



**Agenda Sheet for City Council Meeting of:**  
10/29/2018

<b>Date Rec'd</b>	10/15/2018
<b>Clerk's File #</b>	ORD C35687
<b>Renews #</b>	

<b>Submitting Dept</b>	PLANNING	<b>Cross Ref #</b>	
<b>Contact Name/Phone</b>	TIRRELL BLACK 625-6185	<b>Project #</b>	
<b>Contact E-Mail</b>	TBLACK@SPOKANECITY.ORG	<b>Bid #</b>	
<b>Agenda Item Type</b>	First Reading Ordinance	<b>Requisition #</b>	
<b>Agenda Item Name</b>	0650 - PLESE & PLESE, LLC LAND USE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT		

**Agenda Wording**

Plese & Plese, LLC is a proposal to amend the land use plan map for two split zoned parcels from "Residential 4-10" to "Office". The properties are addressed at 6216 N. Washington Street and 6217 N. Whitehouse Street; the size is approximately 0.27

**Summary (Background)**

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO APPLICATION MADE BY PLESE & PLESE LLC, PLANNING FILE #Z17-630COMP AND AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FROM "RESIDENTIAL 4-10" TO "OFFICE" FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.25 ACRES TOTAL DESCRIBED AS: LOTS 5, 33, AND 34, OF BLOCK 5, BYRNE ADDITION CITY OF SPOKANE, WASHINGTON; AND AMENDING THE ZONING MAP FROM "RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY (RSF)" TO "OFFICE (0-35)."

<b>Fiscal Impact</b>	Grant related? NO	<b>Budget Account</b>	
	Public Works? NO		
Neutral	\$	#	
Select	\$	#	
Select	\$	#	
Select	\$	#	

<b>Approvals</b>		<b>Council Notifications</b>	
<b>Dept Head</b>	TRAUTMAN, HEATHER	<b>Study Session</b>	
<b>Division Director</b>	TRAUTMAN, HEATHER	<b>Other</b>	Plan Commission Mtg
<b>Finance</b>	ORLOB, KIMBERLY	<b>Distribution List</b>	
<b>Legal</b>	RICHMAN, JAMES	tblack@spokanecity.org	
<b>For the Mayor</b>	SANDERS, THERESA	htrautman@spokanecity.org	
<b>Additional Approvals</b>		dkinder@spokanecity.org	
<b>Purchasing</b>		sbishop@spokanecity.org	
		PASSED BY	
		SPOKANE CITY COUNCIL:	

FIRST READING OF THE ABOVE  
ORDINANCE HELD ON  
10/29/2018  
AND FURTHER ACTION WAS DEFERRED  
[Signature]  
CITY CLERK

11/15/2018  
[Signature]  
CITY CLERK

ORDINANCE C35687

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO APPLICATION MADE BY PLESE & PLESE LLC, PLANNING FILE #Z17-630COMP AND AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FROM "RESIDENTIAL 4-10" TO "OFFICE" FOR APPROXIMATELY 0.25 ACRES TOTAL DESCRIBED AS: LOTS 5, 33, AND 34, OF BLOCK 5, BYRNE ADDITION CITY OF SPOKANE, WASHINGTON; AND AMENDING THE ZONING MAP FROM "RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY (RSF)" TO "OFFICE (O-35)."

WHEREAS, the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1990, requiring among other things, the development of a Comprehensive Plan (RCW 36.70A); and

WHEREAS, the City of Spokane adopted a Comprehensive Plan in May of 2001 that complies with the requirements of the Growth Management Act; and

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Act requires continuing review and evaluation of the Comprehensive Plan and contemplates an annual amendment process for incorporating necessary and appropriate revisions to the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, land use amendment application Z17-630COMP was timely submitted to the City for consideration during the City's 2017/2018 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle; and

WHEREAS, Application Z17-630COMP seeks to amend the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan for a change from "Residential 4-10" to "Office" for 0.25 acres of Lots 33 and 34. If approved, the implementing zoning designation requested is "Office (O-35)"; and

WHEREAS, during consideration of the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket, the City Council adopted Resolution 2018-0021 expanding the area of the proposed amendment to include Lot 5; and

WHEREAS, staff requested comments from agencies and departments on April 20, 2018, and a public comment period ran from May 29, 2018 to July 27, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Department of Commerce and appropriate state agencies were given the required 60-day notice before adoption of proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan on September 19, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane City Plan Commission held a substantive workshop regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment on June 19, 2018; and

WHEREAS, a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination of Non-Significance was issued on August 28, 2018 for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map

and Zoning Map changes (“DNS”). The public comment period for the SEPA determination ended on September 11, 2018; and

WHEREAS, notice of the SEPA Checklist and Determination, the Land Use Plan Map changes, and the Zoning Map changes, and announcement of the September 12 2018 Plan Commission Public Hearing was published on August 29, 2018 and September 5, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Notice of Plan Commission Public Hearing and SEPA Determination was posted on the property and mailed to all property owners and taxpayers of record, as shown by the most recent Spokane County Assessor’s record, and occupants of addresses of property located within a four hundred foot radius of any portion of the boundary of the subject property on August 29, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the staff report for Application Z17-630COMP reviewed all the criteria relevant to consideration of the application; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane Plan Commission conducted a public hearing and deliberated on September 12, 2018 for the Application Z17-630COMP and other proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane Plan Commission found that Application Z17-630COMP is consistent with and implements the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission voted 10 to 0 to recommend approval of Application Z17-630COMP; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopts the recitals set forth herein as its findings and conclusions in support of its adoption of this ordinance and further adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the Planning & Development Services Staff Report and the City of Spokane Plan Commission for the same purposes; --

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SPOKANE DOES ORDAIN:

1. Approval of Application. Application Z17-630COMP is approved.
2. Amendment of Land Use Map. The Spokane Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan Map is amended from “Residential 4-10” to “Office” for 10.76 acres, as shown in Exhibit A.
3. Amendment of Zoning Map. The City of Spokane Zoning Map is amended from “Residential Single Family (RSF)” to “Office (O-35)” for this same area, as shown in Exhibit B.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 5, 2018

Ben Stuch  
Council President

Attest:

Yeni K. Hayes  
City Clerk

David A. Cunniff  
Mayor


Approved as to form:  
Pat Dahl  
Assistant City Attorney

11/14/18  
Date


DECEMBER 14, 2018  
Effective Date



# Exhibit A



# Exhibit B



## **Plan Commission Findings**

**Spokane Plan Commission Findings of Fact, Conclusions,  
and Recommendations on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use  
Plan Map Amendment File No. Z2017-630COMP  
(PLESE & PLESE LLC)**

**A Recommendation of the Spokane Plan Commission to the City Council to APPROVE the Comprehensive Plan Amendment application seeking to amend the land use plan map designation from “Residential 4-10” to “Office” for approximately 0.25 ACRES total described as: LOTS 5, 33, AND 34, OF BLOCK 5, BYRNE ADDITION CITY OF SPOKANE. The implementing zoning designation requested is to change to the Office (O-35) zone.**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- A. The City of Spokane adopted a Comprehensive Plan in May of 2001 that complies with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA).
- B. Under GMA, comprehensive plans generally may be amended no more frequently than once a year, and all amendment proposals must be considered concurrently in order to evaluate for their cumulative effect.
- C. Amendment application Z2017-623COMP (the “Application”) was timely submitted for review during the City’s 2017/2018 amendment cycle.
- D. The Application seeks to amend the land use designation for a approximately 0.25 acres total described as lots 5, 33, and 34 of Block 5, Byrne Addition, City of Spokane(the “Property”), from “Residential 4-10” to “Office” with a corresponding change in zoning to Office (O-35) zone.
- E. Annual amendment applications are subject to a threshold review process to determine whether the applications will be included in the City’s Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program.
- F. On February 7, 2018, an Ad Hoc City Council Committee reviewed the applications that had been timely submitted, and forwarded its recommendation to City Council regarding the applications.
- G. On March 26, 2018, the City Council adopted Resolution RES2018-0021 establishing the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program, and including the Application in the Work Program.
- H. Thereafter, on April 20, 2018, staff requested comments from agencies and departments. No adverse comments were received from agencies or departments regarding the Application.
- I. A public comment period ran from May 28, 2018 to July 27, 2018 which provided a 60 day public comment period. The City did not receive any negative comments regarding the Application.



