

CITY OF SPOKANE HEARING EXAMINER

Re: Conditional Use Permit Application by) FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
Extendicare Health Facilities, Inc. for) AND DECISION
property located at 4515 South Freya)
Street)
) FILE NO. Z2007-84-CUP

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL AND DECISION

Proposal: A Conditional Use Permit application by Extendicare Health Facilities, Inc., to allow the development of a 120 bed skilled nursing facility with 75 parking stalls located in the Residential Single-family (RSF) Zone.

Decision: Approval, subject to conditions.

FINDINGS OF FACT
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant: Extendicare Health Facilities, Inc.
111 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53203

Represented by: Dwight Hume
D.J. Hume Company
9101 North Mt. View Lane
Spokane, WA 99218

Represented by: Stacy Bjordahl
Parsons/ Burnett/ Bjordahl, LLP
505 West Riverside Ave., Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Property Address: 4515 South Freya Street in the City of Spokane, Washington.

Property Location: The property is located on the east side of Freya Street south of unimproved 44th Avenue in the City of Spokane Washington.

Legal Description: A full legal description is in the record attached to Exhibit #2A.

Zoning: The property is zoned RSF (Residential Single-family).

Comprehensive Plan Map Designation: The property is designated Residential 4-10 in

the City's 2001 Comprehensive Plan.

Site Description: The site is rectangular in shape and contains approximately 4.87 acres in area. It is vacant of structures but it is heavily treed. The topography is relatively flat with some gently rolling areas and staff states that there is an approximate 6% slope from the northwest corner to the southwest corner of the site.

Surrounding Conditions: The properties surrounding this site are all zoned Residential Single-family and are mostly developed with that use. There is still some vacant land in the area and also some single-family homes on large lots. The site is adjacent to Freya Street which is designated as a principal arterial in the City's Arterial Street Plan.

Project Description: The applicant seeks approval to construct and operate a 120 bed skilled nursing facility on site. A site plan has been submitted and is in the record as Exhibit #2D. The building will be one story in height with a center courtyard. It is to have 40 private rooms and 40 semi-private rooms. 75 parking spaces will be provided. The parking will be located on the north and south ends of the site with access to both locations off of Freya Street. The property is located within the Moran Prairie Special Drainage District and therefore substantial areas on the north and south side of the site have been set aside as drainage control areas.

PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

Authorizing Ordinances: Spokane Municipal Code Sections 17C.110, 17C.110.500 Table 17C.110-1, 17C.190.100, 17C.320.080, 17C.330, and 17G.060.170.

Hearing Date: March 6, 2008

Notices: Mailed: October 12, 2007 and January 28, 2008
Posted: October 12, 2007 and January 28, 2008

Site Visit: March 13, 2008

SEPA: A Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance (MDNS) was issued by the City on February 11, 2008 and modified on February 12, 2008. No appeal was filed of the MDNS.

Testimony:

Marla French
City of Spokane Planning Services
808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane, WA 99201

Mike Britton
City of Spokane Traffic Engineering
808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane, WA 99201

James Sakamoto
City of Spokane Engineering Services
808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane, WA 99201

Mel Beal, Senior Vice President
Extendicare Health Facilities, Inc.
4940 Blazer Parkway
Dublin, OH 43017

Gregg Calvert
12485 W Hayden Ave.
Post Falls, ID 83854

Mike Nilsson
18507 E Appleway Ave.
Spokane Valley, WA 99016

Steve Wright
3505 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

Steve Kocharhook
3506 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

Ezra Eckhardt
4338 S Greystone Ln
Spokane, WA 99223

Barry O'Connell
3510 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

Carol Manix
3416 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

Ben Berriochoa
3404 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

Dwight Hume
D.J. Hume Company
9101 North Mt. View Lane
Spokane, WA 99218

Tom Jank
Extendicare Health Facilities, Inc.
4940 Blazer Parkway
Dublin, OH 43017

