Spokane City Plan Commission
Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Recommendations
Proposed Amendments to Roadway Naming and Addressing Code

A Recommendation from the City Plan Commission to the City Council to approve the proposed amendments as they relate to Roadway Naming and Addressing. These changes were implemented as a result of the Spokane Regional Addressing Standards process, in which a model code was developed by all addressing authorities within Spokane County in order to create a common countywide standard used to reduce addressing conflicts and enhance public safety agencies’ abilities to provide emergency response.

Findings of Fact:

A. The Plan Commission has been asked to consider and make recommendations to the City Council on a proposed ordinance regarding Roadway Naming and Addressing; amending SMC sections 17A.020.120; 17A.020.180; 17A.020.190; repealing section 17D.050; and enacting a new section 17D.050A to chapter 17D of the Spokane Municipal Code.

B. Initial meetings with all Addressing Authorities began in May of 2015, with a draft of the Initial Addressing Standards being presented in September and joint addressing Authorities Committee Meetings were held in September and October or 2015 for review of the standards. The recommended standards were issued in December of 2015.

C. City Council was briefed by Ian VonEssen, the Regional Public Safety GIS Manager, at a Public Safety Committee Meeting in early 2016.

D. On July 14, 2016 staff requested comments from city departments on the draft regulations.

E. On June 4, 2015 staff requested Washington State Department of Commerce grant expedited review from the Growth Management Services Division.

F. On August 26, 2016 the proposed code, summary papers and related documents were posted on the City website.

G. Plan Commission was presented the City of Spokane’s draft code at two workshops occurring on September 28, 2016 and October 12, 2016.

H. On October 7, 2016 a Determination of Non-Significance was issued on the draft code. The appeal period of this determination ended on October 21, 2016. No comments were received.

I. The proposal is consistent with and implements provisions of the City of Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan. There are many references to landscaping, here is a selection:

TR 4.11 Consistency of Rules
Strive for consistency in setting speed limits, designating and locating arterials, and developing other transportation rules.

**Discussion:** Inconsistencies or inequities in transportation rules lead to increased confusion and violations, both intentional and unintentional. Consistency of rules supports a greater common understanding, awareness, and acceptance. Speed limits, for example, that vary from street to street or from one section of an arterial to another are confusing and unclear. Examples of rules include speed limits, designation and location of arterials, and location of traffic calming devices.

**ED 8.1 Quality of Life Protection**
Protect the natural and built environment as a primary quality of life feature that attracts new business.

**Discussion:** The importance of the city's high quality of life as a contributor to a favorable business climate is likely to increase as businesses make more decisions on where to locate based on the city’s appeal. Good schools, good infrastructure and public services, high quality neighborhoods, an attractive community appearance, many natural areas, a variety of recreational opportunities, and the perception of clean air and water attract both businesses and residents. These benefits act as economic development tools and must be protected in order to continue to function as attractions to potential businesses and residents. Individual programs and policies that respond to a particular business need may be of limited success in encouraging firms to expand or attracting new firms if they are not part of a comprehensive effort to upgrade the quality of life of the city. Improving the city’s quality of life where it is poor can have a significant impact on decisions firms make regarding location and workforce changes.

J. Appropriate notice of the Plan Commission hearing was published in the Spokesman Review on October 12, 2016 and October 19, 2016.

K. The City Plan Commission held a public hearing on October 26, 2016 to obtain public comments on the proposed amendment.

**Conclusions:**

A. The Plan Commission has reviewed all public testimony received during the public hearing.

B. The Plan Commission has found that the proposed amendments meet the approval criteria for text amendments to the Unified Development Code:

**SMC 17G.025.010 (F) Approval Criteria:**

1. The proposed amendments are consistent with the applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan; and

2. The proposed amendments bear a substantial relation to public health, safety, welfare, and protection of the environment.

C. The proposed amendments have been reviewed by the City Plan Commission and found to be in conformance with the goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
Recommendations:

By a vote of ___ to ___ the Plan Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of the proposed amendments to the Unified Development Code.

Dennis Dellwo, President
Spokane Plan Commission
October 26, 2016