- J. On May 3, 2017, the Community Assembly received a presentation regarding the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program and the Application, and has been provided with information regarding the dates of Plan Commission workshops and hearings.
- K. On July 11, 2018, the Spokane City Plan Commission held a workshop to study the Application.
- L. On August 28, 2018, a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance were issued for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning Map changes, including the Application. The deadline to appeal the SEPA determination was September 11, 2018.
- M. On September 19, 2018, the Washington State Department of Commerce and appropriate state agencies were given the required 60-day notice of intent to adopt before adoption of any proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan.
- N. On August 29 and September 5, 2018, the City caused notice to be published in the Spokesman Review providing notice of the SEPA Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance, the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map amendment, and announcing the September 12, 2018 Plan Commission Public Hearing.
- O. On August 29, 2018, Notice of Public Hearing and SEPA Determination was posted on the property and mailed to all property owners and taxpayers of record, as shown by the most recent Spokane County Assessor's record, and occupants of addresses of property located within a four hundred foot radius of any portion of the boundary of the subject property.
- P. The staff report found that the amendment met all the decision criteria for approval of a Comprehensive Plan amendment as prescribed by SMC 17G.020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedure.
- Q. On September 12, 2018, the Plan Commission held a public hearing on the Application, and deliberations were continued to the Commission's September 26, 2018 meeting.
- R. Nobody testified in opposition to the Application, and the City did not receive any adverse comments from the public or otherwise regarding the Application.
- S. As a result of the City's efforts, the public has had extensive opportunities to participate throughout the process and persons desiring to comment were given an opportunity to comment.

## **CONCLUSIONS:**

Based upon the application materials, technical studies, staff analysis (which is hereby incorporated into these findings, conclusions, and recommendation), SEPA review, agency and public comments received, and public testimony presented regarding the Application File No. Z2017-630COMP, the Plan Commission makes


the following conclusions with respect to the review criteria outlined in SMC 17G.020.030:

1. The Application was timely submitted and added to the 2018 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program, and the final review application was submitted as provided in SMC 17G.020.050(D).
2. Interested agencies and the public have had extensive opportunities to participate throughout the process and persons desiring to comment have been given that opportunity to comment.
3. The Application is consistent with the goals and purposes of GMA.
4. Any potential infrastructure implications associated with the Application will either be mitigated through projects reflected in the City's relevant six-year capital improvement plans or through enforcement of the City's development regulations at time of development.
5. The Plan Commission agrees with the Staff Report findings that the application meets the decision criteria and review guidelines as listed in SMC 17G.020.
6. The Application is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies for Spokane County, the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities plans, the regional transportation plan, and official population growth forecasts.
7. The Application has been considered simultaneously with the other proposals included in the 2018 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program in order to evaluate the cumulative effect of all the proposals.
8. SEPA review was completed for the Application, and pursuant to SEPA, any adverse environmental impacts associated with the Application will be mitigated by enforcement of the City's development regulations.
9. The Application will not adversely affect the City's ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services citywide at the planned level of service, or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies.
10. The Application proposes a land use designation that is in conformance with the appropriate location criteria identified in the comprehensive plan (e.g., compatibility with neighboring land uses, proximity to arterials, etc.).
11. The proposed map amendment and site is suitable for the proposed designation.

12. The map amendment would implement applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

In the matter of Z2017-630COMP, a request by Taud Hume of Parsons, Burnett, Bjordahl, Hume Attorneys, on behalf of Plese & Plese LLC to change the land use plan designation on .25 acres of land from "Residential 4-10" to "Office" with a corresponding change of the implementing zoning to O-35 (Office, 35 foot height limit), as based upon the above listed findings and conclusions, by a vote of 10 to 0, the Plan Commissions recommends to City Council the APPROVAL of the requested amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan, and authorized the President to prepare and sign on the Commission's behalf a written decision setting forth the Commission's findings, conclusions, and recommendation on the Application.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dennis Dellwo", is written over a horizontal line.

**Dennis Dellwo, President  
Spokane Plan Commission  
October 10, 2018**

## **Staff Report**

**STAFF REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
LAND USE AMENDMENT APPLICATION  
FILE NO. Z17-630COMP, Plese & Plese LLC with City Council Requested Expansion**

**I. SUMMARY OF REQUEST AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is to change the land use designation of portions of two adjacent split-zoned properties, totaling approximately 11,031 square feet (0.25 acres) in size, from "Residential 4-10" to "Office." If the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment is approved, the zoning of the subject properties would be changed from RSF (Residential Single Family) to O-35 (Office with 35 foot height limit). No specific development proposal is being proposed at this time.


The subject property consists of the southern portion of two split-zoned parcels; a 7,680 square foot (0.175 acre) portion of a parcel located at 6216 North Washington Street proposed for a change in land use designation by the property owner ("Parcel 1") and a 3,351 square foot portion of a similarly situated parcel located immediately east and across the alley from the applicant's proposed parcel to the Plan Commission for consideration for the same changes on the land use plan map ("Parcel 2"). During the docketing process for annual Comprehensive Plan amendments, City Council expanded the area of the proposed land use map change to include Parcel 2.

**II. GENERAL INFORMATION:**

<b>Agent(s):</b>	Taudd Hume, Parsons/Burnett/Bjordahl/Hume, LLP
<b>Applicant/Property Owner(s):</b>	Plese & Plese LLC, Vic Plese
<b>Location of Proposal:</b>	<u>Parcel 1 (Owner Initiated):</u> 6216 N Washington Street (parcel 36311.0517).  <u>Parcel 2 (City-Initiated):</u> 6217 N Whitehouse Street (parcel 36311.0503).
<b>Legal Description</b>	Full legal descriptions of the subject properties are available in the Planning Services Department, located on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor of City Hall, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, WA 99201-3329.
<b>Existing Land Use Plan Designation:</b>	"Residential 4-10 " (Residential, 4 to 10 dwelling units per acre)
<b>Proposed Land Use Plan Designation:</b>	"Office"
<b>Existing Zoning:</b>	RSF (Residential Single Family)
<b>Proposed Zoning:</b>	O-35 (Office, 35-foot height limit)

<b>SEPA Status:</b>	A SEPA threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was made on August 28, 2018. The appeal deadline is Noon on September 11, 2018
<b>Enabling Code Section:</b>	SMC 17G. 020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedure
<b>Plan Commission Hearing Date:</b>	September 12, 2018
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Teri Stripes, Assistant Planner; <a href="mailto:tstripes@spokanecity.org">tstripes@spokanecity.org</a>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>APPROVE</b>

### III. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:



- A. Site Description: The subject property consists of portions of two adjacent parcels on the interior of a block bounded by N Francis Avenue, N Washington Street, N Whitehouse Street, and N Dalke Avenue. The first parcel included in the proposal ("Parcel 1"/ 36311.0517) consists of three platted lots on the east side of N Washington Street, with a combined area of approximately 11,325 square feet; the area of the proposed amendment is approximately the 7,680 square foot portion of Parcel 1 that is currently designated "Residential 4-10." The remainder of the parcel is designated "Office." A single family

residence, constructed in 1954, is situated near the middle of the parcel, with the zoning boundary running through it. The properties directly to the north, between Parcel 1 and Francis Avenue, are also owned by the applicant.<sup>1</sup>

City Council Resolution RES 2018-0021 expanded the area of the proposal to include the parcel immediately to the east ("Parcel 2"/ 36311.0503). The zoning and land use designations of Parcel 2 are split between "Residential 4-10" and "Office" along the same lines as Parcel 1. Parcel 2 totals approximately 7,840 square feet (0.18 acres) in size, of which 3,351 square feet (0.09 acres) is currently designated "Residential 4-10" and therefore included in the proposed Comprehensive Plan land use map change. Located on the eastern face of the block, Parcel 2 has frontage on N Whitehouse Street, and is separated from Parcel 1 by an alley. Like Parcel 1, Parcel 2 is developed with a single family residence constructed in 1954.