Ann Winkler
Sunburst Engineering
4310 S Ball Dr.
Veradale, WA 99037

Tim Gavin
3711 N Molter Rd.
Otis Orchards, WA 99207

Gary Marks
3421 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

John Manix
3416 E 45th Ct
Spokane, WA 99223

Jack Kline
4507 S Freya St.
Spokane, WA 99223

Susie Kline
4507 S Freya St.
Spokane, WA 99223

Rick Clough
4328 S Greystone Ln
Spokane, WA 99223

Stacy Bjordahl, Attorney at Law
Parsons/ Burnett/ Bjordahl
505 W Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Exhibits:

1. Planning Services Staff Report
 - 1A. Staff Report
 - 1B. Revised Staff Report dated 03-05-08
2. Application, including:
 - 2A. General application
 - 2B. Conditional Use Permit application
 - 2C. Application for notification map
 - 2D. Site plan
 - 2E. Conditional Use Permit Counter Complete Checklist
3. Pre Development conference notes
4. Fire Department comments and correspondence
5. Engineering Services comments
6. Traffic Engineering comments
 - 6A. Sunburst Engineering Trip Distribution Letter
7. Solid Waste comments
8. Department of Ecology comments
9. Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Spokane Tribe of Indians comments
10. Avista Utilities comments
11. Notice map and Community meeting guidelines
12. Notice parcel listing and address listing
13. Notices
14. Affidavits of Mailing dated 10-12-07 and 01-28-08
15. Affidavits of Posting dated 10-12-07 and 01-28-08
16. SEPA Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance
 - 16A. MDNS issued 02-11-08
 - 16B. MDNS modified 02-11-08
 - 16C. MDNS modified 02-12-08
17. Environmental Checklist
18. Voluntary impact fee agreement
19. SEPA impact fee development agreement
20. Revised SEPA impact fee development agreement
21. Community Meeting Sign in sheet
22. Community Meeting Minutes
23. Hearing File Preparation Checklist
24. Letter dated 10-09-07 to Dwight Hume from Marla French
re: community meeting instructions
25. Letter dated 11-02-07 to Hearing Examiner from Robert and Mary Lou Redmond
re: opposing project
26. Letter dated 11-05-07 to Hearing Examiner from Jack and Susan Kline
re: opposing project
27. Letter dated 12-28-07 to Interested Parties from Marla French
re: request for comments

28. Letter dated 01-22-08 to Dwight Hume from Marla French
re: notice of application, SEPA and public hearing instructions
29. Letter dated 01-23-08 to Dwight Hume from Marla French
re: technically complete application
30. Letter dated 01-30-08 to Marla French from Sally Conley
re: opposing project
31. Letter dated 02-05-08 to Marla French from Gary and Lisa Marks
re: opposing project
32. Letter dated 02-05-08 to Planning Services from Rosalie Descoteaux
re: opposing project
33. Letter dated 02-07-08 to Marla French from Michael & Linda Andrade
re: opposing project
34. Email dated 02-08-08 to Marla French from Ginger Patano
re: opposing project
35. Letter dated 02-08-08 to Marla French from Mark & Katherine Perry
re: opposing project
36. Letter dated 02-08-08 to Marla French from Steven, Patricia & Lauren Wright
re: opposing project
37. Email dated 02-11-08 to Marla French from Ezra Eckhardt
re: opposing project
38. Email dated 02-11-08 to Marla French from John Manix
re: opposing project
39. Letter dated 02-11-08 to Marla French from Ben and Lorie Berriochoa
 - A Exhibits received at or day of the hearing
 - A1 Trip Generation Characteristics provided by Ann Winkler, Sunburst Engineering
 - A2 Complaint forms from Department of Health and Human Services provided by Steve Wright
 - A3 Ezra Eckhardt's written testimony

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

To be approved, the proposed conditional use permit must comply with the criteria set forth in Spokane Municipal Code Section 17G.060.170. The Hearing Examiner has reviewed the proposed conditional use permit and the evidence of record with regard to this section and makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. The proposal is allowed under the provisions of the land use code.

Uses allowed in the various residential zone categories are set forth in Table 17C.110-1 of the municipal code. That table shows that group living uses are allowed in the RSF Zone by conditional use permit. SMC 17C.190.100 gives the characteristics of group living and specifically includes nursing and convalescent homes and assisted living facilities. Therefore, the use is listed as specifically permitted by conditional use permit in

the RSF zone.

