SHORELINE PERMIT APPLICATION

 $Attach\ an\ additional\ sheet\ if\ needed$

Th	The 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.		
	Avista plans to make improvements to Huntington Park that will accommodate visitor use that has changed since the park was initially developed. These improvements consist of sidewalks, which are designed to separate pedestrian traffic from the service road, signage, planters, benches and small grassy areas. One small overlook will be developed to allow the public a safe place to enjoy views of the Upper Falls, and the intake and powerhouse access building may be re-faced with a faux basalt finish. The improvements will be developed in a manner compatible with improvements that may be constructed on the City of Spokane's and/or Avista's adjoining property, both of which are outside the Project Boundary, and with the City of Spokane's Riverfront Park Master Plan. The total project area is 3.8 acres. The ground disturbance will be less than 2 acres and the ground disturbance in the shoreline area will be considerably less.		
3∙	Provide a general description of the property and adjacent uses, including physical characteristics, intensity of development, improvements, and structures.		
	The project property is 3.8 acres in an urban environment downtown Spokane. The Spokane River borders the north portion of the existing Huntington Park and sits down from Post Street and Spokane Falls Blvd. The area is located in the Monroe Street HED, Post Street Substation and City Hall off of Post Street.		
4.	What is the estimated total Fair Market project cost within the Shoreline Jurisdiction? \$1,000,000		
5.	Will the proposed development intrude waterward of the ordinary high water? \square YES \boxtimes NO If yes, describe the intrusion:		
6.	Will the proposed use or development affect existing views of the shoreline or adjacent waters? \Box YES \boxtimes NO If yes, describe:		
	The project will increase the existing views by adding additional pedestrian and bicycle paths along with plazas, nodes, and landscaping areas.		
7.	Explain how the proposed use will not unreasonably interfere with the normal public use of public shorelines.		
	The public has a hard time accessing this area and very little of the public use this view of the Spokane River. The project will open it up for the public to use.		

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

Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Plan and Design Guidelines

Applicable Comprehensive Plan Goals

Overall Transportation: TR 1 Overall Transportation; TR 2 Transportation Options; TR 2.1 Physical Features; TR 2.6 Viable Walking Alternative; TR 2.7 Safe Sidewalks; TR 2.10 Pedestrian and Bicycle Linkages Across Barriers; TR 4.25 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Access to Parks

<u>Transportation</u>: LU 4.4 Connections

Development Character: LU 5.1 Built and Natural Environment; LU 5.2 Environmental Quality Enhancement; LU 5.5

Compatible Development

Adequate Public Lands and Facilities: LU 6.2 Open Space; Public Realm Enhancement: LU 2.1 Public Realm Features

Applicable Design Guidelines
<u>Section C</u>: Pedestrian Environment
<u>Section D</u>: Public Amenities

Applicable Shoreline Management Plan

SMP 3 Circulation: SMP 3.1 Shoreline Access; SMP 3.2 Access System; SMP 4 Conservation: SMP 4.5 Native Plant Retention and Landscaping

SMP 5 Economic Development: SMP 5.5 Water Enjoyment Areas; SMP 5.8 Major Building Entrances

SMP 7 Historic, Cultural, Scientific, Educational: SMP 7.5 Interpretive Signage; SMP 7.11 Public Access and Educational Opportunities

SMP 8 Public Access: SMP 8.1 Access Improvements; SMP 8.3 Access in the Central Business District; SMP 8.10 Access for

Utility Corridors and Facilities;

<u>SMP 9 Recreation</u>: SMP 9.2 Linkages to Recreation Areas <u>SMP 10 Restoration</u>: SMP 10.3 Landscaping with Native Plants

Applicable Shoreline Regulations Chapter 17E Chapter 17E.060.600(G) Transportation Facilities

The current draft pedestrian priority map shows this area rated for the highest priority (7-10 years).

The Comp Plan, Downtown Plan, and the shoreline regulations encourage projects incorporating features that enhance pedestrian and bicycling linkages while incorporating views, gathering areas, and increasing quality of life issues. The project area is designed by connecting two major arterials and the City Hall to the Spokane River through pathways, plazas, and trails. All aspects of the built and natural environment were carefully evaluated during the planning and design phase.

This area has existed in its former state for many years with very little or limited access to this area. The area is within close proximity to Riverfront Park, Spokane River, and in the core of the downtown area. As the downtown area continues to develop, the connection of the Huntington Park area provides an opportunity to continue the plans for downtown.

The plans and regulations encourage projects that can continue the linkage to the existing routes and creating new inspiring designs that incorporate the societal values of the City. The plans and regulations have very similar goals and objectives with regards to enhancement to the public experience also known as public realm. This project is more than just providing access but designing the access in a manner that encourages social interaction as well as beautifying the surrounding urban and natural environment. The design has the correct attributes of providing the various types of pathways, integrating the plazas, nodes, and landscaping into this area.

 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.

There will be no net loss of shoreline ecological functions as the area is already blighted. The natural environment will be enhanced by the planting of native landscaping throughout the project and by providing areas near the river for viewing. Certain areas of the walkway and plaza will incorporate permeable surfaces for protection of the waterway wherever feasible. The site from the gondola will be visually better and more interactive for the public.

10. List of permits required from other than City of Spokane agencies, include name of agency, date of application, and number of application.

FERC amendment, Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, easements, City design approval

In addition to Questions 1-10, all Shoreline Conditional Use Applications must ALSO provide the following information:

inf	ormatio	n:		_	
11.	List the J	provisions of the land use code that a	allows the proposal.		
12.	Please ex the prop	xplain how the proposal is consistenterty.	t with the comprehensive plan de	signation and goals, objectives and	l policies for
13.	Please ex	xplain how the proposal meets the co	oncurrency requirements of SMC	Chapter 17D.010.	
14.	any nece	xplain any significant adverse impac ssary conditions that can be placed or ring property or the surrounding are	on the proposal to avoid significat	nt effects or interference with the t	
15.		xplain how the cumulative impact of e achieving the goals of the shoreline		e permits on the shoreline in the a	rea will not
inf	ormatio	to Questions 1-15, all Shoreline n: he following information for the var		provide the following addition	onal
			REQUIRED	PROPOSED	
		Front yard setback			
		Rear yard setback			

17.	What physical characteristics of the property interfere with your ability to meet the required standards?
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 variance is not granted?
20.	Does compliance with the requirement eliminate or substantially impair a natural, historic, or cultural feature of area-wide significance? If yes, please explain.
21.	Will surrounding properties suffer significant adverse effects if this variance is granted? Please explain.
22.	Will the appearance of the property be inconsistent with the development patterns of the surrounding property? Please explain.
23.	Variance permits for development that will be located landward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), and/or landward of any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant 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 will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.
24.	RCW 90	e permits for development that will be located waterward of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in 0.58.030(2)(b), or within any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the at 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 all reasonable 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.
С.	That the public use of the shorelines will not be adversely affected.