

CITY OF SPOKANE HEARING EXAMINER

Re: Preliminary Plat Application by Syntier)
Engineering on behalf of Hayden) FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
Homes to subdivide approximately) AND DECISION
17.79 acres into 78 single-family lots on)
property located at 2122, 2204, and) FILE NO. Z22-084PPLT
2222 West Strong Road.)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL AND DECISION

Proposal: The Applicant is proposing to subdivide approximately 17.79 acres into 78 single-family lots in a plat to be known as "Forest Grove."

Decision: Approved, with *revised* conditions.

FINDINGS OF FACT **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Agent: Ross Anderson
Syntier Engineering
55 E. Lincoln Road
Spokane, WA 99208

Applicant: Brian Thoreson
Hayden Homes
2464 SW Glacier Place
Redmond, OR 97756

Owners: Keith Riddle and Danny Patterson (2222 W. Strong Road)/Prestige
Worldwide Properties and Reed Moore (2204 W. Strong Road)/
Martin Tucker (2122 W. Strong Road)
706 W. Garland Avenue
Spokane, WA 99205

Property Location: The subject property is located at 2122 W. Strong Road (parcel no. 26245.0057), 2204 W. Strong Road (parcel no. 26254.0056), and 2222 W. Strong Road (parcel no. 26242.0065). The site is located on the north side of W Strong Road, between N Five Mile Road to the west and N Cedar Road to the east, in the City of Spokane, Washington.

Legal Description: The legal description of the property is provided in Exhibit 4, pp. 36-64 (Subdivision Guarantee dated 3-31-2022 and Title Commitment dated 4-4-2022).

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

Comprehensive Plan (CP) Map Designation: The property is designated as R 4-10 (Residential 4-10 units per acre).

Site Description: The site, which includes three parcels, is approximately 17.79 acres in size. The site is generally flat. The slope does not exceed 1% in grade. There are no surface waters, wetlands, or other critical areas on the site. The site is located at the northern municipal boundary in the Five Mile Prairie neighborhood, north of Strong Road. The parcels sit directly to the west of the Cheltenham plats.

Surrounding Conditions and Uses: The adjacent zoning to the south, west, and east is RSF (Residential Single Family). The properties to the north are in the County and are zoned Urban Reserve. All adjacent City land use designations are Residential 4-10; and all adjacent land uses are single-family homes, except for the City water tank that sits southeast of the proposed site.

PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

Authorizing Ordinances: Spokane Municipal Code (SMC) 17C.110, Residential Development; SMC 17G.080.050, Subdivisions; and SMC 17G.060.170, Decision Criteria.

Notice of Community Meeting: Mailed: January 13, 2022
Posted: January 13, 2022

Notice of Application/Public Hearing: Mailed: June 15, 2022
Posted: June 15, 2022
Publication: June 16 & 23, 2022

Community Meeting: January 26, 2022

Site Visit: July 6, 2022

Public Hearing Date: July 6, 2022

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA): A Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued on May 25, 2022. The DNS was not appealed.

Testimony:

Ali Brast
City of Spokane Planning & Development
808 W. Spokane Falls Boulevard
Spokane WA 99201

Ross Anderson
Syntier Engineering
55 E. Lincoln Road
Spokane, WA 99208

Brian Thoreson
Hayden Homes
2464 SW Glacier Place
Redmond, OR 97756

Present but did not Testify or Submitted Comments to the Record:

Kathy Miotke
[No Address Provided]
prairiepyrs@fastmail.com

Steve Thompson
9007 N. Cannon Street
Spokane, WA 99208
ivewritten@gmail.com

Exhibits:

