Land Use Solutions & Entitlement

Land Use Planning Services
9101 N. MT. VIEW LANE Spokane, WA 99218
509-435-3108 (V) 509-467-0229 (F)

10-30-14

Planning Services
W 808 Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane WA 99201

Attn: Tirrell Black, Assistant Planner

Ref: CPA Maple and Wellesley clarifications

Tirrell:
Just a quick note of clarifications about this application and location:

1) This proposal continues an existing office development trend. That is to say, each quadrant of this arterial intersection has office and/or office related uses. According to the City of Spokane 2012-2013 Traffic Flow Map, the intersection has 29,300 VTD.

2) The property located across Maple at the SW corner is a parking lot for the Office located on the SE corner of Ash and Wellesley. You will note that the zoning on that parking lot is also RSF as it was historically approved as a Special Permit under the previous development code.

3) My site plan is nothing more than a photo copy of the site area printed from the City of Spokane’s base map data. I’m sure the surrounding land use shown in this picture is more relevant than the vacant site of the subject proposal.

4) While there are only 2 tax parcels, there are 3 platted lots within this proposal. They are Lots 16, 17 and 18 Block 2 Green’s Addition, except roads. From an aerial view of the subject property, it appears that Wellesley Avenue has taken a major portion of the most northerly Lot 18.

Respectfully submitted

Dwight J Hume
Dwight J Hume
Land Use Solutions and Entitlement

RECEIVED

NOV 19 2014
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Residential 4-10 to Office and from RSF to O-35

ADDRESS OF SITE OF PROPOSAL: (if not assigned yet, obtain address from Public Works before submitting application)
4610 and 4618 N Maple

APPLICANT:
Name: Land Use Solutions and Entitlement, Dwight Humm Agent
Address: 9101 N Mt. View Lane  Spokane WA 99218
Phone (home):  
Email address: dhume@spokane-landuse.com
Phone (work): 509-435-3108

PROPERTY OWNER:
Name: GRR Family LLC
Address: 3531 W Horizon Ave  Spokane WA 99208-8494
Phone (home): N/A
Email address: N/A

AGENT:
Name: Same as applicant
Address:  
Phone (home):  
Email address: 

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:
25011.0214 and 25011.0215

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
Lots 16-18 Block 2 Greens Addition; except roads.

SIZE OF PROPERTY:
17821 sf. (.41 acres.)

RECEIVED
OCT 31 2014

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
LIST SPECIFIC PERMITS REQUESTED IN THIS APPLICATION:

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

SUBMITTED BY:

Dwight J Hume, agent

☐ 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, ____________________________, owner of the above-described property do hereby authorize Dwight Hume to represent me and my interests in all matters regarding this application.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

STATE OF WASHINGTON

COUNTY OF SPOKANE

On this 31st day of October, 2014, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared Gary Ralph Redding, 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.

Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at 04/15/17

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2014

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:
Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from R.4-10 to Office and O-35 zone
Zoning Change from RSF to O-35

ADDRESS OF SITE OF PROPOSAL: (if not assigned yet, obtain address from Public Works before submitting application)
4610 and 4618 N Maple

APPLICANT:
Name: Land Use Solutions and Entitlement, Dwight Hume Agent
Address: 9101 N Mt. View Lane
Phone (home): 
Phone (work): 435-3108
Email address: dhume@spokane-landuse.com

PROPERTY OWNER:
Name: GRR Family LLC
Address: 3531 W Horizon Ave. Spokane WA 99208-8494
Phone (home): N/A
Phone (work): 
Email address: N/A

AGENT:
Name: Dwight J Hume
Address: 9101 N Mt. View Lane Spokane WA 99218
Phone (home): 
Phone (work): 435-3108
Email address: dhume@spokane-landuse.com

ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS:
25011.0214 and 25011.0215

RECEIVED
NOV 19 2014
**LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF SITE:**

Lots 16-18 Block 2 Greens Addition; except roads.

**SIZE OF PROPERTY:**

17821sf (.41 acres)

**LIST SPECIFIC PERMITS REQUESTED IN THIS APPLICATION:**

Comp Plan Map Amendment

**DOES OWNER/APPLICANT OWN PROPERTY ADJACENT TO SUBJECT PROPERTY?**

*If yes, provide all parcel numbers.*

All property is listed above.

---

I acknowledge, as a part of this application, that I am responsible for all notification requirements as described in SMC 17G.060. for public hearing and community meeting. Copies of these instructions are available from the Planning Services Department or on [www.spokaneplanning.org](http://www.spokaneplanning.org).

**SUBMITTED BY:**

☐ Applicant  ☐ Property Owner  ☐ Property Purchaser  ☒ Agent

---

**RECEIVED**

NOV 19 2014

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
Comprehensive Plan or Land Use Code Amendment

Pre-Application

1. Summarize the general nature of the proposed amendment.

The subject site, consist of three platted, vacant lots, located at the SE corner of Maple and Wellesley. It is the only quadrant of the Maple/Wellesley intersection of two principle arterials that is not zoned or used for Office purposes. This is simply an extension of the existing office zone district trend.

