to justify the need for the proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan.
- Conclusion 15: The proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan **IS NOT** more effectively or appropriately addressed through another aspect of the planning department’s work program (neighborhood planning, writing new regulations, etc.).
- Conclusion 16: The Plan Commission **DID** receive enough information from the applicant to be able to reach a decision based on the merits of the proposal.
- Vote by roll call was unanimous 9/0 : **CONCLUSIONS ADOPTED.**
- **RECOMMENDATION:**
 - Todd Beyreuther makes a motion in the matter of Z1500085COMP, a request by Stanley Schwartz on behalf of QueenB Radio, Inc. to amend the land use plan designation from “open space” to “Centers and Corridors Core” on a 1.9 acre parcel located at 2651 E. 49th Avenue, with a corresponding zoning designation of “CC2-District Center”, as based upon the above listed findings and conclusions by recommending the **APPROVAL** of the requested amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Motion seconded by FJ Dullanty.
 - **Vote by roll call was unanimous 9/0: RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL ADOPTED.**
- **Avista Z1500078COMP**
 - **FINDINGS OF FACT:**
 - Todd Beyreuther moved to open the discussion of the findings of fact for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500078COMP applied for by Avista Corporation. Motion seconded by Christy Jeffers.
 - Discussion ensued.

- Christy Jeffers moved to approve the findings of fact A-W for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500078COMP, applied for by Avista Corporation. Motion seconded by FJ Dullanty.
 - **Vote by roll call was unanimous 9/0: FINDINGS OF FACT ADOPTED**
- **CONCLUSIONS:**
- Todd Beyreuther moved to open the discussion on the conclusions for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500078COMP applied for by Avista Corporation. Motion seconded by Michael Baker.
 - Discussion ensued.
 - Christy Jeffers made a motion to vote on conclusions 1-16 at the same time. Seconded by FJ Dullanty. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statements:
 - Conclusion 1: The proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan **IS** consistent with any recent state or federal legislative actions, or changes to state or federal regulations, such as changes to the Growth Management Act, or new environmental regulations.
 - Conclusion 2: The proposed change **IS** consistent with the goals and purposes of the state Growth Management Act.
 - Conclusion 3: Infrastructure implications of the proposed comprehensive plan amendment **IS** reflected in the relevant six-year capital improvement plan(s) approved in the same budget cycle.
 - Conclusion 4: The proposed amendment **IS** internally consistent with development regulations, capital facilities program, shoreline master program, the downtown plan, critical area regulations, and any neighborhood planning documents adopted after 2001. In addition, amendments should strive to be consistent with the parks plan, and vice versa.
 - Conclusion 5: The proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan **IS** consistent with the countywide planning policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the regional transportation improvement plan, and official population growth forecasts.
 - Conclusion 6: The 2015/2016 proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments **HAVE** been reviewed concurrently in order to evaluate their cumulative effect on the comprehensive plan text and map, development regulations, capital facilities program, neighborhood planning documents, adopted environmental policies and other relevant implementation measures.
 - Conclusion 7: Adverse environmental impacts association with this proposed amendment **HAVE NOT** been identified.

- Conclusion 8: A SEPA review **HAS** been completed on the requested amendment.
 - Conclusion 9: The proposed amendment **DOES NOT** adversely affect the City's ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services citywide at the planned level of service, or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies.
 - Conclusion 10: The proposed land use designation **IS** in conformance with the appropriate location criteria identified in the comprehensive plan (e.g., compatibility with neighboring land uses, proximity to arterials, etc.).
 - Conclusion 11: The proposed map amendment and site **ARE** suitable for the proposed designation.
 - Conclusion 12: The map amendment **DOES** implement applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.
 - Conclusion 13: The proposed amendment **IS** consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.
 - Conclusion 14: The applicant **HAS** presented enough evidence to justify the need for the proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Conclusion 15: The proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan **IS NOT** more effectively or appropriately addressed through another aspect of the planning department's work program (neighborhood planning, writing new regulations, etc.).
 - Conclusion 16: The Plan Commission **DID** receive enough information from the applicant to be able to reach a decision based on the merits of the proposal.
 - **Vote by roll call was unanimous 9/0: CONCLUSIONS ADOPTED.**
- **RECOMMENDATION:**
 - **Todd Beyreuther makes a motion in the matter of Z1500078COMP, a request by Avista Corporation to amend the land use plan designation from "Residential 15-30" to "Light Industrial" on 14 parcels totaling 2.78 acres, with a corresponding change of implementing zoning designation to "Light Industrial", as based upon the above listed findings and conclusion, by recommending to City Council the APPROVAL of the requested amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Motion seconded by Michael Baker.**
 - **Vote by roll call was unanimous 9/0: RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED.**
 - John Dietzman recused himself from the rest of the hearing.