1. Planning Services Staff Report dated 06/09/22
2. DNS dated 05/25/22
3. Community Meeting and Application Materials, including:
 - Notification Map Application, Map, and Parcel List (pp. 1-4)
 - Community Meeting Instructions and Notice of Community Meeting (pp. 5-8)
 - Individual Notice Affidavit on 01/13/22 (p. 9)
 - Public Notice Affidavit on 01/13/22 (p. 10)
 - Meeting Sign-In Sheet (p. 11)
 - Meeting Recording
4. First Submittal and Agency Comments – Technically Incomplete, including:
 - Request for Comments dated 04/13/22 (pp. 1-3)
 - General Application (pp. 4-8)
 - Preliminary Long Plat Application, including maps and plans (pp. 9-15)
 - SEPA Environmental Checklist (pp. 16-28)
 - Traffic Generation and Distribution Letter (TGD L) dated 02/09/22 (pp. 29-35)
 - Title Insurance Guarantee (pp. 36-65)
 - Spokane Regional Health District (SRHD) Comments (pp. 66-67)
 - Spokane Tribe of Comments (p. 68)
 - City of Spokane Street Department Comments (p. 69)
 - Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (WSDAHP) Comments (pp. 70-71)
 - Washington State Department of Ecology (WSDOE) Comments (pp. 72-73)
 - Five Mile Prairie Neighborhood Council Comments (p. 74)
 - City of Spokane Street Department Comments via email (pp. 75-76)
 - Public Comment (K. Miotke) via email (p. 77)
 - City of Spokane Engineering Department Comments (pp. 78-81)
 - Avista Comments (pp. 82-85)
 - Technically Incomplete Letter dated 04/28/22 (pp. 86-89)
5. Revised Materials and Agency Response, including:
 - Request for Comments via email dated 05/11/22 (pp. 1-4)
 - General Application (p. 5)
 - Preliminary Plat Maps (pp. 6-7)
 - SEPA Environmental Checklist (pp. 8-20)
 - TGD L dated 05/09/22 (pp. 21-28)
 - City of Spokane Street Department Comments via email (pp. 29-39)
 - WSDOE Comments (pp. 40-41)
6. Notice of Application and Public Hearing Materials, including:
 - Notice of Application Instructions dated 05/19/22 (pp. 1-2)
 - Notice of Application and Public Hearing with Map and Parcel List (pp. 3-6)

- Public Notice Affidavit of posting on 05/24/22 (p. 6)
 - Individual Notice Affidavit of mailing on 05/24/22 (p. 7)
 - Public Comment (S. Thompson) via email (pp. 9-10)
7. Revised Notice of Application and Public Hearing Materials, including:
 - Notice of Application Instructions dated 05/19/22 (pp. 1-2)
 - Notice of Application and Public Hearing (pp. 3-4)
 - Public Notice Affidavit of mailing on 06/15/22 (p. 5)
 - Individual Notice Affidavit of posting on 06/15/22 (p. 6)
 - Affidavit of Publication dated 06/27/22 and Notice (pp. 7-8)
 8. Planning Services Presentation
 9. Email Correspondence between Applicant and City Engineering re: wording of Dedication #6.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

To be approved, the proposed preliminary plat must comply with the criteria set forth in Section 17G.060.170 SMC. The Hearing Examiner has reviewed the plat application and the evidence of record with regard to the application and makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. *The proposal is allowed under the provisions of the land use codes. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(1).*

The site is zoned RSF. The Applicant proposes to develop the site with single-family residences. This proposed use is outright permitted in the RSF zone. See Table 17C.110-1; *see also* SMC 17C.110.115. The density range of the proposal is 5.95 dwelling units per acre (DUs/acre). See Staff Report, p. 3. Therefore, the net density of the project fits within the 4-10 DUs/acre allowed under the municipal code. See *id.* The proposed development also satisfies the minimum lot size and frontage requirements for the SFR zone. See *id.* In addition, the proposed development will be required to satisfy all other applicable development standards, as provided in the conditions of approval. The Hearing Examiner concludes that this proposal is authorized by the land use codes.

2. *The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives, and policies for the property. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(2).*

The proposed development is consistent with the pertinent provisions of the CP. The site is designated as Residential 4-10. This designation allows single-family residences on individual lots and attached (zero-lot line) single-family residences. See CP, Chapter 3, p. 3-40. Land with this designation may be developed with a minimum of 4 DUs/acre and a maximum of 10 DUs/acre. See *id.* The density of the project fits within this designation, as discussed above.

