



DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

Map Amendment from Residential 15-30 to Office and a zone change from RMF to O-35

ADDRESS OF SITE OF PROPOSAL: (if not assigned yet, obtain address from Public Works before submitting application)
701 and 707 S Sherman

APPLICANT:

Name: David Jeter MPT, COMT, Acceleration Physical Therapy
Address: 1111 W Wellesley Ave. Spokane WA 99205
Phone (home): **Phone (work):** 448-9358
Email address: djeterpt1@gmail.com

PROPERTY OWNER:

Name: Patricia Upton aka Patricia Reilly
Address: 7421 Wandering St. Las Vegas Nevada 89131
Phone (home): **Phone (work):** N/A
Email address: N/A

AGENT:

Name: Land Use Solutions & Entitlement, Dwight Hume
Address: 9101 N Mt. View Lane Spokane WA 99218
Phone (home): **Phone (work):** 435-3108
Email address: dhume@spokane-landuse.com

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:

35203.0101 (701 S Sherman) and 35203.0102 (707 S Sherman)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

See attached

SIZE OF PROPERTY:

.29 acres

RECEIVED

OCT 29 2018

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

LIST SPECIFIC PERMITS REQUESTED IN THIS APPLICATION:

Land Use Map Amendment and associated zone change

SUBMITTED BY:

Applicant Property Owner Property Purchaser Agent

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:

Sara Eichelberger Power of Attorney over Patricia Upton AKA Patricia Reilly
I, Patricia Upton aka Patricia Reilly, owner of the above-described property do hereby authorize Dwight Hume to represent me and my interests in all matters regarding this application.

X Sara Eichelberger

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

Nevada
STATE OF WASHINGTON)
Clark) ss.
COUNTY OF SPOKANE)

On this *25th* day of *October*, 20*18*, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of *Nevada* duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared *Sara Eichelberger*, *POA over Patricia Upton AKA Patricia Reilly* 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.

[Signature]
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
residing at *State of Nevada Clark County*
6400 Sky Pointe di Ste 140
Las Vegas NV 89131

RECEIVED

OCT 29 2018

Neighborhood and Planning Services





Comprehensive Plan Amendments



Z18-883COMP 701 & 707 S Sherman

MAR 11 2019

Full Review & Fees for Applications approved for Annual Amendment Work Program:

Neighborhood and Planning Services

This "Full Review" application and full payment of fees is required to be completed and filed with City of Spokane within 15 days of council action by all applicants when proposals have been added to the "Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program" by City Council Resolution.

Please respond to these questions on a separate piece of paper. Incomplete answers may jeopardize your applications chances of being reviewed during this amendment cycle. Answers to these questions will assist in review of the criteria in SMC 17G.020.030.

1. Describe the nature of the proposed amendment and explain if there is any change from the early threshold review application. *The amendment is to change the allowed land use from medium density apartments to office for a physical therapy service.*
2. How will the proposed change provide a substantial benefit to the public? *Yes, the location is in close proximity to other major medical services and would be a convenient adjunct to those services and patients.*
3. Is this application consistent or inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives and policies? Describe and attach a copy of any study, report or data, which has been developed that supports the proposed change and any relevant conclusions. If inconsistent please discuss how the analysis demonstrates that changed conditions have occurred which will necessitate a shift in goals and policies. *The proposed amendment is consistent with the adopted Office policy as a trending expansion of the Office designation located immediately north of the subject property across Hartson Avenue.*
4. Is this application consistent or inconsistent with the goals and policies of state and federal legislation, such as the Growth Management Act (GMA) or environmental regulations? If inconsistent, describe the changed community needs or priorities that justify such an amendment and provide supporting documents, reports or studies. *The proposal is consistent with GMA and other applicable state and federal guidelines.*
5. Is this application consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the Regional Transportation Improvement District, and official population growth forecasts? If inconsistent please describe the changed regional needs or priorities that justify such an amendment and

provide supporting documents, reports or studies. *The proposal is consistent with CWPP and existing adopted land use policies.*

6. Are there any infrastructure implications that will require financial commitments reflected in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan? Are there other infrastructure implications that may be relevant given the review criteria in SMC 17G.020.030(C)? *No*
7. Will this proposal require an amendment to any supporting documents, such as development regulations, Capital Facilities Program, Shoreline Master Program, Downtown Plan, critical areas regulations, any neighborhood planning documents adopted after 2001, or the Parks Plan? If yes, please describe and reference the specific portion of the affected plan, policy or regulation. *No*

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

Project Description

Z18-883COMP Acceleration Physical Therapy

This is a map amendment request to change the Residential 15-30 category to Office and the RMF zone to O-35 for a physical therapy service to be located at the SE corner of Hartson and Sherman Street.

The current use of these two lots is a rental house and vacant lot. If approved, the house will be removed and the site graded for the construction of a small therapy office and on-site parking. It is yet to be determined if the existing basalt outcropping can be removed as well.