- **Morningside Z1500084COMP**

- **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- Todd Beyreuther moved to open discussion of the findings of fact for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500084COMP applied for by Morningside Investments, LLC. Motion seconded by Patricia Kienholz.
- Discussion ensued.
- FJ Dullanty moved to make an amendment to include that the application to increase the density to 15-30 units per acre with a cap of 750 units on this particular project, will not increase the density of the Neighborhood Center Comprehensive Plan of the intended density in the area when Comprehensive Plan was approved. Motion seconded by Patricia Kienholz. Motion failed.
- Todd Beyreuther made a motion to approve the findings and fact A through X. Motion seconded by Christy Jeffers. Motion passed. (6/2): **FINDINGS OF FACT ADOPTED.**

- **CONCLUSIONS:**

- Todd Beyreuther made a motion to open discussion of the conclusions for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z1500084COMP applied for by Morningside Investments, LLC. Motion seconded by FJ Dullanty.
- Discussion ensued.
- Conclusion 1 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan **IS** consistent with any recent state or federal legislation actions, or changes to state or federal regulations, such as changes to the Growth Management Act, or new environmental regulations;
 - **Vote by roll call was 6 in favor, with 2 opposed.**
- Conclusion 2: was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The proposed change **IS NOT** consistent with the goals and purpose of the state Growth Management Act.
 - **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor, with 3 opposed.**
- Conclusion 3: was read and discussed. The vote was deferred until the end of the hearing.
- Conclusion 4: was read and discussed. The vote was deferred until the end of the hearing.
- Conclusion 5: was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:

- The proposed amendment **IS NOT** internally consistent with development regulations, capital facilities program, shoreline master program, the downtown plan, critical area regulations, and any neighborhood planning documents adopted after 2001. In addition, amendments should strive to be consistent with the parks plan, and vice versa.
- **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor, 3 three opposed.**
- Conclusion 6 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan **IS** consistent with the countywide planning policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the regional transportation improvement plan, and official population growth forecasts.
 - **The voice vote for this motion was unanimous.**
- Conclusion 7 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The 2015/2016 proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments **HAVE** been reviewed concurrently in order to evaluate their cumulative effect on the comprehensive plan text and map, development regulations, capital facilities program, neighborhood planning documents, adopted environmental policies and other relevant implementation measures.
 - **The voice vote for this motion was unanimous.**
- Conclusion 8 was read and discussed. Christy Jeffers moved to vote on Conclusions 8 and 9 at the same time. Motion seconded by FJ Dullanty. The Plan Commission voted to approve statements:
 - Conclusion 8: Adverse environmental impacts association with this proposed amendment **HAVE** been identified. If adverse environmental impacts have been identified, adequate mitigation measures **HAVE** been identified as requirements for incorporation into a decision on the proposed amendment.
 - Conclusion 9: A SEPA review **HAS** been completed on the requested amendment.
 - **The voice vote for approval of Conclusions 8 and 9 was unanimous.**
- Conclusion 10 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The proposed amendment **DOES NOT** adversely affect the City's ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services citywide at the planned level of service, or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies.
 - **Vote for this motion was 6 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

- Conclusion 11 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The proposed amendment **IS NOT** in conformance with the appropriate location criteria identified in the comprehensive plan (e.g., compatibility with neighboring land uses, proximity to arterials, Neighborhood Centers, etc.)
 - **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor, and 3 opposed.**
- Conclusion 12 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The proposed amendment and site **ARE NOT** suitable for the proposed designation.
 - **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor and 3 opposed.**
- Conclusion 13 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - The map amendment **DOES NOT** implement applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.
 - **Vote by roll call was 7 in favor and 1 opposed.**
- Conclusion 14 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted on and approved the statement:
 - The proposed amendment **IS NOT** consistent with the comprehensive plan policies.
 - **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor and 3 opposed.**
- Conclusion 15 was read:
 - FJ Dullanty made a motion to remove conclusion fifteen from the list. Christy Jeffers opposed the motion. Commissioners voted, and the motion failed, with 1 in favor and 7 opposed.
 - Conclusion 15 was discussed. The Plan Commission voted on and approved the statement:
 - The applicant **HAS NOT** presented enough evidence to justify the need for the proposed change to the comprehensive plan.
 - **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor, 2 opposed, with 1 abstention.**
- Conclusion 16 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted on and approved the statement:
 - The proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan **IS** more effectively or appropriately addressed through another aspect of the planning department's work program (neighborhood planning, writing new regulations, etc.)
 - **Vote by roll call was 5 in favor, 3 opposed.**
- Conclusion 17 was read and discussed. The Plan Commission voted on and approved the statement:

- The Plan Commission **DID** receive enough information from the applicant to be able to reach a decision based on the merits of the proposal.
 - **Vote by roll call was 8 in favor, none opposed.**
- **RECOMMENDATION:**
 - FJ Dullanty made a motion in the matter of Z1500084COMP, a request by J.R. Bonnett Engineering on behalf of Morningside Investment, LLC to change the land use plan designation on 45.5 acres of 49.48 acres within the Windhaven First Addition PUD, to include changing 41.63 acres from “Residential 4-10” to “Residential 15-30”, with a corresponding change of the implementing zoning to Residential Multifamily; and, changing 3.87 acres of “Residential 4-10” to “Residential 10-20”, with a corresponding change of the implementing zoning to Residential Two-Family, as based upon the above listed findings and conclusions by recommending to City Council the DENIAL of the requested amendment to the Lan Use Plan Map of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Motion seconded by Michael Baker.
 - **Vote by roll call was 4 in favor, with 3 opposed and 1 abstention: *RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED.***
 - Conclusion 3 was revisited by Plan Commission members. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - Infrastructure implications of the proposed comprehensive plan amendment ARE NOT reflected in the relevant six-year capital improvement plan(s) approved in the same budget cycle.
 - **Vote by roll call was 6 in favor, with 2 opposed.**
 - Conclusion 4 was revisited by Plan Commission members. The Plan Commission voted to approve the statement:
 - Mitigations for the proposed amendment DO NOT result in a potential funding shortfall that suggests the need to scale back on land use objectives and/or service level standards.
 - **Vote by roll call was 7 in favor, with 1 opposed.**

Meeting Adjourned at 7:09 P.M.

Next Plan Commission Meeting is scheduled for **October 12, 2016**