The proposal is generally supported by the goals, objectives, and policies of the CP. The site is within the Urban Growth Area and is designated for precisely this type of development. The proposed development will include lots and homes of similar style and nature to the residential development to the east. See CP, Chapter 8, Policy DP 1.4, p. 10 (encouraging project designs that blend with existing neighborhoods); *see also* CP, Chapter 8, Policy DP 1.2, p. 8-5 (stating that new development should be compatible

with the context of the area and improve the surrounding neighborhood). With respect to urban land within the City, this proposal is a natural progression in the residential development, consistent with the long-term plans for the area. See CP, Chapter 3, Goal LU 5, p. 3-26 (promoting development that is complementary with other land uses); see also CP, Chapter 3, Policy LU 5.5, p. 3-27 (discussing the need to ensure compatibility when permitting infill developments).

There were no reports that the public infrastructure was not sufficient to accommodate the development. See Paragraph 3. So long as the project conditions are satisfied, public services and facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed development. This fulfills Policy LU 1.12, Public Facilities and Services. See CP, Chapter 3, Policy LU 1.12, p. 3-14. In addition, the project, as conditioned, promotes the efficient use of land by focusing growth in areas where adequate facilities and services are available. See CP, Chapter 3, Policy LU 3.1, p. 3-17.

Considering the characteristics and design of the proposal, the Hearing Examiner agrees with the Staff that it is consistent with the CP. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

3. *The proposal meets the concurrency requirements of Chapter 17D.010SMC. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(3).*

On April 13, 2022, and May 11, 2022, requests for comments on the application were circulated to all City departments and outside agencies with jurisdiction. See Exhibits 4 & 5. In response, the City received comments from various agencies regarding the project. See *id.* None of the commenting agencies or departments reported that concurrency was not satisfied. See Staff Report, p. 4. To the extent any deficiencies exist in public infrastructure, those conditions are addressed by the project conditions. See e.g. Condition 6 (listing improvements for roads, sewer, water, etc.). The Hearing Examiner concludes that, with the proposed conditions, the project satisfies this criterion for approval.

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. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(4).*

The Hearing Examiner concludes that the property is suitable for the proposed use, given its physical characteristics. The development area is of sufficient size and shape to accommodate the project, as is demonstrated by the layout shown on the proposed plat. See Exhibit 5, pp. 6-7. The location of the site does not pose genuine limitations on its use and development. The site is located adjacent to Strong Road and near other, similar developments/uses. The subject site is relatively flat, the highest slope being approximately 1% in grade. See Exhibit 5, p. 10 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(1)(b)). Thus, the topography does not present a genuine obstacle to development.

There are no indications of surface water on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. See Exhibit 5, p. 10 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(a)(1)). Storm water drainage on the property will be handled through the typical methods identified in the Spokane Regional Stormwater Manual (SRSW). See Exhibit 5, p. 11 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(c)). No groundwater will be withdrawn as the project will be served by city water. See Exhibit

5, p. 11 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(b)(1)); see also Staff Report, p. 6 In addition, public wastewater will be collected and routed to the public sewage treatment facility. See Exhibit 5, p. 11 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(b)(2)). There is no reason to expect that groundwater will be impacted by this project. See e.g. Exhibit 5, p. 11 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(c)(2)).

There are no known historic or cultural features on the development site. See Exhibit 5, p. 16 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(13)). However, the WSDAHP advised that its predictive model indicates a high probability of encountering cultural resources within the proposed project area. See Exhibit 4, pp. 70-71. Both WSDAHP and the Spokane Tribe of Indians recommended that a cultural survey be completed for this site. See *id.*; see also Exhibit 4, p. 68. Based upon this recommendation, the project conditions require the developer to enlist the services of an archaeologist to conduct a cultural survey of this site prior to any ground disturbing activities. See Condition 3. The Applicant has confirmed that this survey is already in progress. *Testimony of B. Thoreson.*

Various City departments and agencies reviewed the SEPA checklist for physical characteristics of the property and no other comments were received indicating the site is unsuitable for development. See Exhibit 1, pp. 4-5.