Parcels to the south of the subject property are primarily developed with single family residences. There are residential as well as office uses to the west and east. All public streets in the vicinity are improved but do not include sidewalks. Francis Avenue, approximately 100 feet north of the subject property, is a principal arterial street and also designated as State Route 291. Spokane Transit Authority Route 27 provides bus service along Francis Avenue. Washington Street and Whitehouse Street are local access streets.


Project Description: Plese & Plese LLC, the owner of Parcel 1, initiated the proposal to amend the Comprehensive Plan land use plan map designation for a portion of Parcel 1 from "Residential 4-10" to "Office." The Comprehensive Plan Amendment application is a non-project action under SEPA and, if approved, would allow any type of development in the designated zoning category (at time of building or "project" application) to occur. The applicant stated possible development goals in their application: "The property owner seeks to develop the three parcels it owns as a single site for a bank or office use, as permitted in the underlying Office zone." However, the subject land use map amendment, if approved, does not bind the applicant to this stated use.

City Council established the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program for 2018 by resolution (RES 2018-0021) on March 26, 2018. In approving RES 2018-0021 and establishing the docket for annual Comprehensive Plan amendments, Council found that Z2017-630COMP met the guidance set forth in SMC 17G.020.026(D) for consideration of a geographic expansion, specifically to include Parcel 2, which is also split between the RSF and O-35 zones. Because the expansion to include Parcel 2 was initiated by city council and not by the applicant, the City has assumed the burden of notification to the increased notification area as well as placing a sign on the Whitehouse property. Staff has provided the required extra notice, spoken with the current property owner at 6217 N Whitehouse Street, who has voiced no negative concerns and appears to be happy with the assistance to clean-up the split zoning status of their property. Staff has received no public or agency comments on the expansion of the proposed land use map change.


If approved, both parcels will be zoned O-35 (Office with a 35-foot height limit) and could be developed consistent with office and other uses permitted within that zoning category.

<sup>1</sup> Tax parcel 6311.0519 at 6228 N Washington Street and tax parcel 36311.0518 at 6222 N Washington Street, both within the "Office" land use designation.

## B. Proposed Land Use Plan Map



## C. Land Use History:



The subject property is located in a section of the city annexed 1907 and was platted the same year as part of Block 5 of the Byrne Addition subdivision. Interior lots in the Byrne Addition were 30 feet in width, and both Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 consist of multiple smaller lots from the original subdivision plat. Historic zoning maps indicate that the boundary between higher intensity zones along the south side of Francis Avenue and single family residential zones conformed to a boundary between original platted lots in Byrne Addition, but not the eventual boundary between parcels, which reflected holdings of multiple 30-foot-wide lots. The location of the land use and zoning boundary resulted in split designation and zoning of both Parcel 1 and Parcel 2.

In 1954, residences were constructed on both parcels. The adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 2001 changed the designation of the northern portion of each parcel from "Medium Residential/Low Rise Office" to "Office," but retained the existing boundary between designations, which cuts across both parcels.



D. Adjacent Land Use:

Parcel 1

North:	Office (single family residences)
South:	Residential 4-10 (single family residences)
East:	Residential 4-10 (single family residences)
West (across N Washington Street):	Residential 4-10 (single family residences) and Office (custom retail)

Parcel 2

North:	Office (Hair and Nail Salon)
South:	Residential 4-10 (single family residences)
East (across N Whitehouse Street):	Residential 4-10 (single family residences)
West:	Residential 4-10 (single family residences)

E. Applicable Municipal Code Regulations: SMC 17G.020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedures.

F. Application Process:

- Application was submitted on October 30, 2017 and Certified Complete on April 20, 2018;
- City Council established the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program for 2018 by Resolution, RES 2018-0021 on March 26, 2018;
  - March 26, 2018, Council found that Z2017-630COMP most closely met the guidance of SMC 17G.020.026(D) for consideration of a geographic expansion at 6217 N. Whitehouse Street (0.09 acres)
- Applicant was provided Notice of Application on May 16, 2018;
- Notice of Application was posted, published, and mailed on May 29, 2018, which began a 60-day public comment period. The comment period ended July 27, 2018;
- The applicant made a presentation regarding the proposal to the North Hill Council on June 14, 2018.
- A SEPA Determination of Non Significance was issued on August 28, 2018;
- Notice of Public Hearing was posted and mailed by August 29, 2018;
- Notice of Public Hearing was published on August 29 and September 5, 2018;
- Hearing Date is scheduled with the Plan Commission for September 12, 2018.

#### **IV. AGENCY, INTERESTED DEPARTMENT, AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

Notice of this proposal and Council's expansion was sent to City departments and outside agencies for their review. Department comments are included in the file. No substantive comments were received on this proposal.

As of the date of the staff report, one written public comment has been received regarding this proposal. That letter will be included in the packets forwarded to the Plan Commission and/or City Council.

#### **V. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

SMC 17G.020.010 provides the following guiding principles for the annual comprehensive plan amendment process:

1. Keep the comprehensive plan alive and responsive to the community.
2. Provide for simultaneous review of proposals to allow for cumulative impact analysis of all applications on a City-wide basis and in conjunction with budget decisions.
3. Make map adjustments based on a foundation in policy language, consistently applying those concepts citywide.
4. Honor the community's long-term investment in the comprehensive plan, through public participation and neighborhood planning processes, by not making changes lightly.
5. Encourage development that will enable our whole community to prosper and reinforce our sense of place and feeling of community, in an ecologically, economically and socially sustainable manner.
6. The proposed changes must result in a net benefit to the general public.

#### **VI. REVIEW CRITERIA**

SMC Section 17.G.020.030 provides a list of considerations that are to be used, as appropriate, by applicants in developing amendment proposals, by planning staff in analyzing proposals, and by the plan commission and city council in making recommendations and decisions on amendment proposals. The applicable criteria are shown below in ***bold italic*** print. Following each criterion is staff analysis relative to the amendment requested.

##### ***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.***

**Staff Analysis:** The applicant's proposal with the Council expansion is being considered and processed in accordance with the most current regulations of the Growth Management Act, the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the Spokane Municipal Code. There are no known recent state, federal or local legislative actions with which the proposal would be in conflict. Staff concludes this criterion is met.

**B. GMA.**

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

**Staff Analysis:** The Growth Management Act (GMA) details 13 goals to guide the development and adoption of the comprehensive plans and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.020, "Planning Goals"), and these goals guided the City's development of its comprehensive plan and development regulations. This proposal has been reviewed for GMA compliance by staff from the Washington Department of Commerce. No comments received or other evidence in the record indicates inconsistency between the proposed plan map amendment and the goals and purposes of the GMA. The proposal meets this criterion.

**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.***

**Staff Analysis:** The applicant's proposal with the Council expansion has been reviewed by city departments responsible for providing public services and facilities. No comments have been made indicating that this proposal creates issues with any public services and facilities. Per State law, any subsequent development of the site will be subject to a concurrency determination pursuant to SMC 17D.010.020. Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

**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.***

**Staff Analysis:** Staff has concluded that this criterion is not applicable to this proposal. There are no funding shortfall implications.

**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.***

**Staff Analysis:** The proposal is internally consistent with applicable supporting documents of the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

Development Regulations. As a non-project proposal, there are no specific plans for development of this site. Additionally, any future development on this site will be required to be consistent with the current development regulations at the time an application is submitted. The proposal does not result in any non-conforming uses or development and staff finds no reason to indicate that the proposed Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and zone change would result in a property that cannot be reasonably development in compliance with applicable regulations.

Capital Facilities Program. As described in the staff analysis of criterion C, above, no additional infrastructure or capital expenditures by the City are anticipated for this non-project action, and it is not anticipated that the City's integrated Capital Facilities Program would be affected by the proposal.

Neighborhood Planning Documents Adopted After 2001. The North Hill Neighborhood, utilizing the \$21,150 allocated by the Spokane City Council in 2007, began a planning process in 2014, and adopted the North Hill Neighborhood Action Plan in June 2015. The strategic plan identifies goals, policies, and catalytic projects related to supporting the Garland Business District, reduce crime, improve public safety, and preservation of neighborhood character. The plan does not identify any strategies relating to the future use or development of the subject parcel, nor were any priority projects identified within or adjacent to the subject parcel. Therefore, the proposal to change the land use designation and zoning for the subject property is internally consistent with applicable neighborhood planning documents.

