SHORELINE PERMIT APPLICATION

Attach an additional sheet if needed

| Th | e proposed action requires approval of: |
|-----|--|
| | Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP) |
| | ☐ Shoreline Conditional Use Permit (SCUP) |
| | ☐ Shoreline Variance (SV) |
| All | Shoreline Permits must provide the following information: |
| 1. | Identify the name of the shoreline (water body) with which the site of the proposal is associated. Spokane River |
| 2. | Provide a general description of the proposed project, including the proposed use or uses and the activities necessary to accomplish the project. |
| | Vacate Granite St. between Upriver Dr. and Ross Court per the approved vacation requested dated October 21, 2019. Create a turnaround for fire department access, create a storm water swale and re-install sidewalks, curb and paving for new turnaround. Includes creating fire department access at East N. Crescent Ave. |
| 3. | Provide a general description of the property and adjacent uses, including physical characteristics, intensity of development, improvements, and structures. |
| | Adjacent property is Riverview Retirement community with the assisted living facility (Terrace Building) and associated facilities. |
| 4. | What is the estimated total Fair Market project cost within the Shoreline Jurisdiction? Estimated at \$250,000 |
| 5. | Will the proposed development intrude waterward of the ordinary high water? \Box YES \mathbf{x} NO If yes, describe the intrusion: |
| 6. | Will the proposed use or development affect existing views of the shoreline or adjacent waters? \Box YES X NO If yes, describe: |
| 7. | Explain how the proposed use will not unreasonably interfere with the normal public use of public shorelines. |
| | The proposed use will not interfere with the normal public use of shorelines. The public access and walkway / trail is on the opposite side of the street where the work referenced in this application is occurring. |

| | Reference the Granite Street Vacation approval dated October 21, 2019. |
|-----|--|
| | |
| 9. | A detailed narrative of how the impacts of the proposal have been analyzed to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, including each step of the mitigation sequencing process, as defined in Section 17E.060.220 SMC. |
| | The proposed project has been analyzed to achieve no net loss of shorline ecological functions. This has been achieved by not performing any construction activities in the Ordinary High Water Mark Area. The work proposed is on the north side of Upriver Drive. Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) are provided and include a construction entrance, silt fencing and inlet protection on all existing and proposed storm water structures. The footprint of the proposed construction has been minimized. The area will be landscaped and sodded within the swale. The proposed project will result in an increase in landscaped and ehhanced shoreline buffer area. This is consistent with the mitigation measures outlined in Spokane Minicipal Code 17E.060.220. |
| 10. | List of permits required from other than City of Spokane agencies, include name of agency, date of application, and number of application. |
| | There are no other known permits required as a result of this project. |
| | addition to Questions 1-10, all Shoreline Conditional Use Applications must ALSO provide the following |
| | List the provisions of the land use code that allows the proposal. |
| | Per Donna deBit 6/12/20 - Only need to respond to questions 1-10 |
| 12. | Please explain how the proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives and policies for the property. |
| | |
| 13. | Please explain how the proposal meets the concurrency requirements of SMC Chapter 17D.010. |
| | |
| | |
| 14. | Please explain any significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties the proposal will have and any necessary conditions that can be placed on the proposal to avoid significant effects or interference with the use of neighboring property or the surrounding area, considering the design and intensity of the proposed use. |
| | |
| | |

Last Updated March 16, 20N

8. Please explain how the proposal is consistent with the map, goals, and policies of the Shoreline Master Program.

| 15. | Please explain how the cumulative impact o preclude achieving the goals of the shoreline | | use permits on the shoreline in the area will no | ot | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|--|-----|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Per Doi | nna deBit 6/12/20 - Only ned | ed to respond to questions 1-10 | | | | | |
| In | addition to Questions 1-15, all Shore | eline Variance Application | ns must provide the following addition | nal | | | | |
| | ormation: | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Fill out the following information for the var | riance being requested: | | | | | | |
| | | REQUIRED | PROPOSED | | | | | |
| | Front yard setback | ILLQUILLD | TROTOSED | | | | | |
| | Rear yard setback | | | | | | | |
| | Side yard setback | | | | | | | |
| | Lot coverage percentage | | | | | | | |
| | Lot size | | | | | | | |
| | Lot width | | | | | | | |
| | Height | | | | | | | |
| | Other (specify): | | | | | | | |
| | other (openly). | | | | | | | |
| 17. | 17. What physical characteristics of the property interfere with your ability to meet the required standards? | | | | | | | |
| 18. | 18. How does this property physically differ from other similarly zoned properties in the area and how do the physical characteristics of the subject property prevent developing to the same extent? | | | | | | | |
| 19. | What hardship will result if the requested va | ariance is not granted? | | | | | | |
| 20. | Does compliance with the requirement elim significance? If yes, please explain. | ninate or substantially impair a | natural, historic, or cultural feature of area-w | ide | | | | |

| 21. | Will sur | rounding properties suffer significant adverse effects if this variance is granted? Please explain. |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 22. | Will the explain. | e appearance of the property be inconsistent with the development patterns of the surrounding property? Please |
| | | Per Donna deBit 6/12/20 - Only need to respond to questions 1-10 |
| 23. | RCW 90 | e permits for development that will be located landward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in 0.58.030(2)(b), and/or landward of any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, icant can demonstrate all of the following: |
| | a. | That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property. |
| | | |
| | b. | That the hardship described in (a) of this subsection is specifically related to the property, and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, size, or natural features and the application of the master program, and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant's own actions. |
| | | |
| | c. | That the design of the project is compatible with other authorized uses within the area and with uses planned for the area under the comprehensive plan and shoreline master program and will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment. |
| | | |
| | d. | That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area; |
| | e. | That the variance requested is the minimum necessary to afford relief. |
| | | |

| | f. | That the | public interest wi | ll suffer no | substantial | detrimental | effect |
|--|----|----------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
|--|----|----------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------|

Per Donna deBit 6/12/20 - Only need to respond to questions 1-10

| Variance permits for development that will be located waterward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in |
|---|
| RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), or within any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the |
| applicant can demonstrate all of the following: |

| That the strict application | | | performance | standards | set | for th | in th | e applicable | master |
|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-----|--------|-------|--------------|--------|
| program precludes all reaso | nable use of | the property. | | | | | | | |

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

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