Construction is expected to occur during the construction season following approval of this amendment request.

End of Description

Z18-883COMP 701 and 707 S Sherman

Neighborhood and
Planning Services**A. Regulatory Changes.**

Amendments to the comprehensive plan must be 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.

No changes to GMA or environmental regulations are known to affect the proposed amendment. Accordingly, the proposed amendment is consistent with applicable GMA and environmental regulations.

B. GMA.

The change must be consistent with the goals and purposes of the state Growth Management Act.

The proposal is consistent with the adopted goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. That document has the same internal compliance requirement. Therefore, this meets the GMA requirements.

C. Financing.

In keeping with the GMA's requirement for plans to be supported by financing commitments, infrastructure implications of approved comprehensive plan amendments must be reflected in the relevant six-year capital improvement plan(s) approved in the same budget cycle.

No new infrastructure improvements will be triggered by this proposal. All expenses associated with this proposal are on site and privately funded.

D. Funding Shortfall.

If funding shortfalls suggest the need to scale back on land use objectives and/or service level standards, those decisions must be made with public input as part of this process for amending the comprehensive plan and capital facilities program.

No impacts will occur to require a shortfall to service levels from this proposed amendment.

E. Internal Consistency.

1). The requirement for internal consistency pertains to the comprehensive plan as it relates to all of its supporting documents, such as the development regulations, capital facilities program, shoreline master program, 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. For example, changes to the development regulations must be reflected in consistent

adjustments to the goals or policies in the comprehensive plan. As appropriate, changes to the map or text of the comprehensive plan must also result in corresponding adjustments to the zoning map and implementation regulations in the Spokane Municipal Code.

The proposed expansion of Office designation designation is inconsequential to the internal and applicable plans and programs of the City of Spokane.

2). If a proposed amendment is significantly inconsistent with current policy within the comprehensive plan, an amendment proposal must also include wording that would realign the relevant parts of the comprehensive plan and its other supporting documents with the full range of changes implied by the proposal.

Not Applicable

F. Regional Consistency.

All changes to the comprehensive plan must be 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 designation to Office from Residential 15-30 is not consequential to Regional Consistency.

G. Cumulative Effect.

All amendments must be considered 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

1) Land Use Impacts.

In addition, applications should be reviewed for their cumulative land use impacts. Where adverse environmental impacts are identified, mitigation requirements may be imposed as a part of the approval action

The proposed amendment has no accumulative impacts. The site size of .29 acres can only generate 8 residential units of density if combined with other ownerships. This will stand alone as a separate office use.

2) Grouping.

Proposals for area-wide rezones and/or site-specific land use plan map amendments may be evaluated by geographic sector and/or land use type in order to facilitate the assessment of their cumulative impacts.

This proposal has no effects on land use type or geographic area.

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

H. SEPA.

SEPA review must be completed on all amendment proposals and is described in chapter [17E.050](#)

1. Grouping.

When possible, the SEPA review process should be combined for related land use types or affected geographic sectors in order to better evaluate the proposals' cumulative impacts. This combined review process results in a single threshold determination for those related proposals.

The applicant is unaware of other pending applications. Notwithstanding, this expansion of an existing Office designation has insignificant cumulative impacts

2. DS.

If a determination of significance (DS) is made regarding any proposal, that application will be deferred for further consideration until the next applicable review cycle in order to allow adequate time for generating and processing the required environmental impact statement (EIS) *Not Applicable*

I. Adequate Public Facilities

The amendment must not adversely affect the City's ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services (as described in CFU 2.1 and CFU 2.2) citywide at the planned level of service, or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies

The proposal has no impacts upon citywide services.

J. UGA.

Amendments to the urban growth area boundary may only be proposed by the city council or the mayor of Spokane and shall follow the procedures of the countywide planning policies for Spokane County: *Not Applicable*

K. Demonstration of Need.

1) Map Changes.

Changes to the land use plan map (and by extension, the zoning map) may only be approved if the proponent has demonstrated that all of the following are true:

- a. The 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.);

The site is within proximity of other existing office complexes serving this area. AS stated above, Rockwood Multi-Care is the owner of numerous vacant lots directly across Sherman from the subject property and it is expected that these lots will be zoned for office use as they expand their existing facility nearby.

- b. The map amendment or site is suitable for the proposed designation;

The site is suitable for the proposed small physical therapy office use. In-lieu-of this, the site would have to be combined with other adjacent ownerships to be effectively used for the RMF zone.

- c. The map amendment implements applicable comprehensive plan policies and subarea plans better than the current map designation.

As stated above, this is a more appropriate and beneficial use to the area that is now trending toward expanded medical services rather than an apartment complex.

2) Rezones Land Use Plan Map Amendments

The extension of the existing O-35 zone does not impact other areas or zones citywide.

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services