



DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

Map Amendment from R 4-10 to Office and zone change from RSF to O-35

ADDRESS OF SITE OF PROPOSAL: (if not assigned yet, obtain address from Public Works before submitting application)
4502 and 4508 N Madison, 4601 N Monroe and 4616 N Monroe

APPLICANT:

Name: Department of Ecology, C/O Fran Huntington Facilities Manager
Address: 300 Desmond Dr Lacey WA 98503
Phone (home): **Phone (work):** 360-407-7028
Email address: Fhun461@ecy.wa.gov

PROPERTY OWNER:

Name: Washington State Department of Ecology
Address: PO Box 47600 Olympia WA 98504
Phone (home): **Phone (work):** N/A
Email address: N/A

AGENT:

Name: Dwight J Hume dba Land Use Solutions and Entitlement
Address: 9101 N Mt. View Lane Spokane WA 99218
Phone (home): **Phone (work):** 509-435-3108
Email address:

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:

35062.3610, 35062.3609, (Houses); 35062.3619 (W Parking Lot); 35062.3515 (NE Parking Lot)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

See Attached Legal Descriptions

SIZE OF PROPERTY:

Houses (.28 acres); W. Parking Lot (.57 acres); NE Parking Lot (.17 acres) Total Acres 1.02 acres

LIST SPECIFIC PERMITS REQUESTED IN THIS APPLICATION:

Land Use Map Amendment with implementing zone changes.

RECEIVED

OCT 29 2013

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

SUBMITTED BY:

Washington State Department of Ecology

by Fran Huntington, [Signature]

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, Fran Huntington, Facility Manager of the above-described property do hereby authorize Dwight J Hume dba Land Use Solutions and Entitlement to represent DOE and our interests in all matters regarding this application.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SPOKANE)

On this 10th day of October, 2018, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared Fran Huntington, 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.



Valerie L Pearson Valerie L Pearson
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington,
residing at Lacey, Washington

RECEIVED

OCT 29 2018

Neighborhood and Planning Services



Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Full Review
RECEIVED

Z18-884COMP DOE

MAR 11 2019

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

**Neighborhood and
Planning Services**

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

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

1. Describe the nature of the proposed amendment and explain if there is any change from the early threshold review application. *The applicant needs the subject parcels changed to Office from Residential 4-10 to accommodate a storage facility for emergency response equipment. The Docketing Committee and Council recommended that the parcel located at the SE corner of Monroe and Wellesley not be included in the cross-over to Office to prevent a trend to Office within that block.*
2. How will the proposed change provide a substantial benefit to the public? *The current storage of this emergency response equipment is located off campus in Airway Heights, imposing a delayed response from the home office to the incident.*
3. Is this application consistent or inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives and policies? Describe and attach a copy of any study, report or data, which has been developed that supports the proposed change and any relevant conclusions. If inconsistent please discuss how the analysis demonstrates that changed conditions have occurred which will necessitate a shift in goals and policies. *The application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as the existing adjacent facility for DOE is zoned Office.*
4. Is this application consistent or inconsistent with the goals and policies of state and federal legislation, such as the Growth Management Act (GMA) or environmental regulations? If inconsistent, describe the changed community needs or priorities that justify such an amendment and provide supporting documents, reports or studies. *The proposal is consistent with GMA and other applicable state and federal guidelines.*
5. Is this application consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the Regional Transportation Improvement District, and official population growth forecasts? If inconsistent please describe the changed regional needs or priorities that justify such an amendment and

Planning & Development Services, 808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard, Spokane, WA 99201-3336

my.spokanecity.org | Phone: 509.625.6300

(Rev Feb 2018)

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

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

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

**Neighborhood and
Planning Services**

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Project Narrative Summary

Department of Ecology Map Amendment

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

The Department of Ecology has purchased the remaining two homes located on the block where the DOE has headquartered in Spokane. Except for a "C" store located at the NW corner of the block, DOE will now have the rest of the block for their use.

These houses are located at the NEC of Princeton and Madison and are addressed as 4502 and 4508 N Madison. The purpose of this request is to enable DOE to relocate their emergency response equipment currently being stored in west Spokane near the waste to energy plant. The project would replace the houses with an accessory structure for said storage. Budgeting has been approved and is subject to this zone change prior to permitting, which is now delayed until the spring of 2020, pending the procedural completion of this annual amendment.

In addition, the DOE will improve the existing on-site parking lots. Those improvements are scheduled for completion by June 30, 2019. A schematic site plan is included showing the proposed parking lot locations and a proposed preliminary site plan of the storage facility.

Finally, as part of the annual amendment, the parking lots that are currently under the approval of a special permit, will be upgraded to the O-35 zone to bring these parcels into compliance with the comprehensive plan and remove the non-conforming classification of said lots. Except that, during the Docketing Committee review, the committee recommended that the DOE parking lot located separately on the SEC of Monroe and Wellesley, be left as an RSF/Special Permit parking area so as to avoid future Office expansion within that block.

End of Narrative

Section 17G.020.030
Final Review Criteria

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

18-884COMP DOE

A. Regulatory Changes.

Amendments to the comprehensive plan must be consistent with any recent state or federal legislative actions, or changes to state or federal regulations, such as changes to the Growth Management Act, or new environmental regulations.

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

B. GMA.

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

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

C. Financing.

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

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

D. Funding Shortfall.

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

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

E. Internal Consistency.

1).The requirement for internal consistency pertains to the comprehensive plan as it relates to all of its supporting documents, such as the development regulations, capital facilities program, shoreline master program, downtown plan, critical area regulations, and any neighborhood planning documents adopted after 2001. In addition, amendments should strive to be consistent with the parks plan, and vice versa. For

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

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

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

Not Applicable

F. Regional Consistency.

All changes to the comprehensive plan must be consistent with the countywide planning policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the regional transportation improvement plan, and official population growth forecasts

The expansion of the existing Office designation is not consequential to Regional Consistency.

G. Cumulative Effect.

All amendments must be considered concurrently in order to evaluate their cumulative effect on the comprehensive plan text and map, development regulations, capital facilities program, neighborhood planning documents, adopted environmental policies and other relevant implementation measures

1) Land Use Impacts.

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

The proposed amendment of 1.02 acres within an existing city block that is trending toward Office, has no cumulative land use impacts.

2) Grouping.

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

This proposal has no effects on land use type or geographic area. It is bringing the entire DOE complex of on-site operations into zoning compliance.

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services

H. SEPA.

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

1. Grouping.

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

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

2. DS.

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

I. Adequate Public Facilities

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

The proposal has no impacts upon citywide services.

J. UGA.

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

K. Demonstration of Need.

1) Map Changes.

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

- a. The designation is in conformance with the appropriate location criteria identified in the comprehensive plan (e.g., compatibility with neighboring land uses, proximity to arterials, etc.);

Office designations are allowed when trending and expanding from an existing Office designation, or when used to make a common use and site consistent in zoning.

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

As stated in "a" above, a common zone for a common use within a common site is appropriate.

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

The current map designation recognizes former single-family zones and uses. The ownership is now the DOE and their common operations of Office, parking and storage, thus eliminating some non-conforming uses for parking and accommodating a storage facility for emergency response equipment and supplies. The removal of the two remaining houses within this block is entirely suitable.

2) Rezones Land Use Plan Map Amendments *If approved, the corresponding zone would be O-35 and this would bring all of the DOE ownership within the block to an O-35 zone and eliminate the non-conforming special permit on-site parking lots.*

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

Neighborhood and
Planning Services