**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Map Amendment from R 10-20 to R 15+ and a corresponding zone change from RTF to RHD

**ADDRESS OF SITE OF PROPOSAL:** (if not assigned yet, obtain address from Public Works before submitting application)

W 1022 and 1028 Sinto Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICANT:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Ten Talents LLC C/O Mark Agee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>P O Box 1199 Veradale WA 99037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (home):</td>
<td>Phone (work): 509-951-1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marklagee@gmail.com">marklagee@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY OWNER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Same as above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AGENT:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Land Use Solutions and Entitlement c/o Dwight Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>9101 N Mt. View Lane Spokane WA 99218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone (home):</td>
<td>Phone (work): 435-3108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhume@spokane-landuse.com">dhume@spokane-landuse.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:**

35182.2405 and 35182.2406

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE:**

Bingamans Addn. Lot 5 Block 8 (W 1028 Sinto)
Bingamans Addn. Lot 6 and the West 40 ft. of Lot 7 (W 1022 Sinto)

**SIZE OF PROPERTY:**

1028 Sinto (7100 sf) 1022 Sinto (12780 sf) Total: 19889 sf (.46 acres)

**LIST SPECIFIC PERMITS REQUESTED IN THIS APPLICATION:**

Map Amendment and Zone Change
In the case of discretionary permits (administrative, hearing examiner, landmarks commission or plan commission), if the applicant is not the property owner, the owner must provide the following acknowledgement:

I, ___ Ten Talents LLC Mark L Agee, Manager ___, owner of the above-described property do hereby authorize ___ Dwight Hume ____________________________ to represent us and our interests in all matters regarding this application.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF WASHINGTON )
COUNTY OF SPOKANE ) ss.

On this _____ day of ___________, 20___, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared _____________________, to me known to be the individual that executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged the said instrument to be free and his/her free and voluntary act and deed, for the uses and purposes therein mentioned.

Witness my hand and official seal hereto affixed the day and year first above written.

______________________________
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
residing at ________________________
Comprehensive Plan or Land Use Code Amendment

W 1022 & 1028 Sinto Map Amendment

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:
(Please check the appropriate box(es))

☐ Comprehensive Plan Text Change  ☑ Land Use Designation Change
☐ Regulatory Code Text Change  ☐ Area-Wide Rezone

Please respond to these questions on a separate piece of paper. Incomplete answers may jeopardize your application’s chances of being reviewed during this amendment cycle.

1. General Questions (for all proposals):
   a. Summarize the general nature of the proposed amendment.
      A map amendment from R 10-20 and RTF zone to R 15+ and an RHD zone within the North Monroe Street Corridor.

   b. Why do you feel this change is needed?
      The existing residential structures were first constructed in 1891 and 1910 and are both functionally obsolete. Moreover, the City designated the subject properties within a Corridor that is intended to accommodate much higher densities than the current RTF zone allows. With Spokane’s current shortage of housing, it is appropriate to accommodate some of that housing demand with the intended higher density zones.

   c. In what way(s) is your proposal similar to or different from the fundamental concepts contained in the comprehensive plan?
      As stated above, this is the recently updated North Monroe Corridor and pursuant to LU 3-2, Corridors are areas of mixed use that extend no more than two blocks in either direction from the center of the transportation corridor (Monroe). Within a Corridor, there is a greater intensity of development. Housing is up to 44 units per acre next to the transportation corridor with a density transition to 22 units per acre at the outer edge. This proposal is therefore consistent with the policy provisions of the comprehensive plan due to the location within the Corridor at a mid-point of that allowed density transition.

   d. For text amendments: What goals, policies, regulations or other documents might be changed by your proposal?  Not Applicable

   e. For map amendments:
      1. What is the current Land Use designation and zoning for each affected parcel?  R 10-20 and RTF
      2. What is the requested Land Use designation and zoning for each affected parcel?  R 15+ and RHD
      3. Describe the land uses surrounding the proposed amendment site(s); e.g. land use type, vacant/occupied, etc.
         Subject: Existing S/F and 8-plex
         West: Residential S/F
         North/NE: Residential S/F
         South: vacant, garage, s/f and duplex
         East: S/F and Retail
f. Do you know of any existing studies, plans or other documents that specifically relate to or support your proposal? **No plans**

g. Why did you decide to pursue a comprehensive plan amendment rather than address your concern through some other aspect of the Development Services department's work program (e.g. neighborhood planning, public input on new regulations, etc.)?

