

# SHORELINE PERMIT APPLICATION

*Attach an additional sheet if needed*

The proposed action requires approval of:

- Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP)
- Shoreline Conditional Use Permit (SCUP)**
- Shoreline Variance (SV)

All Shoreline Permits must provide the following information:

1. Identify the name of the shoreline (water body) with which the site of the proposal is associated. **The name of the water body/shoreline is the Spokane River**
2. Provide a general description of the proposed project, including the proposed use or uses and the activities necessary to accomplish the project.  
**A realignment of a portion of North Center Street will be constructed in the area of the Mission Campus known as the Ross Court. This 3.2 acre property is bordered by Upriver Drive, Granite, North Center, and an alley. The activities necessary to realign will include surveying the boundaries, designing the roadway, stormwater, curb, gutter and then constructing the necessary items. Typical construction activities include grading, asphalt placement, concrete placement for curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, and landscaping. The area that borders Upriver Drive will have native trees and other plants placed for landscaping.**
3. Provide a general description of the property and adjacent uses, including physical characteristics, intensity of development, improvements, and structures. **The property in this area was once residential. Avista has over time purchased the properties within the Ross Court, rezoned the area to light industrial and expanded the campus area to improve and be compatible with the residential neighborhood. The Riverview multi residential area is to the northwest and northeast of the proposal. The Avista Mission Campus area lies directly to the southwest and Upriver Drive borders southeast.**
4. What is the estimated total Fair Market project cost within the Shoreline Jurisdiction? **\$75,000**
5. Will the proposed development intrude waterward of the ordinary high water?  YES  **NO** If yes, describe the intrusion:
6. Will the proposed use or development affect existing views of the shoreline or adjacent waters?  YES  **NO**  
If yes, describe: **The realignment of North Center Street ultimately will improve the views in the shoreline area since the overall plan is to place trees and native vegetation within a planting strip paralleling Upriver Drive and the proposed area. The stormwater that this area generates will be collected on site and overall improve the cumulative impact to Spokane River.**
7. Explain how the proposed use will not unreasonably interfere with the normal public use of public shorelines. **The Upriver Drive separates the area that is used for recreation. The Spokane River and Centennial Trail are**

on the southeast side of the proposal. The realignment will not impact or interfere with the normal public use of the public shorelines because the road relocation is on the northerly side of Upriver Drive and access to the shorelines will remain the same.

8. Please explain how the proposal is consistent with the map, goals, and policies of the Shoreline Master Program. **The shoreline in this area is designated with a small area of Limited Urban Conservancy and Urban Conservancy. The section of the shoreline does not adequately reflect the actual conditions in relationship to the designation. The Upriver Drive separates the area of the Centennial Trail and Spokane River. The majority of natural area is located near the Spokane River. This area of the 200' shoreline boundary has been very manipulated, developed and does not have or exhibit any character for proper ecological functioning for the shoreline. The proposed site area has been substantially disturbed and is open with gravel and jersey barriers. The proposal will eventually place native landscaping consisting of trees and plants to enhance the aesthetics and area within this area of the road relocation.**
9. A detailed narrative of how the impacts of the proposal have been analyzed to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, including each step of the mitigation sequencing process, as defined in Section 17E.060.220 SMC. **Impacts of the proposal have been analyzed by visual inspection of the site. The area is very void of any significant vegetation that enhances the shoreline. Much of the absence of high quality shoreline area in this vicinity is due to the past and existing development, Upriver Drive and Centennial Trail bisecting the 200' shoreline area. The majority of vegetation is manicured with grass sod. The eventual placement of the native vegetation is expected to enhance the overall quality of area. The construction of the swale will keep the stormwater drainage from the upland development in an area to ensure that there is no runoff encroaching into the shoreline area and provide better and overall protection to the Spokane River with regards to cumulative impacts.**
10. List of permits required from other than City of Spokane agencies, include name of agency, date of application, and number of application. **Approval of the design plans for the road, sidewalks, curbs, and gutters will be needed prior to construction. Also, the vacation of Hamblin Street will need approval prior to the relocation of North Center.**

**In addition to Questions 1-10, all Shoreline Conditional Use Applications must ALSO provide the following information:**

11. List the provisions of the land use code that allows the proposal.

**Section 17C.130.030 Characteristics of Industrial Zones Section A distinguishes the zoning category in areas designated light industrial as areas that provide a wide variety and range of employment opportunities without potential conflicts from interspersed residential uses. A full range of industrial, commercial and office use is allowed. Avista Corp has existed in the Mission Campus area for over 50+ years. The complex contains the corporate headquarters office and service operations. The Mission Campus has been an integral part of the Logan Neighborhood and has complemented the residential uses. A portion of the North Center Street was completed within the past three years. The relocation of the remainder of North Center Street is only a reconfiguration of the traffic within the campus area. This relocation will consolidate and delineate the borders and parameters of the campus. The basic and intended compatibility and land use environment with the residential neighborhood is recognized and remains within the plans. Avista over the past several years has been gradually expanding the potential for growth, the commercial/light industrial nature of business activities and development has been designed to be compatible with the residential development.**