In order to be approved, however, the use must also comply with various other standards set forth in the code. SMC 17C.330.120 lists certain development standards for group living. The first relates to density. In this zone, the proposal would be allowed 1.5 residents per 1,000 square feet of site area. For this site that provision would allow over 300 residents, excluding employees. The project is designed to have 120 residents at full occupancy. That code section also provides a minimum spacing requirement of 600 feet between similar uses. There are no similar uses within 600 feet of this proposed facility. The project also has the required outdoor area for this type of use and more parking than is required by the municipal code. Therefore the requirements of SMC17C.330.120 have been met.

Other decision criteria are set forth in SMC 17C.320.080. Those will be analyzed under Decision Criteria #5 below.

2. The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives, and policies for the property.

The Hearing Examiner finds that this criterion has been met and in so doing hereby adopts and incorporates the findings set forth in the Planning Services Revised Staff Report Exhibit #1B, pages 3 and 4. In addition the Hearing Examiner makes the following additional findings.

There is little or no mention of this type of use in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The fact that it is allowed by conditional use permit in residential zones means that the City has decided that as long as certain measures are taken to mitigate any impacts to surrounding properties, that the use can be compatible with residential uses. In fact, the purpose clause of Chapter 17C.330, set forth in 17C.330.010, states that those regulations are to insure that uses in the group living category will be compatible with the character of residential and commercial uses. As stated under decision criteria #1 above, the applicant's proposal will comply with all of those code requirements. There are additional decision criteria which will be discussed under decision criteria #5 below.

Conditional use permits are often referred as "second look" permits. They are for uses that can be compatible in various zones but the municipal authority wants to take a second look to insure that possible adverse impacts have been mitigated. It is not the same as a zone change and conditional use permits in residential zones are used for many uses including schools and churches. Conditional use permits require compliance with regulations and may also have additional conditions of approval. If a proposed use does comply then it is allowed to proceed. The Hearing Examiner finds, therefore, that allowing this use in the Residential 4-10 Category is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan. No evidence was submitted to show that it is not compliant with the Comprehensive Plan.

3. The proposal meets the concurrency requirements of Chapter 17D.010 SMC.

Staff has circulated this application to all applicable City departments and agencies with jurisdiction over land development and the only department that commented regarding concurrency was the Engineering Services department. There were no other agency comments regarding the proposal not meeting concurrency requirements. The Engineering Services' comments have been addressed and incorporated into the MDNS which was issued under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). It requires a payment of impact fees for traffic mitigation. No other evidence was presented to show that concurrency could not be achieved for any City services.

4. If approval of a site plan is required, the property is suitable for the proposed use and site plan considering the physical characteristics of the property, including but not limited to size, shape, location, topography, soils, slope, drainage characteristics, the existence of ground or surface water and the existence of natural, historic or cultural features.

A site plan is in the record as Exhibit #2D. It shows the site being developed with a 60,200 square foot, one-story building containing 120 beds in a skilled nursing facility. In addition there is associated dining, activity, kitchen, laundry and staff work areas and also outside courtyards and outdoor living space. There is parking on the north and south ends of the site with the number of stalls exceeding the City's requirements. Much of this site also will be used for storm water detention and disposal. There were no physical characteristics of the site identified which would preclude development and no evidence of ground or surface waters that cannot be disposed of adequately according to the Engineering Services department. Further, there was no evidence of the existence of natural, historic or cultural features on site except for the fact that the site is heavily treed.

Many neighbors were concerned with the removal of trees on site. The applicant testified that most trees on site will have to be removed in order to level the site for the building. The City has no tree retention ordinance and no regulatory requirement that any number of trees be retained. There are requirements for the planting of new trees around the perimeter of the site as well as on the street frontage along Freya Street. So the applicant will be landscaping and providing new trees but the nature of the site will change because of the removal of most or all of the trees. This would occur, however, regardless of what uses were constructed on site. The Hearing Examiner finds, therefore, that this site appears suitable for the proposed use.