Miscellaneous Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies. Staff have compiled a group of Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies which are excerpted from the Comprehensive Plan and contained in Exhibit S-2 of this report. Further discussion of cogent Comprehensive Plan policies are included under criterion K.2 below.

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.***

**Staff Analysis:** The proposal is generally consistent with current comprehensive plan policies, as described in further detail in findings elsewhere within this report. Therefore, no amendment to policy wording is necessary and this criterion does not apply to the subject proposal.

#### ***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.***

**Staff Analysis:** This amendment will not impact 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.***

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.***

**Staff Analysis:** This application with the Council's expansion are being reviewed as part of the annual cycle of comprehensive plan amendments. Adjacent properties to the north, east, and west along Francis are properties zoned Office. There are no indications that there will be adverse impacts on either site by this action.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

## **H. SEPA.**

***SEPA review must be completed on all amendment proposals.***

### **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.***

### **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).***

**Staff Analysis:** The application with the Council's expansion has been reviewed in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) that requires that the potential for adverse environmental impacts resulting from a proposal be evaluated during the decision-making process. On the basis of information contained with the environmental checklist, the written comments from local and State departments and agencies concerned with land development within the city, a review of other information available to the Director of Planning Services, and in recognition of the mitigation measures that will be required by State and local development regulations at the time of development, a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued on August 28, 2018.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

## **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.***

**Staff Analysis:** All affected departments and outside agencies providing services to the subject properties have had an opportunity to comment on the proposal and no agency or department offered comments suggesting the proposal would affect the City's ability to provide adequate public facilities to the property or surrounding area or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies. Any specific site development impacts can be addressed at time of obtaining a building permit, when actual site development is proposed.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

## **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.***

**Staff Analysis:** The subject proposal does not involve an amendment to the Urban Growth Area boundary. Therefore, this criterion does not apply to this proposal.

***K. Demonstration of Need.***

***1. Policy Adjustments.***

***Proposed policy adjustments that are intended to be consistent with the comprehensive plan should be designed to provide correction or additional guidance so the community's original visions and values can better be achieved [...]***

**Staff Analysis:** This proposal with the Council's expansion are a request for a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan Map amendment, not a policy adjustment.

This criterion is not applicable to this proposal.

***2. 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.);***

**Staff Analysis:** The applicant provided a discussion of the applicable Goals and Policies from the Comprehensive Plan, which supports their request for the Land Use Plan Map Amendment. Staff has reviewed and concurs with the analysis prepared by the applicant. Policy LU 1.5 suggests that office uses should be located where it continues the office development pattern, such as along Francis Avenue and in designated Centers and Corridors: "For example, office use is encouraged in areas designated Office along the south side of Francis Avenue between Cannon Street and Market Street to a depth of not more than approximately 140 feet from Francis Avenue."

Where it splits Parcel 1, the depth of the current Office designation is almost 122 feet from Francis Avenue. The proposed land use map amendment would increase that depth to approximately 184 feet. That depth of office zoning also occurs where Francis Avenue intersects with Howard Street and Division Street.

Thus staff finds that by changing the land use plan map designation from Residential 4-10 to Office on both parcels, the range of potential uses of the sites will be

expanded and the properties can be reused in more productive manner, and still provide the buffering to the adjacent residential uses.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

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

**Staff Analysis:** The subject parcels are without slope and have sufficient area and dimension so that it can easily be developed in accordance with the standards of the O-35 zone. The O-35 zone can be applied to both parcels without negatively affecting adjacent or nearby uses. Each parcel has direct connections to the arterial street network and have close access to transit service provided by STA Route 27.

Staff finds that both parcels are suitable for the proposed designation.

***c. The map amendment implements applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.***

**Staff Analysis:** Staff finds that the proposed amendment with the Council's expansion are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

Staff concludes that this amendment and staff recommendations would implement the Comprehensive Plan better than the current land use plan designation.

**3. *Rezones, Land Use Plan Map Amendment.***

***Corresponding rezones will be adopted concurrently with land use plan map amendments as a legislative action of the city council. If policy language changes have map implications, changes to the land use plan map and zoning map will be made accordingly for all affected sites upon adoption of the new policy language. This is done to ensure that the comprehensive plan remains internally consistent and to preserve consistency between the comprehensive plan and supporting development regulations.***

**Staff Analysis:** The applicant has requested a corresponding change in the zoning classification to occur if the change to Office Land Use Plan Map designation is made. The applicant has requested O-35 (Office with 35-foot height limit) zoning, which matches the adjacent zoning designation to the north, east, and west. The O-35 zone implements the "Office" land use designation proposed by the applicant. No policy language changes have been identified as necessary to support the proposed land use plan map amendment. The proposal meets this criterion.

**VIII. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Following the close of public testimony and deliberations regarding conclusions with respect to the review criteria and decision criteria detailed in SMC Chapter 17G.020, Plan



Commission will need to make a recommendation to City Council for approval or denial of the requested amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Staff recommends that the Plan Commission recommend **APPROVAL** of the requested amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan Map for the subject property consisting of portions of two properties totaling approximately 11,031 square feet (0.25 acres) in size and located at 6216 N Washington Street and 6217 N Whitehouse Street.

**IX. LIST OF EXHIBITS**

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
A-1	Application Materials
A-2	SEPA Checklist
S-1	SEPA Determination of Non-Significance
S-2	Relevant Comprehensive Plan Policies
P-1	Public Comment – Foley
PA-1	Agency Comment – Spokane Tribe of Indians

## EXHIBIT S-2 – RELEVANT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

### LU 1.5 Office Uses

*Direct new office uses to Centers and Corridors designated on the Land Use Plan Map.*

**Discussion:** Office use of various types is an important component of a Center. Offices provide necessary services and employment opportunities for residents of a Center and the surrounding neighborhood. Office use in Centers may be in multi-story structures in the core area of the Center and transition to low-rise structures at the edge.

To ensure that the market for office use is directed to Centers, future office use is generally limited in other areas. The Office designations located outside Centers are generally confined to the boundaries of existing Office designations. Office use within these boundaries is allowed outside of a Center.

The Office designation is also located where it continues an existing office development trend and serves as a transitional land use between higher intensity commercial uses on one side of a principal arterial street and a lower density residential area on the opposite side of the street. Arterial frontages that are predominantly developed with single-family residences should not be disrupted with office use. For example, office use is encouraged in areas designated Office along the south side of Francis Avenue between Cannon Street and Market Street to a depth of not more than approximately 140 feet from Francis Avenue.

Drive-through facilities associated with offices such as drive-through banks should be allowed only along a principal arterial street subject to size limitations and design guidelines. Ingress and egress for office use should be from the arterial street. Uses such as freestanding sit-down restaurants or retail are appropriate only in the Office designation located in higher intensity office areas around downtown Spokane.

Residential uses are permitted in the form of single-family homes on individual lots, upper-floor apartments above offices, or other higher density residential uses.

### CFU 2.1 Available Public Facilities

*Consider that the requirement for concurrent availability of public facilities and utility services is met when adequate services and facilities are in existence at the time the development is ready for occupancy and use, in the case of water, wastewater and solid waste, and at least a financial commitment is in place at the time of development approval to provide all other public services within six years.*

**Discussion:** Public facilities are those public lands, improvements, and equipment necessary to provide public services and allow for the delivery of services. They include, but are not limited to, streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, solid waste disposal and recycling, fire and police facilities, parks and recreational facilities, schools and libraries. It must be shown that adequate facilities and services are available before new development can be approved. While occupancy and use imply an immediate need for water, wastewater and solid waste services, other public services may make more sense to provide as the demand arises. For example, a certain threshold of critical mass is often needed before construction of a new fire

station, school, library, or park is justified. If these facilities and services do not currently exist, commitments for services may be made from either the public or the private sector.

## **CFU 2.2 Concurrency Management System**

*Maintain a concurrency management system for all capital facilities.*

**Discussion:** A concurrency management system is defined as an adopted procedure or method designed to ensure that adequate public facilities and services needed to support development and protect the environment are available when the service demands of development occur. The following facilities must meet adopted level of service standards and be consistent with the concurrency management system: fire protection, police protection, parks and recreation, libraries, public wastewater (sewer and stormwater), public water, solid waste, transportation, and schools.