*There is no purpose or budget for a neighborhood study. Furthermore, the area has been designated a Corridor since the original adoption of the comprehensive plan with policy provisions for density increases at the inner corridor but no changes in zoning to accommodate the intended growth. Accordingly, this is the only opportunity to amend the plan, as a private sector amendment.*

h. Has there been a previous attempt to address this concern through a comprehensive plan amendment?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [x] No

i. If yes, please answer the following questions:
   1. When was the amendment proposal submitted?
   2. Was it submitted as a consistent amendment or an inconsistent amendment?
   3. What were the Plan Commission recommendation and City Council decision at that time?
   4. Describe any ways that this amendment proposal varies from the previously considered version.
W 1022 and 1028 Sinto Threshold Supplement

1. Describe how the proposed amendment is appropriately addressed as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

   The request is for a map change to the adopted Comprehensive Plan Map, hence the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

2. The proposed amendment does not raise policy or land use issues that are more appropriately addressed by an ongoing work program approved by the City council or by a neighborhood or subarea planning process.

   The subject site is located well within a designated Corridor (mid-point in the west half of the Corridor. LU 3.2 calls for a density transition from the Transportation Corridor (Monroe Street) from 44 du/ac to 22 du/ac on the westerly edge of the Corridor. At this mid-point location, the requested density is between these ranges and no other sub-area plan effort would conclude otherwise. Accordingly, no sub-area plan is needed to accomplish this amendment.

3. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the resources and time frame of the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program.

   No special studies are expected to be generated by this amendment request; accordingly, this can be processed within the normal timeframe of an annual amendment.

4. In the case of a private application for a land use map change, nearby properties may also seem to be candidates for amendment. At the time of docketing or during plan commission review, expansion of the geographic scope of an amendment proposal may be considered, shared characteristics with nearby, similarly situated property may be identified and the expansion is the minimum necessary to include properties with those shared characteristics. Has the applicant had any outreach to surrounding property owners whose property may be so situated?

   There are only two owners within this block from Monroe to Madison; the applicant, (Ten Talents LLC) has the west half of the block and Robert Tweedy owns the east half of the block. While Tweedy has not been contacted, his remaining residential RTF lot would be a logical inclusion as it completes the change of designation and then adjoins the CC-2 DC corner.

5. Describe how the proposed amendment is consistent with current general policies in the comprehensive plan for site-specific amendment proposals. The proposed amendment must be consistent with policy implementation in the Countywide Planning policies, the GMA, or other state or federal law, and the WAC.

   a) This proposal is within an adopted designated Corridor. As stated above, LU 3.2 discusses Corridor land use as no more than 2 blocks deep from the transportation Corridor, (Monroe Street). This then, enables the future development of higher density land use with a density transition from 44 du/ac near Monroe to 22 du/ac at
the west edge of the Corridor. The subject properties are a mid-point and therefore should allow upwards of 30+ units/ acres. Hence the request to change to R-15-30. Note too that the properties along Sinto east of Monroe are already designated HDR-55.

Moreover, as part of an existing designated Corridor within an adopted plan, it is therefore consistent with County Planning policies, the GMA and the WAC.

In summary, the amendment request further implements the intent of the area within a designated Corridor as having the appropriate zone for higher density residential use and offers a reasonable density transition that should not prejudice future sub-area plan updates to this Corridor.

6. The proposed amendment is not the same as or substantially similar to a proposal that was considered in the previous year’s threshold review process, but was not included in the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program, unless additional supporting information has been generated.

*No previous applications have been considered.*

7. If this change is directed by state law or a decision of a court or administrative agency, please describe. *N/A*

8. Please provide copy of agenda or other documentation of outreach to neighborhood council made prior to application.

*The applicant will reach out to both the Emerson Garfield NC and West Central to inform them of this intended change to the land use and zone maps.*

End of Threshold Supplement
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