5. The proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties, and if necessary conditions can be placed on the proposal to avoid significant effect or interference with the use of neighboring property or the surrounding area, considering the design and intensity of the proposed use.

As stated above there are additional decision criteria for conditional use permits for nursing home facilities and they are set forth in SMC 17C.320.080F. These criteria

are specific to this use and are required to be met in order for the Hearing Examiner to find that the use will not have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area. These approval criteria are:

1. Proportion of residential household living uses. The overall residential appearance and function of the area will not be significantly lessened due to the increase proportion of uses not in the residential household living category in the residential area. Consideration includes the proposal by itself and in combination with other uses in the area not in the residential household living category and is specifically based on:

- a. The number, size, and location of other uses not in the residential household living category in the residential; and*
- b. The intensity and scale of the proposed use and of existing residential household living uses and other uses.*

The proposed use is more than 600 feet from any similar uses and from any non residential household living category uses. It therefore complies with the spacing requirements of SMC 17C.330.120. The intensity and scale of the use is consistent with the density standards of that same section of the code and with those standards being met, the use is deemed by the ordinance compatible with the surrounding residential area.

2. Physical compatibility.

- a. The proposal will be compatible with adjacent residential developments based on characteristics such as the site size, building scale and style, setbacks, and landscaping; or*
- b. The proposal will mitigate differences in appearance or scale through such means as setbacks, screening, landscaping, and other design features.*

The building is a 60,200 square foot building so it will not look like a single-family home. It is only one story, however, with its highest peak being 25 feet high. It is therefore shorter than many of the residential uses surrounding which are two-stories in height. In addition, the elevations shown by the applicant at the hearing show peaked roofs and other elements of residential style architecture that are used to give the building a residential rather than an institutional look. The development of the building must comply with the landscaping, screening, storm drainage and all other applicable onsite performance standards in the City's code. The setbacks proposed are substantial and are considerably greater than required. The setback on the north side is 120 feet and there will be green space and a 6' high screening fence. On the east side the setback is 48' and again a 6' fence will be constructed. To the south the setback is 125 feet with green space and a fence. Adjacent to Freya Street additional

right-of-way will be dedicated, the street will be widened, and sidewalks will be constructed with street trees. Therefore, the Hearing Examiner finds that the proposal meets the ordinance requirements for compatibility. See SMC 17C.330.010.

Testimony from the owners of neighboring properties questioned the compatibility of this proposal with the neighborhoods surrounding. They testified that in order to be compatible it had to be single family residential development rather than this nursing home development. The City has identified group living, as a residential use which is allowed in the RSF zone by a conditional use permit under certain circumstances. Therefore the City has deemed that this use can be compatible with single family uses as long as there is appropriate mitigation. The Hearing Examiner cannot find that the use is incompatible just because the site is not being developed with single family homes.

3. Livability. The proposal will not have significant adverse impacts on the livability of nearby residential zoned lands due to:

- a. Noise, glare from lights, late-night operations, odors and litter; and*
- b. Privacy and safety issues.*

The proposal should not contribute much in the way of noise to the surrounding neighborhood. The age of clientele and the limited mobility of the clientele as well as the controlled and structured atmosphere of this facility should result in very little outside noise at any time of the day or night. It should produce much less noise than if the site were developed with single family residential uses. While there was some concern for noise from emergency vehicles voiced at the public hearing on this matter, the applicant testified that in their experience they averaged about one emergency vehicle visit per month which is not significant. All lighting on site will be shielded downward to avoid glare on surrounding properties and the parking lots will be screened with 6' fences. There will be some glare from automobile headlights as traffic leaves the site, but that would be true of virtually any use on site. There was no evidence that late night operations would cause livability problems in the neighborhood and also no evidence that excessive litter or odor would be associated with this use. The applicant testified that exhaust from kitchen vents will be filtered and the type of food prepared for this clientele did not involve deep-frying or foods that were particularly odiferous. Finally, privacy and safety should not be compromised as the residents of this facility will be essentially immobile and kept indoors. The applicant testified that doors in the facility are equipped with alarm systems so that clients will not exit the facility without the knowledge of the staff. No evidence was presented that privacy or safety would be compromised in any way.