The Hearing Examiner concludes that the property is suitable for the proposed use, given the conditions and characteristics of the site. As a result, this criterion is satisfied.

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. See SMC 17G.060.170(C)(5).*

On or about May 5, 2022, the Applicant prepared a revised environmental checklist for the project. The checklist supports the conclusion that no significant environmental impacts will arise from this project. For example, there are no wetlands, surface waters, or other limiting features. See Exhibit 5, p. 10 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(a)(1)). The property does not lie within a 100-year floodplain. See Exhibit 5, p. 11 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(3)(a)(5)). No threatened or endangered species were identified on the site. See Exhibit 5, pp. 12 & 13 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(4)(c) & B(5)(b)). The project is not anticipated to create any significant noise or light, beyond that associated with normal residential uses. See Exhibit 5, pp. 14 & 16 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(7)(b) & B(11)). No waste materials will be discharged into the ground or into surface waters. See Exhibit 5, p. 11 (Environmental Checklist ¶¶ B(3)(a)(6), B(3)(b)(2) & B(3)(c)(2)). No environmental hazards are anticipated to arise due to this project. See Exhibit 5, p. 13 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(7)(a)).

The Applicant will be required to implement onsite controls for stormwater and surface drainage generated from the development. See SMC 17D.060.010 *et seq.*; see also Staff Report, p. 5. As discussed above, all stormwater will be collected, treated, and discharged in accordance with the SRSM. See Paragraph 4. These requirements have been incorporated into the project conditions. See Condition 6 & Dedications 10-11.

The project will result in additional traffic, and certain improvements will be required to support the proposed development. For example, the developer will be required to make

frontage improvements to Strong Road. See Condition 6(c). In addition, the City will be collecting impact fees based upon the schedules in SMC 17D.075.180, or based upon an independent fee calculation pursuant to SMC 17D.075.050. See Dedication 13. The impact fee will be collected for each single-family residence and must be paid prior to issuance of the building permit. See *id.* Thus, to the extent there are impacts from traffic, those impacts are being mitigated via road improvements and impact fee contributions.

There will be some impacts due to construction activity. However, the construction impacts will not result in significant environmental impacts, and can be adequately mitigated (e.g. dust control, limited work hours, etc.). Further, the construction activity is temporary. Once the construction project ends, the potential impacts from noise, dust, and emissions from vehicles will cease. See e.g. Exhibit 5, p. 14 (Environmental Checklist ¶ B(7)(b)(1) (concerning construction noise)). In addition, the environmental impacts of the completed project are minor.

Various departments and agencies reviewed the proposal and did not conclude that there were significant environmental impacts. The City examined the environmental checklist, and ultimately issued a DNS on May 25, 2022. See Exhibit 2. The appeal period for the DNS expired on June 8, 2022. See *id.* The DNS was not appealed.

Based upon the foregoing, the Hearing Examiner concludes that the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties and, therefore, this criterion for approval has been met.

6. *The proposed subdivision makes appropriate (in terms of capacity and concurrence) provisions for: (a) public health, safety, and welfare; (b) open spaces; (c) drainage ways; (d) street, roads, alleys, and other public ways; (e) transit stops; (f) potable water supplies; (g) sanitary wastes; (h) parks, recreation and playgrounds; (i) schools and school grounds; and (j) sidewalks, pathways, and other features that assure safe walking conditions. See SMC 17G.060.170(D)(5).*

The proposal makes adequate provisions for public health, safety, and welfare. The record does not contain evidence that this project is antithetical to the community's interests. The proposal is designed and will be required to satisfy the applicable City standards for drainage, streets, and other public ways; proper disposal of storm water; and the like. All the pertinent facilities, such as streets, curbing, sidewalks, etc., must be designed and constructed in accordance with City standards. Other than those issues, there were no other comments from any department or agency suggesting that the proposed development placed undue stresses on the public infrastructure or services. There was no testimony or other evidence that convinced the Hearing Examiner that there would be significant impacts on public health, safety, or welfare.