The procedure for concurrency management includes annual evaluation of adopted service levels and land use trends in order to anticipate demand for service and determine needed improvements. Findings from this review will then be addressed in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans, Annual Capital Budget, and all associated capital facilities documents to ensure that financial planning remains sufficiently ahead of the present for concurrency to be evaluated.

The City of Spokane must ensure that adequate facilities are available to support development or prohibit development approval when such development would cause service levels to decline below standards currently established in the Capital Facilities Program.

In the event that reduced funding threatens to halt development, it is much more appropriate to scale back land use objectives than to merely reduce level of service standards as a way of allowing development to continue. This approach is necessary in order to perpetuate a high quality of life. All adjustments to land use objectives and service level standards will fall within the public review process for annual amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Program.

## Public Comment

June 6, 2018

16

City of Spokane  
Planning Dept.  
attn: Teri Stripes  
808 N. Spokane Falls Blvd.  
Spokane WA 99201-3333

RECEIVED

JUN 07 2018

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Dear Teri Stripes:

I am writing about the Please + Please LLC application for a zone change. I live at 6202 N. Washington St. The two houses involved in the proposal are: 6216 N. Washington + 6217 N. Whitehouse.

I do object to having these two houses demolished to make room for businesses. I've been reading in the Spokesman-Review that Spokane is short of family houses. In fact, some people who want to relocate cannot find a house to move to. These two houses have had continuous occupancy by families.


Sincerely,  
Merrilee Foley



RECEIVED

JUN 07 2018


PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



SPOKANE WA 990  
06 JUN 2018 PM 1 L

*City of Spokane, Planning Dept.  
 Attn: Jeri Stripes  
 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.  
 Spokane WA 99201-3333*

99201-33333



**Agency Comment**



## Spokane Tribe of Indians

April 30, 2018

Tirrell Black  
Planner

**RE: File No, Z17-630COMP**

Ms. Black:

Thank you, for allowing the Spokane Tribe of Indians the opportunity to comment on your undertaking is greatly appreciated.

We are hereby in consultation for this project.

As I understand that this is change to zoning map from RSF to O-35, it's unlikely that the project will impact any cultural resources in the proposed area.

This letter is your notification that your project has been cleared, and your project may move forward.

As always, if any artifacts or human remains are found upon inadvertent discovery, this office should be immediately notified and the work in the immediate area cease.

Should additional information become available our assessment may be revised.

Again thank you for this opportunity to comment and consider this a positive action that will assist in protecting our shared heritage.

If questions arise, please contact me at (509) 258 – 4315.

Sincerely,

Randy Abrahamson  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (T.H.P.O.)



# **SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) Determination**

**NONPROJECT DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE**

**FILE NO(S):** Z17-630COMP

**PROPONENT:** Plese & Plese LLC

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:** The proposal is to change the land use of two properties, a total of 0.253 acres in size, from "Residential 4-10" to "Office." If the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment is approved, the zoning would be changed from "Residential Single Family" to "Office, 35 foot height limit." No specific development proposal is being approved at this time.

**LOCATION OF PROPOSAL, INCLUDING STREET ADDRESS, IF ANY:**

**APPLICANT REQUESTED LOCATION:**

The subject site includes a portion of one parcel located at 6216 North Washington Street, located south of Francis Avenue (a portion of parcel 36311.0517, which is currently split-zoned). The concerned portion of the property totals approximately 0.175 acres. Included is a location and notification map.

**CITY COUNCIL EXPANSION:**

A similarly situated parcel (also split-zoned) located immediately east across the alley from the applicant's proposed parcel is also being forwarded to the Plan Commission for consideration for the same changes on the land use plan map. This is parcel 36311.0503, addressed as 6217 N. Whitehouse Street. This would add 3,351 sq. ft. or 0.09 acres to the proposal.

Legal Description: Parcel Number: 36311.0517, 6216 N WASHINGTON ST, BYRNE ADD L33TO35 B5, CITY-NE 1/4 SEC 31-26-4 and Parcel Number: 36311.0503, 6217 N WHITEHOUSE ST, BYRNE ADD L4-5 B5, CITY-NE 1/4 SEC 31-26-4.

**LEAD AGENCY:** City of Spokane

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

- There is no comment period for this DNS.
- This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in section 197-11-355 WAC. There is no further comment period on the DNS.
- This DNS is issued under 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for at least 14 days from the date of issuance (below). Comments regarding this DNS must be submitted no later than 5 p.m. on September 11, 2018 if they are intended to alter the DNS.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Responsible Official:** Heather Trautman

**Position/Title:** Director, Planning Services **Phone:** (509) 625-6300

**Address:** 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, WA 99201

**Date Issued:** August 28, 2018 **Signature:** 

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPEAL OF THIS DETERMINATION**, after it has become final, may be made to the City of Spokane Hearing Examiner, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane WA 99201. The appeal deadline is Noon on September 18, 2018 (21 days

## Environmental Checklist

File No. \_\_\_\_\_

### **Purpose of Checklist:**

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

### **Instructions for Applicants:**

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

### **Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:**

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "*does not apply*."

IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (Part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**A. BACKGROUND**

- 1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Rezone a portion of 6216 N. Washington St - Plese & Plese, LLC
- 2. Name of applicant: Plese & Plese, LLC
- 3. Address and phone number of applicant or contact person: Vic Plese - Plese & Plese LLC c/o Plese Realty LLC 201 W. Francis Ave. 99205 - 509-489-2323
- 4. Date checklist prepared: 10/31/2017
- 5. Agency requesting checklist: Spokane City Planning
- 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): unknown - to be determined
- 7. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. no
- b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain. no
- 8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to his proposal. n/a
- 9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. n/a
- 10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. comprehensive plan change / rezone of approximately 7,040 sq ft of a 23,040 sq ft site

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. Zone change from RSF to O35 for approximately 7,040 sq ft of a 23,040 sq ft site - to be used for parking for a bank, credit union or office building (to be determined)

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information to a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist. 6216 N. Washington St.  
Spokane, WA 99205

13. Does the proposed action lie within the Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)? The General Sewer Service Area? The Priority Sewer Service Area? The City of Spokane? (See: Spokane County's ASA Overlay Zone Atlas for boundaries.) \_\_\_\_\_  
City of Spokane

14. The following questions supplement Part A.

a. Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA) / Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)

(1) Describe any systems, other than those designed for the disposal of sanitary waste, installed for the purpose of discharging fluids below the ground surface (includes systems such as those for the disposal of stormwater or drainage from floor drains). Describe the type of system, the amount of material to be disposed of through the system and the types of material likely to be disposed of (including materials which may enter the system inadvertently through spills or as a result of firefighting activities).  
n/a

(2) Will any chemicals (especially organic solvents or petroleum fuels) be stored in aboveground or underground storage tanks? If so, what types and quantities of material will be stored?  
n/a

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 31 2017

- (3) What protective measures will be taken to insure that leaks or spills of any chemicals stored or used on site will not be allowed to percolate to groundwater. This includes measures to keep chemicals out of disposal systems.

Paving & landscape/swales that will be required by City of Spokane  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Will any chemicals be stored, handled or used on the site in a location where a spill or leak will drain to surface or groundwater or to a stormwater disposal system discharging to surface or groundwater?

no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. Stormwater

- (1) What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)?

unknown  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts?

