

**STAFF REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATION  
FILE NO. Z2018-253COMP**

**I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

This is an application sponsored by City of Spokane Council Member Kinnear for an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, adding to the text of Chapter Two - Implementation, to include a reference to the Joint City Council-Administration Six-Year Strategic Plan adopted by resolution number (RES2017-0101), amended or adopted thereafter, with the addition of the following language to follow the last paragraph of section 2.1:

***Strategic Implementation***

*In addition to these regulatory tools city staff will implement the tenets of the plan in their projects and programs. Because the comprehensive Plan is designed to help the community realize a shared vision of the future, as the community, environment, and legal framework changes over time so should the community's guiding document. To ensure that the Comprehensive Plan functions as a living document, evolving to meet the needs of the community, the Joint Administration-Council Strategic Plan will serve as a strategic implementation guide to help direct the actions and priorities of elected officials and city staff. The Strategic Plan is designed to direct attention to projects that implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.*

**II. GENERAL INFORMATION:**

- A. Applicant: City of Spokane Council Member Kinnear
- B. Location of Proposal: City-wide.
- C. SEPA Status: This text amendment is procedural in nature and categorically exempt from SEPA review per WAC 197-11-800(19).
- D. Enabling legislation: SMC 17G.020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process
- E. Plan Commission Hearing Date: September 12, 2018

F. Staff Contact: Shauna Harshman, 625-6551

G. Procedural Requirements:

- Agency & Departmental Review (April 20 – May 7, 2018)
- Notice of Application (May 29, 2018)
- Public Comment Period (May 29-July 27, 2018)
- Plan Commission Substantive Workshops (June 13, 2018)
- Notice of Plan Commission Hearing (August 29, 2018)
- Plan Commission Hearing (September 12, 2018)
- City Council Action (Fall 2018)

#### **IV. DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

Notice of this proposal was sent to City departments and outside agencies for their review. No comments concerning the specific language of the proposed amendment were received.

#### **V. CONCLUSIONS**

SMC 17G.020.030 provides a list of considerations that are to be used, as appropriate, in evaluating proposal to amend the comprehensive plan. The following is a list of those considerations followed by staff analysis relative each.

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.

*Relevant facts: The proposal 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 is 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.

*Relevant facts: The “Legislative findings” included in the Revised Code of Washington pertaining to GMA is essentially a call for coordinated and planned growth that is done cooperatively between citizens, government, and the private sector. The complete text of the “Legislative findings” follows:*

RCW 36.70A.010, *Legislative findings.*

*The legislature finds that uncoordinated and unplanned growth, together with a lack of common goals expressing the public's interest in the conservation and the wise use of our lands, pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety, and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state. It is in the public interest that citizens, communities, local governments, and the private sector cooperate and coordinate with one another in comprehensive land use planning.*

*The Growth Management Act contains 13 goals to guide the development and adoption of the comprehensive plans and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.020, "Planning Goals"). The two goals that are most directly related to the land use element state:*

- ◆ *Urban growth. "Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner."*
- ◆ *Reduce sprawl. "Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low density development."*

*Based on the evaluation provided elsewhere in this report, staff concludes that the application is consistent with these and the rest of the GMA Planning goals and the overall purpose of the Growth Management Act.*

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.

*Relevant facts:* *Staff has concluded that this criterion is not applicable to this proposal. There are no financing implications.*

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.

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

E. Internal Consistency.

1. Internal Consistency.

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.

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.

*Relevant facts: The proposal is internally consistent and does not result in the need for other amendments to the Comprehensive Plan amendments or development regulations.*

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.

*Relevant facts: 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.

i. 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.

ii. 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.

*Relevant facts: This application is being reviewed as part of the annual cycle of comprehensive plan amendments. Staff concludes that this criterion is met.*

#### H. SEPA.

SEPA review must be completed on all amendment proposals and is described in chapter 17E.050.

##### 1. Grouping.

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

##### 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).

*Relevant facts: The text amendment is procedural in nature and categorically exempt from SEPA review per WAC 197-11-800(19).*

#### 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.

*Relevant facts: 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. 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.*

*Relevant facts: The proposal does not involve amendment of the urban growth area boundary. This criterion is not applicable 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. The need for this type of adjustment might be supported by findings from feedback instruments related to monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the comprehensive plan. Examples of such findings could include:

- a. growth and development as envisioned in the plan is occurring faster, slower or is failing to materialize;
- b. the capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased;
- c. land availability to meet demand is reduced;
- d. population or employment growth is significantly different than the plan's assumptions;
- e. plan objectives are not being met as specified;
- f. the effect of the plan on land values and affordable housing is contrary to plan goals;
- g. transportation and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected;
- h. a question of consistency exists between the comprehensive plan and its elements and chapter 36.70A RCW, the countywide planning policies, or development regulations.

***Relevant facts:*** *This proposal is a request for a Comprehensive Plan text 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.);

***Relevant facts:***

*This criterion is not applicable to this proposal.*

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

***Relevant facts:*** *This criterion is not applicable to this proposal.*

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

Relevant facts: *This criterion is not applicable to this proposal.*

- 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.

Relevant facts: *This criterion is not applicable to this proposal.*

L. Inconsistent Amendments.

- 1. Review Cycle.  
 Because of the length of time required for staff review, public comment, and plan commission’s in-depth analysis of the applicant’s extensive supporting data and long-term trend analysis, proposals that are not consistent with the comprehensive plan are addressed only within the context of the required comprehensive plan update cycle every seven years pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(4)(C) and every other year starting in 2005.

Relevant facts: *This is not an inconsistent Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Plan amendment request.*

- 2. Adequate Documentation of Need for Change.
  - a. The burden of proof rests entirely with the applicant to provide convincing evidence that community values, priorities, needs and trends have changed sufficiently to justify a fundamental shift in the comprehensive plan. Results from various measurement systems should be used to demonstrate or document the need to depart from the current version of the comprehensive plan. Relevant information may include:
  - b. growth and development as envisioned in the plan is occurring faster, slower or is failing to materialize;
  - c. the capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased;
  - d. land availability to meet demand is reduced;
  - e. population or employment growth is significantly different than the plan’s assumptions;
  - f. transportation and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected;

- g. conditions have changed substantially in the area within which the subject property lies and/or Citywide;
- h. assumptions upon which the plan is based are found to be invalid; or
- i. sufficient change or lack of change in circumstances dictates the need for such consideration.

*Relevant facts: This is not an inconsistent Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Plan amendment request.*

3. Overall Consistency.

If significantly inconsistent with the current version of 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.

*Relevant facts: This is not an inconsistent Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Plan amendment request.*

**VI. RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that this Comprehensive Plan text change be approved as proposed.