4. Public Services.

- a. The proposed use is in conformance with the street designations of the*

transportation element of the comprehensive plan;

- b. The transportation system is capable of supporting the proposed use in addition to the existing uses in the area. Evaluation factors include street capacity, level of service, and other performance measures; access to arterials; connectivity; transit availability; on-street parking impacts; access restrictions; neighborhood impacts; impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation; safety for all modes; and adequate transportation demand management strategies;*
- c. Public services for water supply, police and fire protection are capable of serving the proposed use, and proposed sanitary waste disposal and stormwater disposal systems are acceptable to the engineering services department.*

The site will be accessed from Freya Street which is designated as a principal arterial in the City's Arterial Street plan. Therefore, there will be no cut-through traffic through residential neighborhoods. Freya Street adjacent to this site will be improved to principal arterial standards which includes dedication of additional right-of-way from the site, additional paving and construction of curb, sidewalk and planting strip. Under City regulations, the applicant is required to have at least 30 parking spaces but will provide 75 to minimize any on-street parking impacts. Further, a trip generation letter has been submitted to the City of Spokane for its review by the applicant's traffic engineer. The City approved the trip generation letter and based on that letter is requiring payment of an impact fee pursuant to SEPA. The applicant has agreed to pay the impact fee. At the hearing on this matter, the applicant's traffic engineer also submitted evidence that the proposal would generate less traffic as a skilled nursing facility than it would if developed with single family homes. While the neighborhood residents at the hearing objected to the numbers being used by the traffic engineer as the density of a single family development, the numbers used were within the density ranges allowed by the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan would require development of single family homes at between 4 units per acre and 10 units per acre. The number used by the applicant's traffic engineer would have development at a density of just less than 8 units per acre. Still, the traffic generated by this use is significantly less than it would be with single family development and no expert testimony or evidence was presented to show that the trip generation letter was in anyway faulty.

The City departments responsible for evaluating the water supply, police and fire protection and other public facilities have submitted no objections to the proposal. The site will be served with public water and sewer and both are adequate in this area according to staff. In addition, the facility will be constructed with sprinkler systems and alarms. The proposed stormwater system must comply with the special Moran Prairie Drainage District requirements in the City Code. The City's Engineering Services Department testified that the concept drainage plan submitted has been approved and a final drainage plan must be submitted at the time of building permit application.

Two other potential adverse impacts were addressed in public testimony. The first concerns the reputation of the applicant, Extendicare Health Facilities. At the hearing on this matter, several written complaints compiled by the Washington State Department of Health and Human Services were submitted by a neighbor. They were complaints made against certain existing Extendicare Health Facilities. The licensing of this facility and the handling of complaints is within the purview of that State department, however, and the Hearing Examiner cannot turn down a proposal like this that complies with the land use codes based on prior performance by the applicant. The licensing and any disciplinary action is within the jurisdiction of the State of Washington.

There was also some testimony that the construction of this facility will adversely affect neighboring property values. While no expert testimony was submitted on this issue, the Hearing Examiner again lacks authority to consider this issue. There are no criteria in the zoning code relating to the consideration of the effect on property values so the issue is irrelevant in this case.

DECISION

Based on the findings and conclusions above, it is the decision of the Hearing Examiner to approve the proposed conditional use permit subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is for a conditional use permit to allow the development of a 120 bed skilled nursing facility on site. The proposal shall be developed substantially in accordance with the site plan and elevations submitted. The building is to be one story and no taller than 25 feet high and residential in character. At least 75 parking spaces are to be provided. If changes are proposed to the site plan, elevations or other aspects of the proposal those proposed changes shall be submitted to planning services for review and approval. If planning services deems those proposed changes to be substantial then they shall be submitted to the Hearing Examiner for review and approval.
2. The applicant shall comply with the design standards set forth in SMC 17C.110.500, Land Use Standards, Residential Zones, Institutional Design Standards, to maintain compatibility with, and limit potential negative impacts on surrounding residential areas.
3. The applicant is encouraged to preserve as many mature trees on site as possible.
4. All parking areas must be hard surfaced.
5. The project is located in the Moran Prairie Special Drainage District as defined in SMC 17D.060.130. All storm water and surface drainage generated on-site shall be disposed of in accordance with SMC 17D.060 "Stormwater Facilities" and as per the Project Engineer's recommendations, based on a drainage plan accepted for the Conditional Use Permit. Pre-development flow of any off-site runoff passing through the site shall not be

increased (rate) due to development of the site based on a 100-year design storm.