There were public comments raising concerns about the condition of Strong Road. See Exhibit 4, p. 74; see also Exhibit 6, p. 10. However, the Applicant will be making minor repairs to the portion of Strong Road adjacent to its frontage. *Testimony of A. Brast.* The project conditions require the Applicant to make frontage improvements, including the addition of a separated sidewalk on the north side of Strong Road along the project's frontage. See *id.*; see also Condition 6(c). The Applicant will also be paying impact fees to account for the project's impact on the transportation system. See Dedication 13. The Hearing Examiner concludes that the developer is making contributions that are

proportional to its anticipated impact. The developer is not responsible to address all the potential deficiencies of Strong Road.

The Hearing Examiner concludes that the proposal satisfies the applicable subdivision standards. The Hearing Examiner also adopts and incorporates the staff's analysis of this issue, found on pages 5-6 of the Staff Report. This criterion is met.

DECISION

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

1. Per the current transition requirements identified in 17C.110.200.C.1.c, ensure that Lot 18 and Lot 17, Block 3 are at least 7,200 square feet in size, since 8907 N Cannon is over 7,200 square feet. The transition requirements apply to the first 80 feet of the subject property. If, at the time of Final Plat submittal, this transition code section no longer exists, then these transition requirements will not apply.
2. Street trees are required with all new construction. A street tree plan will be required to be submitted with the Engineering public improvement documents to ensure sufficient plantings are achieved. The approved plan will be adopted as the planting plan for the subdivision and each single-family building permit will be required to adhere to the plan.
3. Per comments submitted by WSDAHP and the Spokane Tribe, a Cultural Resource Survey is required prior to any ground disturbing activity.
4. Per comments submitted by the SRHD, refer to email dated April 13, 2022 for requirements for demolition as well as requirements to decommission wells and on-site septic systems
5. Per comments from Avista, the developer shall dedicate 10-foot "dry" utility easements behind any border easements and sidewalk right of way (ROW). If needed, the developer will also grant a 5-foot rear utility easement across the rear or side of lots located in Block 3 for utilities that will potentially extend from existing gas and electric facilities to the north. The following dedication language shall be included on the final plat:
 - a. Dry utility easements (electric, gas, phone, fiber, cable TV, etc.) as shown on the herein described plat are hereby dedicated for the use of serving utility companies for the construction, reconstruction, relocation, maintenance, protection, inspection and operation of their respective facilities, together with the right to prohibit changes in grade over installed underground facilities and the right to prohibit, trim and/or remove trees, bushes, and landscaping without compensation and to prohibit brick, rock, masonry, or any structures that may interfere with the construction, reconstruction, reliability, maintenance, and safe operation of the same. Storm drain dry wells and water meter boxes shall not be placed within the "Dry" easements; however, lateral crossings by storm drain and sewer lines are permitted. Serving utility companies are granted the right to install utilities across private roads, driveways, border easements, tracts, common areas, and open space. Serving utility companies are also

granted the right to install utilities across future acquisition areas, and or border easements.

6. Engineered construction plans for public street, sewer, water, and storm water systems must be approved for construction and the improvements must be completed prior to plat finalization. Street and storm improvements may be bonded for; however, all water and sewer improvements must be installed and accepted for service prior to plat finalization.
 - a. Centerline monuments must be shown on the street improvement plans and must be installed at the locations outlined in Section 3.7-13 of the Design Standards.
 - b. Plans must be designed to show full pavement sections, separated sidewalk with plant strip and street trees, all driveway approaches, and street drainage.
 - c. Frontage improvements will be required along Strong Road. The exact improvements that will be required will be determined during the engineering plan review process.
 - d. The centerline for Road 2 must line up directly across from the centerline of existing Nettleton Court. An offset intersection across Strong Road will not be allowed.
7. Applicable dedicatory statements must be added to the final plat dedication detailing who Tract A is being dedicated to and for what purpose. A Homeowner's Association (HOA) must be established for the maintenance of all shared private facilities within the plat. Final plat dedication must reference the recording information of the document establishing the HOA.
8. All easements, both public and private, must be shown or referenced on the final plat. There are several easements showing in the title report that must be referenced on the final plat. If blanket in nature, the easement must be referenced in a Surveyor's Note.
9. Addresses must be shown on the final plat. Address permits can be applied for at the City of Spokane permit center, or by emailing a request to addressing@spokanecity.org, or by calling (509) 625-6999.