Building and parking lot stormwater will be routed to swales as required but will be minimal  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT**

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

Evaluation for  
 Agency Use  
 Only

**1. Earth**

- a. General description of the site (circle one): *flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountains, other.* \_\_\_\_\_

Flat  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? None

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. Sand  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill: none needed  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? As much as allowed by code but likely 85-90%  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth, if any: n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Air**

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known. unknown  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 31 2017  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Water

- a. SURFACE:

- (1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from the surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? no If so, note location on the site plan.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- (6) Does the proposal involve any discharge of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

n/a  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. GROUND:

- (1) Will groundwater be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sanitary waste treatment facility. Describe the general size of the system, the number of houses to be served (if applicable) or the number of persons the system(s) are expected to serve.

n/a  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

c. WATER RUNOFF (INCLUDING STORMWATER):

- (1) Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and method of collection and disposal if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Minor runoff from building roof and parking lot-  
directed to grass swale(s)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- d. PROPOSED MEASURES to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any.

see above  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

4. Plants

a. Check or circle type of vegetation found on the site:

\_\_\_\_\_ Deciduous tree: *alder, maple, aspen, other.*

  x   Evergreen tree: *fir, cedar, pine, other.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Shrubs

  x   Grass

\_\_\_\_\_ Pasture

\_\_\_\_\_ Crop or grain

\_\_\_\_\_ Wet soil plants, *cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage,*  
*other.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Water plants: *water lilly, eelgrass, milfoil, other.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Other types of vegetation.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?   mostly weeds and some grass  

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.   n/a  

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:   n/a  

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site are known to be on or near the site:

birds: *hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other.*   n/a  

mammals: *deer, bear, elk, beaver, other.*   n/a  

fish: *bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other.*   n/a  

other:   n/a  

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

not known  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

no effect  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**6. Energy and natural resources**

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc. Electricity and natural gas through Avista for heating/cooling; office, computer use.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

LED lighting  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**7. Environmental health**

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

(1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Property already served by city  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. NOISE:

(1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Construction at beginning only  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(3) Proposed measure to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

Rental home  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe. \_\_\_\_\_

no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- c. Describe any structures on the site. 836 Square foot rental home with basement and single carport  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, which? Said rental house  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? Portion of site is O35 (Office) and approx 55 feet at the south end is RSF (residential single family)
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? see above  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?  
n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area? If so, specify. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?  
Unknown at this time but estimated at 10-15
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? 2 Households
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: My real estate company who currently manages the rentals will aid the occupants in finding new rentals. Neither have lived there for more than one year  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: All three ~~other~~ corners of this intersection are commercially zoned - the project would fit nicely with existing uses  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any?  
Indicate whether high, middle or low-income housing. \_\_\_\_\_  
n/a

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated?  
Indicate whether high-, middle- or low-income housing. \_\_\_\_\_  
2 middle-class rental units (\$700 per month and \$1,000 per month)

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if  
any: see 8k

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not  
including antennas; what is the principal exterior building  
material(s) proposed? 35 feet

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or  
obstructed? none

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts,  
if any: Landscaping and screening as would be required

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What  
time of day would it mainly occur? Downward-facing building and  
parking lot lighting only.

RECEIVED  
OCT 31 2017  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: parking lot lighting would be downward facing to reduce light pollution  
\_\_\_\_\_

**12. Recreation**

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? Ruth Park 2 blocks  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**13. Historic and cultural preservation**

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic archaeological, scientific or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site. none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any: \_\_\_\_\_  
       n/a  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_

**14. Transportation**

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any. Washington, 125 feet away from intersection Francis if allowed  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop? one block
- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate? \_\_\_\_\_  
       Unknown as we don't know the eventual size of the bank or office building, but approximately 15-25. Displacing none
- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private). no  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail or air transportation? If so, generally describe. \_\_\_\_\_  
       no  
       \_\_\_\_\_
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak would occur. unknown  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_

*(Note: to assist in review and if known indicate vehicle trips during PM peak, AM Peak and Weekday (24 hours).)*

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: n/a  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

**15. Public services**

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe. \_\_\_\_\_  
no  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any:   n/a    
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**16. Utilities**

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: *electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.* \_\_\_\_\_

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.   City of Spokane for water & sewer    
  Avista Utilities for natural gas & electricity    
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**C. SIGNATURE**

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: 10/31/2017Signature: **Please Print or Type:**Proponent: Vic S. PleseAddress: 201 W. Francis Ave.Plese & Plese LLCSpokane, WA 99205Phone: 509-489-2323

Person completing  
form (if different  
from proponent): \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**FOR STAFF USE ONLY**

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

- A. there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.
- B. probable significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.
- C. there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING &amp; DEVELOPMENT

**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS**  
*(Do not use this sheet for project actions)*

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

- 1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

No

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

unknown

- 2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life?

n/a

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life are:

n/a

- 3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

n/a

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

n/a

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

- 4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, flood plains or prime farmlands?

n/a

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

n/a

- 5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

n/a

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

n/a

- 6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

MINOR INCREASE

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

TBD

- 7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

n/a

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

C. SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency may withdraw any Determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: 10/31/17 Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Please Print or Type:

Proponent: Picose Pies LLC Address: 201 W. Francis Ave  
Vic Piese  
Phone: 509 489 2323 Spokane WA 99205  
Person completing form (if different from proponent): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

- A.  there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.
- B.  probable significant adverse impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.
- C.  there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

## **Application Materials**

# City of Spokane

Planning Services  
Department



## General Application

### DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

Rezone from RSF to O-35 (southern 55ft)

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

6216 N. Washington St. 99205

### APPLICANT:

Name: Plesc & Plesc, LLC

Address: 201 W. Francis Ave

Phone (home): 509 466 4677

Phone (work): 509 489 2323

Email address: vic@plesc.com

### PROPERTY OWNER:

Name: Same

Address:

Phone (home):

Phone (work):

Email address:

cell 509 217 7889

### AGENT:

Name: Stacy A. Bjordahl, Parsons/Burnett/Bjordahl/Hume LLP

Address: 505 W. Riverside Ave

Phone (home):

Phone (work): 509 252 5066

Email address: sbjordahl@pbllaw.biz

### ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:

36311.0517

### LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

L33-35, B5, Byrne Add

### SIZE OF PROPERTY:

11,520 SF ; Approx 7,040 Affected

### LIST SPECIFIC PERMITS REQUESTED IN THIS APPLICATION:

Threshold Review Application  
for Camp Plan Amendment

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**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:


I, Vic S. Plesc, owner of the above-described property do hereby authorize Stacy Bjordahl to represent me and my interests in all matters regarding this application.

*Vic S. Plesc*

STATE OF WA }  
COUNTY OF Spikeane } SS

On this 31 day of Oct, 2017, before me a Notary Public in and for the above named County and State, personally appeared before me, Vic S. Plesc, who is the a member of Plesc + Plesc LLC, to me known to be the individual described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged that he signed the same as his voluntary act and deed for the purposes and uses therein mentioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year first written above.



*Gail R. Gilleran*  
Notary Public in and for the State of WA residing at Spikeane

RECEIVED  
OCT 31 2017  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



**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:

I, Vic S. Aluse, owner of the above-described property do hereby authorize Stacy Bjordahl to represent me and my interests in all matters regarding this application.

*Vith*


**ACKNOWLEDGMENT:**

STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF SPOKANE )

On this 31 day of Oct, 2017, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared Vic S. Aluse, 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.

Gail R Gilleran  
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,  
residing at Spokane



RECEIVED  
OCT 31 2017  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**Supplemental**  
**Attachment to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application-Early Threshold Review**  
**Plese & Plese LLC**

**Description of Proposed Amendment:**

Comprehensive Plan amendment to redesignate approximately 7,680 +/- square feet from Residential 4-10 (R 4-10) to Office (O), with a corresponding rezone from RSF to O-35. The subject property is identified as Spokane County Assessor Tax Parcel #36311.0517, which is comprised of Lots 33, 34 and 35, Block 5 of Byrne Addition. Lot 35 is currently zoned O-35 and the property owner seeks to rezone the remainder of the parcel, Lots 33 and 34, from R 4-10 to O-35.

The subject parcel is approximately 11,325 +/- square feet in size, but only 7,680 +/- square feet of the site is part of the Comprehensive Plan and rezone request, as the remainder already has the Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning requested in this application.

**Questions:**

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

The property owner seeks to develop the three parcels it owns as a single site for a bank or office use, as permitted in the underlying Office zone. A land use map change to Office-35 is required for a portion of one of the parcels under ownership, in order for the entire ownership and proposed site to have a single zone.

The Spokane Municipal Code does not permit a rezone without a Comprehensive Plan amendment first or simultaneous; therefore the proposal is appropriately presented as a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

The property owner anticipates utilizing the area under consideration for future parking only, to support an O-35 allowed use on the northern portion of the property; therefore, the property owner would consider a Development Agreement to limit allowable uses if the application is approved by City Council.

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

The subject parcel #36311.0517 includes 3 underlying lots (Lots 33-35, Block 5, Byrne Addition), with Lot 35 and a portion of Lot 34 already zoned O-35. The purpose of the application is to obtain one zone for the entire parcel: O-35. The applicant owns the two parcels to the north and intends to develop the three parcels as a single site. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment and rezone are necessary in order to do so.