- a. No building permit shall be issued until evidence satisfactory to the City Engineer has been provided showing that the recommendations of SMC 17D.060 “Stormwater Facilities” and the Project Engineer’s recommendations, based on the drainage plan accepted for the Conditional Use Permit, have been complied with.
 - b. All storm water facilities necessary to serve the proposed Conditional Use Permit shall be designed and constructed in accordance with City standards.
 - c. Prior to construction a grading, drainage and erosion and sediment control plan showing finished 1-foot contours and supporting calculations shall be submitted to Engineering Services – Developer Services for review and acceptance.
 - d. A conceptual drainage analysis from Apex Companies LLC dated October 12, 2006 and two subsequent drainage submittals dated October 17, 2007 and December 11, 2007 have been received and reviewed by Engineering Services – Developer Services.
 - e. The City accepts the concept of the general storm water disposal method presented in the concept and preliminary drainage reports. Additional geotechnical investigation and supplemental analysis and calculations are required for a complete drainage submittal and a final drainage report.
 - f. Two copies of a final drainage report, including supporting geotechnical calculations and documentation, shall be submitted to Engineering Services – Developer Services for review and acceptance. The developer will be responsible for all costs associated with constructing storm water improvements necessary to serve the site.
6. All broken, heaved, or sunken sidewalk adjacent to this site shall be replaced to City standards whether existing or caused during construction.
7. The applicant shall comply with the condition set forth in the Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance for this proposal.
8. Any proposed signage must comply with SMC 11.17 – Sign Code.
9. This approval does not waive the applicant’s obligation to comply with all of the requirements of the Spokane Municipal Code including the Uniform Codes, as well as requirements of City Departments and outside agencies with jurisdiction over land development.
10. Spokane Municipal Code section 17G.060.240 regulates the expiration of this approval, and Table 17G.060-3 sets forth the time frame for the expiration of all

approvals.

11. Prior to the issuance of any building or occupancy permits, the applicant shall submit evidence to this file that the property owner has signed and caused the following statement to be recorded with the Spokane County Auditor's Office.

COVENANT

Development of this property is subject to certain conditions on file with the City of Spokane Planning Department and the Office of the City of Spokane Hearing Examiner. The property may not be developed except in accordance with these conditions. A copy of these conditions is attached to this Covenant.

This statement shall be identified as a Covenant. The owner's signature shall be notarized.

12. This approval is subject to the above-stated conditions. By accepting this approval the applicant acknowledges that these conditions are reasonable and agrees to comply with them. The filing of the above required covenant constitutes the applicant's written agreement to comply with all conditions of approval. The property may not be developed except in accordance with these conditions and failure to comply with them may result in the revocation of this approval.

DATED this 21st day of March 2008.



Greg Smith
City of Spokane Hearing Examiner

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Appeals of decisions by the Hearing Examiner are governed by Spokane Municipal Code 17G.060.210 and 17G.050.

Decisions by the Hearing Examiner regarding conditional use permits are final. They may be appealed by any party of record by filing a Land Use Petition with the Superior Court of Spokane County. **THE LAND USE PETITION MUST BE FILED AND THE CITY OF SPOKANE MUST BE SERVED WITHIN TWENTY-ONE (21) CALENDAR DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE DECISION SET OUT ABOVE.** The date of the decision is the 21st day of March 2008. **THE DATE OF THE LAST DAY TO APPEAL IS THE 11th DAY OF APRIL 2008 AT 5:00 P.M.**

In addition to paying any Court costs to appeal the decision, the ordinance requires payment of a transcript fee to the City of Spokane to cover the costs of preparing a verbatim transcript and otherwise preparing a full record for the Court.

Pursuant to RCW 36.70B.130, affected property owners may request a change in valuation for property tax purposes notwithstanding any program of revaluation.