2. Why do you feel this change is needed?

The three lots have been vacant for several years and have not been replaced with single family housing stock. The trend has been to use these quadrants of the intersection for office use rather than single family housing stock.

3. In what way(s) is your proposal similar to or different from the fundamental concepts contained in comprehensive plan?

The trend has been to use the quadrants of the intersection for office and office related uses. The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan goals, objectives and policies. LU 1.5 allows expansion where there is an established trend. In this case, the remaining office quadrants are currently being used for office and office related uses.

4. For text amendments: What goals, policies, regulations or other documents might be changed by your proposal? N/A

5. For map amendments:
   a. What is the current Land Use designation and zoning for each affected parcel?
      The subject parcels are designated R 4-10 and zoned RSF.
   b. What is the requested Land Use designation and zoning for each affected parcel?
      The requested designation is Office and O-35 zoning
   c. Describe the land uses surrounding the proposed amendment site(s); e.g., land use type, vacant/occupied, etc.
      North: Office
      South: Single Family
      East: Single Family
      West: Office and Parking Lot

RECEIVED
NOV 19 2014
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
6. Do you know of any existing studies, plans or other documents that specifically relate to or support your proposal?

Yes, See File # Z12000-43 Cancer Care NW. This decision relies upon the trend or transition to Office and recognizes the location against major traffic impacts of I-90. The traffic volume of this intersection is 29300 VTD and has traffic related impacts of noise.

7. Why did you decide to pursue a comprehensive plan amendment rather than address your concern through some other aspect of the Planning Services department’s work program (e.g., neighborhood planning, public input on new regulations, etc.)?

There were no other options available for the reasonable use of the property.

Has there been a previous attempt to address this concern through a comprehensive plan amendment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please answer the following questions: N/A

a. When was the amendment proposal submitted?

b. Was it submitted as a consistent amendment or an inconsistent amendment?

c. What were the Plan Commission recommendation and City Council decision at that time?

d. Describe any ways that this amendment proposal varies from the previously considered version.
1. General Questions (for all proposals):
   a. Describe the nature of the proposed amendment and explain why the change is necessary.

   The subject site, consist of three platted and vacant lots, located at the SE corner of Maple and Wellesley. It is the only quadrant of the Maple/Wellesley intersection of two principle arterials, not zoned or used for Office purposes. This is simply an extension of the existing office zone district.

   b. How will the proposed change provide a substantial benefit to the public?

   The proposed designation continues an existing office trend. As stated above, this is the only quadrant of the intersection not being used for office or office related uses, such as parking. LU-1.5 Office, states that Office designation is also located where it continues an existing development trend. It also serves as a transitional land use to the existing low density designation flanking the subject property on the east and south. Finally, access to the subject site is from arterials of Maple and Wellesley, which carry a combined daily traffic volume of 19300 VTD.

   c. 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 proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan goals, objectives and policies. LU 1.5 allows expansion where there is an established trend. In this case, the remaining office quadrants are currently being used for office and office related uses.

   Comprehensive Plan Policy LU 5.3 “Off-Site Impacts”
   Ensure that off-street parking, access, and loading facilities do not adversely impact the surrounding area.

   New parking lots should also have the same zoning classification as the primary use. In addition, these facilities should be developed to minimize adverse impacts to adjacent properties. All parking lots should be paved. Parking lots and loading areas should have appropriate buffers to fully screen them from adjacent, less intensive uses. Access to business and higher density residential sites should be controlled to avoid impacts on adjacent uses, pedestrian movement, and street functions.

   The subject site will access Principal Arterials and not local access streets. Parking will be screened pursuant to adopted development standards.

   d. 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 “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 proposed change is consistent with these goals.

e. 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 provide supporting documents, reports or
studies.

This is a .41 acre site bounded by two major arterials and fits within a trend of having
office use at each quadrant of the intersection. CWPP issues or other regional plans are
not applicable.

f. Are there any infrastructure implications that will require financial commitments reflected
in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan?

No the site does not need new infrastructure to serve this site.

g. 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.

None of the above are affected by this proposal.

h. If this proposal is to modify an Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundary, please provide a
density and population growth trend analysis. Changes to the Urban Growth Area may
occur only every five years and when the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC)
reviews all UGA’s countywide. N/A

2. For Text Amendments: N/A

a. Please provide a detailed description and explanation of the proposed text amendment.
Show proposed edits in "line in/line out" format, with text to be added indicated by
underlining, and text to be deleted indicated with strikethroughs.
b. Reference the name of the document as well as the title, chapter and number of the specific goal, policy or regulation proposed to be amended/added.

3. For Map Change Proposals:
   a. Attach a map of the proposed amendment site/area, showing all parcels and parcel numbers. See attached
   b. What is the current land use designation? R 4-10
   c. What is the requested land use designation? Office
   d. Describe the land uses surrounding the proposed amendment site (land use type, vacant/occupied, etc.
      
      North: Office,
      South: single family residential
      East: single family residential
      West: Office use for parking lot