The following statements will be required in the dedication of the final plat:

1. Only City water and sanitary sewer systems shall serve the plat; the use of individual on-site sanitary waste disposal systems and private wells is prohibited.
2. Ten-foot utility easements as shown here on the described plat are hereby dedicated to the City and its permittees for the construction, reconstruction, maintenance, protection, inspections and operation of their respective facilities together with the right to prohibit structures that may interfere with the construction, reconstruction, reliability and safe operation of the same.
3. The plat is located within the Five-Mile Prairie Special Drainage District. The development of any below-grade structures, including basements, is subject to prior review of a geotechnical evaluation for foundation design to determine suitability and effects from stormwater and/or subsurface runoff. The geotechnical evaluation shall be submitted to Developer Services for review and concurrence prior to the issuance of a building permit. It must address the disposal of storm

water runoff and the stability of soils for the proposed structure. This evaluation must be performed by a geotechnical engineer, licensed in the State of Washington. It must be submitted to the City Building Department and to Developer Services for review and concurrence prior to issuance of any building permit for the affected structure. An overall or phase-by-phase geotechnical analysis may be performed in lieu of individual lot analyses to determine appropriate construction designs.

4. A temporary turn-around easement over a portion of Lots 2 and 3, Block 3, as shown hereon, is hereby granted to the City of Spokane until such a time as the public street right-of-way is extended. The temporary turn-around easement is for the use of the public and may be used by the public in the same manner as public rights-of-way and the same restrictions and liabilities apply to said easement as if it is a public ROW.
5. The future extension of Acorn Ave will require that the plat(s) of the development requiring said extension must remove the temporary cul-de-sac and replace it with city standard curb/gutter, sidewalk, and planting strips/swales at said plat(s) expense.
6. *The property owner(s) of Lots 2 and 3, Block 3, will be responsible for all costs associated with reconstruction of private improvements impacted by removal of the temporary turn-around and construction of the required street improvements.*
7. Development of the subject property, including grading and filling, are required to follow an erosion/sediment control plan that has been submitted to and accepted by Development Services prior to the issuance of any building and/or grading permits.
8. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the lots shall be connected to a functioning public or private sanitary sewer system and connected to a public or private water system, complying with the requirements of the Development Services and having adequate pressure for domestic and fire uses, as determined by the Water and Hydroelectric Services Department and the Fire Department.
9. All parking areas and driveways shall be hard surfaced. All new or modified driveway locations will need to be reviewed and approved prior to construction.
10. All Stormwater and surface drainage generated on-site must be disposed of on-site in accordance with chapter 17D.060 SMC, Stormwater Facilities, the Spokane Regional Stormwater Manual, and City Design Standards. A surface drainage plan shall be prepared for each lot and shall be submitted to the City of Spokane Planning & Development Department for review and acceptance prior to the issuance of a building permit on said lot.
11. No building permit shall be issued for any lot in this subdivision until evidence satisfactory to the Director of Engineering Services has been provided showing that the recommendations of Chapter 17D.060 SMC, Stormwater Facilities, and the Project Engineer's recommendations, based on the drainage plan accepted for the final subdivision, have been complied with.
12. Slope easements for cut and fill, as deemed necessary by Planning & Development in accordance with City Design Standards, are granted along all public right of ways.

13. A Transportation Impact Fee will be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit for the affected lot.
14. General Facilities Charges for new and/or upsized water and sewer services will apply to the Lots within this plat.

SIGNED this 7th day of July 2022.



Brian T. McGinn
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 of the Hearing Examiner regarding preliminary plats are final. They may be appealed to the City Council. All appeals must be filed with the Planning Department within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of the decision. The date of the decision is the 7th day of July. **THE DATE OF THE LAST DAY TO APPEAL IS THE 21st DAY OF JULY 2022, AT 5:00 P.M.**

In addition to paying the appeal fee 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 City Council.