Land Use Policy 1.5 states in part:

The Office designation is also located where it continues an existing office development trend and serves as a transitional land use between

higher intensity commercial uses on one side of a principal arterial street and a lower density residential area on the opposite side of the street. Arterial frontages that are predominantly developed with single-family residences should not be disrupted with office use. For example, office use is encouraged in areas designated Office along the south side of Francis Avenue between Cannon Street and Market Street to a depth of not more than *approximately* 140 feet from Francis Avenue.

(Emphasis added).

Land Use Policy 1.5 suggests the zoning designation extend only 140 feet southerly of Francis Avenue; however, that is not a specific rule and there is no corresponding requirement in the Spokane Municipal Code. In other words, it is a guideline. Furthermore, based upon the platted lot configurations in Byrne Addition of 30 or 40 feet in width and any subsequent boundary line adjustments, it is nearly impossible to obtain a “perfect” 140 foot depth without creating either parcels or lots with multiple zones, which good planning practice discourages.

Furthermore, there are other areas within the vicinity where the O-35 zone extends southerly approximately 180 feet in depth from Francis Avenue. These include property on Howard Street and Normandie Street. See aerial image identified as “Re: #5” previously submitted. Therefore, these other properties support the premise that 140 feet is simply a guideline.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that the property owner is seeking the amendment in order for the existing Office zoned parcels to meet code requirements for setbacks, parking, landscaping, stormwater control and ingress/egress separation from Francis Avenue and overall site design and circulation. Simply stated, code requirements and user needs often drive the width and depth of a site, such that the “guideline” must yield to specific code requirements and site layout.

The application is consistent with the other following policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

**Land Use 1.12**

The proposed map change is consistent with Land Use Goal 1.12. Existing public facilities and services are available to serve this site.

**Land Use 3.1**

The proposed map change is consistent with Policy LU 3.1, which encourages the efficient use of land. Under Policy LU 3.1, future growth should be directed to locations where adequate services and facilities are available. There already adequate public services and facilities in the area and serving the subject property.

**Economic Development Goal 6**

The proposed map change is consistent with Goal ED 6, which recommends that development be located where infrastructure capacity already exists before extending infrastructure into new areas. Policy ED 6.1. In this case, public services such as water, sewer, roadways, gas, and electricity, are available to serve the site.

Consistency with County Wide Planning Policies:

The request is consistent with the CWPP. The CWPP encourage growth in urban areas where services and utilities already exist. When the site is redeveloped for office use, the property owner will be required to demonstrate that levels of service are maintained, as required by the CWPP. The CWPP also encourage the use of public transit and development in areas where public transit service is available. This area is served by public transit. It is important to note that the City has adopted development regulations and policies to implement the CWPP at the City level. Development of this site will be required to comply with the City's polices and development regulations; thus consistency with the CWPP is achieved.

-- End of Form --



Tax Parcels   Districts   Permits   Zoning



*Re: #5*

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

# Comprehensive Plan Amendment



Planning Services 46  
Department  
808 W Spokane Falls Blvd  
Spokane, WA 99201  
Phone: (509) 625-6060  
www.spokaneplanning.org

**Record/Permit Number: Z17-630COMP**

Job Title: Rezone from RSF to O-35 (Southern 55ft)

Expires:

**Site Information:**

Address: 6216 N WASHINGTON ST

Permit Status: Pending  
Status Date: 10/31/2017

Parcel #: 36311.0517

Parent Permit:

**Applicant**

**Owner**

**PLESE & PLESE LLC  
201 W FRANCIS AVE  
SPOKANE WA 99205-6361**

**PLESE & PLESE LLC  
201 W FRANCIS AVE  
SPOKANE WA 99205-6361**

509-489-2323


Description of Work: Rezone from RSF to O-35 (Southern 55ft)

**Contractor(s)**

Fees:	Qty:	Amount:	Payments:	Ref#	Amount:
Pre-application Fee	1	\$500.00	10/31/2017 Check	3951	\$500.00
		<u>\$500.00</u>			<u>\$500.00</u>
			<b>Estimated Balance Due :</b>		<b>Amount:</b>
					\$0.00

---

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**



# Comprehensive Plan or Development Standard Amendment Threshold Review - Counter Complete Checklist

This checklist includes all of the required information for submitting a **Early Threshold Review Application** for an item that has been docketed for full review as a COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT STANDARD AMENDMENT. It includes required information of the State Environmental Policy Act. Applications will not be processed until all of the following information is submitted and determined "Counter Complete."

- Predevelopment meeting summary (if applicable)
- Pre-application meeting or correspondence with neighborhood council (for map amendments)
- General Application, completed and signed
- Threshold Review Application for Comprehensive Plan Amendments
- Environmental checklist, if required under SMC Chapter 17E.050.
- Additional materials such as photographs illustrating the site or visioning documents appropriate to a non-project action may be included.
- For a map amendment, (2) paper copies and one PDF (formatted for posting and emailing) of the site plan, drawn to a minimum scale of 1"=100', on a sheet no larger than 24"x36", which will include all of the following:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's name, mailing address and phone number</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section, township and range</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> North arrow and scale</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Legal description</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Dimensions of property and property lines</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> City limits and section lines</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Existing utilities in adjoining right-of-way</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Existing streets, alleys, major easements or public areas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Location of existing buildings</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Unstable slopes (if applicable)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands (if applicable)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Water courses such as streams, rivers, etc. (if applicable)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Flood plains, flood fringe or flood way (if applicable)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Significant habitat or vegetation (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<p><del>9/21</del> 10/31/2017 Vic Place application to change land use on 36311.0517.</p>
--	---

- N/A  For a text amendment, instead of the site plan, please include the proposed amendment with the text to be added underlined and the text to be deleted with strikethroughs.
- Additional application information may be requested later if item is put on the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program and may include, but is not limited to, the following: critical area studies, noise studies, air quality studies, visual analysis, transportation impact studies, geotechnical and wetland studies *None at this time.*
- Planning & Development Department filing fees, as required under SMC Chapter 8.02

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**Planning Services**  
 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall  
 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd  
 Spokane, Washington 99201  
 509.625.6300 (rev. 201709)

## Washington St & Francis Ave

48

Vic Plese

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2017 10:10 AM  
**To:** jeff.zabinski@premera.com  
**Cc:** gillflah@comcast.net  
**Attachments:** washington.pdf (390 KB)

Jeff,

I understand you are the chair of the North Hill Neighborhood Council and I was instructed to reach out to you to let you know about a comprehensive plan amendment we are applying for. The property is at the very north end of your council area on the SE corner of Francis & Washington. I was told last year that the city wasn't accepting comp plan amendments until 10/31/17, to be reviewed in 2018 - when applications needed to be submitted by 10/31/17 - so I apologize for the last minute email.

The attached PDF shows an aerial with some of our notes. I am submitting an application for a comp plan amendment/zone change for the southerly 55 feet of 6216 N. Washington St, which is currently a rental home. We purchased both 6216 & 6222 N. Washington last year after being approached by a credit union who wants to move onto the Francis corridor. The first 125 feet from Francis, going south, is zoned O-35 (office no more than 35 feet in height) and the balance is RSF (residential single family). Although the RSF zone will allow paving, waste collection & landscaping, it will not allow parking, which is very important for a bank, credit union or office building. The zoning line runs right through the middle of the home at 6216 N. Washington.

Our plan is to eventually build abutting Francis Avenue and have parking to the south of the building, to provide a buffer to the homes on the southerly edge. This plan would be a marked improvement from the two rental homes that are currently on site and I'm confident the neighbors will agree. The zoning does not allow for retail, and anything we build there would be a low impact and not typically open "after hours". The other three corners of Francis & Washington are all commercial (Fireplace Center on the SE corner, Spokane Quick Lube on the NW and Inside 'n Out Hand Wash on the NE).

This will be a long process, but I understand that I needed to reach out to the Neighborhood Council as one of the first steps. I look forward to discussing with you. Please feel free to call me anytime if you have questions.