12. Please explain how the proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives and policies for the property.

The comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives and policies which are significant to this project are contained within LU4 – Transportation and LU 5- Development Character. The Avista Mission Campus since the development of the corporate headquarters and the service center 50+ years ago has endeavored to design a pleasant atmosphere that is compatible, attractive, and complementary with the surrounding neighborhood and land uses. The details with the use of geothermal pools, landscaping, sidewalks, etc. all blend within the surrounding environment and character of the neighborhood. This area is established and the reroute of North Center provides a physical boundary and delineates an area between the Riverview Living Facilities. The proposal provides a route that continues to make traffic and pedestrian flow safer. The proposed street relocation will have sidewalks and native landscaping to accommodate access and flow to the river and Centennial Trail while enhancing the natural environment. The road relocation and vacation of Hamblin Street is a comprehensive effort of the development of the Avista Mission Campus and was designed to minimize while enhancing the quality of the built and natural environment.

13. Please explain how the proposal meets the concurrency requirements of SMC Chapter 17D.010.

**The growth of the Avista Mission Campus is considered as infill and was developed and designed to continue the efforts to be compatible with surrounding uses. The infrastructure including, water, sewer, roads, public services are all existing. The overall development of this area which includes the reroute of North Center, supports the Growth Management Act and Countywide Planning Policies, which support infill development, designing projects to be compatible with surrounding uses, and encouraging safe access to the river, trail, etc.**

14. Please explain any significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties the proposal will have and any necessary conditions that can be placed on the proposal to avoid significant effects or interference with the use of neighboring property or the surrounding area, considering the design and intensity of the proposed use.

**The development plans for the reroute displaced residents. Every effort has been made to work with the residents to relocate. This has been an ongoing effort for the past several years so Avista can grow the campus. The purchase of the properties from the various residents was voluntary. The reroute design incorporates measures including a taller fence between the residents and new located street. This will provide the residents some privacy and a buffer from the Campus. The reroute will also provide a defined route for traffic as an alternative that could potentially keep traffic from the Riverview neighborhood.**

15. Please explain how the cumulative impact of several additional conditional use permits on the shoreline in the area will not preclude achieving the goals of the shoreline master program.

**Within this area there are no other conditional use permits on the shoreline that are proposed at this time. The reroute of the street is not adding another street and the cumulative shoreline impacts would be net zero. The proposal would not interfere or preclude achieving the goals of the shoreline master program. The proposal will increase and enhance the shoreline area by adding areas of native vegetation in an area that is a graveled area.**

**In addition to Questions 1-15, all Shoreline Variance Applications must provide the following additional information:**

16. Fill out the following information for the variance being requested:

	<i>REQUIRED</i>	<i>PROPOSED</i>
Front yard setback		
Rear yard setback		
Side yard setback		
Lot coverage percentage		

Lot size		
Lot width		
Height		
Other (specify):		

17. What physical characteristics of the property interfere with your ability to meet the required standards?
  
18. How does this property physically differ from other similarly zoned properties in the area and how do the physical characteristics of the subject property prevent developing to the same extent?
  
19. What hardship will result if the requested variance is not granted?
  
20. Does compliance with the requirement eliminate or substantially impair a natural, historic, or cultural feature of area-wide significance? If yes, please explain.
  
21. Will surrounding properties suffer significant adverse effects if this variance is granted? Please explain.
  
22. Will the appearance of the property be inconsistent with the development patterns of the surrounding property? Please explain.
  
23. Variance permits for development that will be located **landward** of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), and/or landward of any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:

- a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property.
  - b. That the hardship described in (a) of this subsection is specifically related to the property, and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, size, or natural features and the application of the master program, and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant's own actions.
  - c. That the design of the project is compatible with other authorized uses within the area and with uses planned for the area under the comprehensive plan and shoreline master program and will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.
  - d. That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area;
  - e. That the variance requested is the minimum necessary to afford relief.
  - f. That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.
24. Variance permits for development that will be located **waterward** of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), or within any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:
- a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes all reasonable use of the property.

b. That the proposal is consistent with the criteria established under WAC 173-27-170(2)(b) through (f).

c. That the public use of the shorelines will not be adversely affected.

*Rita Riedel Aug 28, 2015*