Sincerely,


Vic Plese  
Plese Realty, LLC (my business)  
Plese & Plese, LLC (the partnership that owns the property in question)  
201 W. Francis Ave.  
Spokane, WA 99205  
509-489-2323 office  
509-217-7889 cell  
509-489-3333 fax

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT





Parcel	36311.0519	5552 SF
	36311.0518	6400 SF
	<u>36311.0517</u>	<u>11520 SF</u>
		23,472 SF

180 feet on Washington  
 128 feet on Francis

• 125' MOL

• 80' MOL

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

## Environmental Checklist

File No. \_\_\_\_\_

### **Purpose of Checklist:**

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

### **Instructions for Applicants:**

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

### **Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:**

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply."

IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (Part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**A. BACKGROUND**

- 1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Rezone a portion of 6216 N. Washington St - Plese & Plese, LLC
- 2. Name of applicant: Plese & Plese, LLC
- 3. Address and phone number of applicant or contact person: Vic Plese - Plese & Plese LLC c/o Plese Realty LLC 201 W. Francis Ave. 99205 - 509-489-2323
- 4. Date checklist prepared: 10/31/2017
- 5. Agency requesting checklist: Spokane City Planning
- 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): unknown - to be determined
- 7. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. no
- 7. b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain. no
- 8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to his proposal. n/a
- 9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. n/a
- 10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. comprehensive plan change / rezone of approximately 7,040 sq ft of a 23,040 sq ft site

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. Zone change from RSF to O35 for approximately 7,040 sq ft of a 23,040 sq ft site - to be used for parking for a bank, credit union or office building (to be determined)

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information to a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist. 6216 N. Washington St.  
Spokane, WA 99205

13. Does the proposed action lie within the Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)? The General Sewer Service Area? The Priority Sewer Service Area? The City of Spokane? (See: Spokane County's ASA Overlay Zone Atlas for boundaries.) City of Spokane

14. The following questions supplement Part A.

a. Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA) / Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)

(1) Describe any systems, other than those designed for the disposal of sanitary waste, installed for the purpose of discharging fluids below the ground surface (includes systems such as those for the disposal of stormwater or drainage from floor drains). Describe the type of system, the amount of material to be disposed of through the system and the types of material likely to be disposed of (including materials which may enter the system inadvertently through spills or as a result of firefighting activities).

n/a

(2) Will any chemicals (especially organic solvents or petroleum fuels) be stored in aboveground or underground storage tanks? If so, what types and quantities of material will be stored?

n/a

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

- (3) What protective measures will be taken to insure that leaks or spills of any chemicals stored or used on site will not be allowed to percolate to groundwater. This includes measures to keep chemicals out of disposal systems.

Paving & landscape/swales that will be required by City of Spokane  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Will any chemicals be stored, handled or used on the site in a location where a spill or leak will drain to surface or groundwater or to a stormwater disposal system discharging to surface or groundwater?

no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. Stormwater

- (1) What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)?

unknown  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts?

Building and parking lot stormwater will be routed to swales as required but will be minimal  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT**

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

Evaluation for  
 Agency Use  
 Only

**1. Earth**

- a. General description of the site (circle one): *flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountains, other.* \_\_\_\_\_

Flat  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? None

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. Sand

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. no

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill: none needed

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. no

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? As much as allowed by code but likely 85-90%

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth, if any: n/a

2. Air

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known. unknown

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. no

RECEIVED  
OCT 31 2017  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**3. Water**

a. SURFACE:

- (1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from the surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- (5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? no If so, note location on the site plan.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- (6) Does the proposal involve any discharge of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

n/a  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. GROUND:

- (1) Will groundwater be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sanitary waste treatment facility. Describe the general size of the system, the number of houses to be served (if applicable) or the number of persons the system(s) are expected to serve.

n/a  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

c. WATER RUNOFF (INCLUDING STORMWATER):

- (1) Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and method of collection and disposal if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Minor runoff from building roof and parking lot-  
 directed to grass swale(s)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- d. PROPOSED MEASURES to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any.

see above  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

4. Plants

a. Check or circle type of vegetation found on the site:

\_\_\_\_\_ Deciduous tree: *alder, maple, aspen, other.*

  x   Evergreen tree: *fir, cedar, pine, other.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Shrubs

  x   Grass

\_\_\_\_\_ Pasture

\_\_\_\_\_ Crop or grain

\_\_\_\_\_ Wet soil plants, *cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage,*  
*other.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Water plants: *water lilly, eelgrass, milfoil, other.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Other types of vegetation.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?   mostly weeds and some grass  

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.   n/a  

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:   n/a  

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site are known to be on or near the site:

birds: *hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other.*   n/a  

mammals: *deer, bear, elk, beaver, other.*   n/a  

fish: *bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other.*   n/a  

other:   n/a  

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

not known  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

no effect  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**6. Energy and natural resources**

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc. Electricity and natural gas through Avista for heating/cooling; office, computer use.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

LED lighting  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**7. Environmental health**

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Property already served by city  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. NOISE:

(1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Construction at beginning only  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(3) Proposed measure to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

Rental home  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- c. Describe any structures on the site. 836 Square foot rental home with basement and single carport  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, which? Said rental house  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? Portion of site is O35 (Office) and approx 55 feet at the south end is RSF (residential single family)
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? see above  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?  
n/a  
\_\_\_\_\_
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area? If so, specify. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?  
Unknown at this time but estimated at 10-15
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? 2 Households
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: My real estate company who currently manages the rentals will aid the occupants in finding new rentals. Neither have lived there for more than one year  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: All three ~~other~~ corners of this intersection are commercially zoned - the project would fit nicely with existing uses  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

**9. Housing**

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any?  
Indicate whether high, middle or low-income housing. \_\_\_\_\_  
n/a

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated?  
Indicate whether high-, middle- or low-income housing. \_\_\_\_\_  
2 middle-class rental units (\$700 per month and \$1,000 per month)

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if  
any: see 8k

**10. Aesthetics**

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not  
including antennas; what is the principal exterior building  
material(s) proposed? 35 feet

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or  
obstructed? none

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts,  
if any: Landscaping and screening as would be required

**11. Light and Glare**

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What  
time of day would it mainly occur? Downward-facing building and  
parking lot lighting only.

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: parking lot lighting would be downward facing to reduce light pollution  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**12. Recreation**

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? Ruth Park 2 blocks  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**13. Historic and cultural preservation**

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe. no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic archaeological, scientific or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site. none  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any: \_\_\_\_\_  
     n/a  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**14. Transportation**

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any. Washington, 125 feet away from intersection Francis if allowed  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop? one block
- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate? \_\_\_\_\_  
Unknown as we don't know the eventual size of the bank or office building, but approximately 15-25. Displacing none
- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private). no  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail or air transportation? If so, generally describe. \_\_\_\_\_  
no  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak would occur. unknown  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

*(Note: to assist in review and if known indicate vehicle trips during PM peak, AM Peak and Weekday (24 hours).)*

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: n/a  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation for  
Agency Use  
Only

**15. Public services**

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe. \_\_\_\_\_  
no  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any:  n/a   
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**16. Utilities**

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: *electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.* \_\_\_\_\_

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.  City of Spokane for water & sewer   
 Avista Utilities for natural gas & electricity   
\_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



**C. SIGNATURE**

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: 10/31/2017Signature: **Please Print or Type:**Proponent: Vic S. Plese  
Plese & Plese LLCAddress: 201 W. Francis Ave.  
Spokane, WA 99205Phone: 509-489-2323Person completing  
form (if different  
from proponent): \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

**FOR STAFF USE ONLY**

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

- A. there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.
- B. probable significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.
- C. there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING &amp; DEVELOPMENT

**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS**  
*(Do not use this sheet for project actions)*

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

- 1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

No

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

unknown

- 2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life?

n/a

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life are:

n/a

- 3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

n/a

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

n/a

**RECEIVED**

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

- 4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, flood plains or prime farmlands?

n/a

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

n/a

- 5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

n/a

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

n/a

- 6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

MINOR INCREASE

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

TBD

- 7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

n/a

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

C. SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency may withdraw any Determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: 10/31/17 Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Please Print or Type:

Proponent: Piese Pies LLC Address: 201 W. Francis Ave  
Vic Piese  
Phone: 509 489 2323 Spokane WA 99205

Person completing form (if different from proponent): \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

- A.  there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.
- B.  probable significant adverse impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.
- C.  there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2017

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT