

Infill Development Project
Summary Report and Recommendation

Spokane City Plan Commission
Infill Development Steering Committee



October 6, 2016

Contents

Problem Definition	1
Goals and Evaluation Criteria	7
Recommendation Priorities and Evaluation.....	11

Appendices

A. Maps and Tables 1 through 6.....	A-i
Table 1 Permits issued in the city of Spokane, 2006-2015	A-1
Table 2 Housing units created in the city of Spokane, 2006-2015	A-2
Map 1 New building permits by building class, 2006-2015	A-3
Table 3 Development opportunities: Vacant and underdeveloped land by zoning type and scale	A-4
Table 4 Development opportunities: Vacant and underdeveloped land by neighborhood council area	A-5
Map 2 Development opportunities: Council district 1	A-6
Map 3 Development opportunities: Council district 2	A-7
Map 4 Development opportunities: Council district 3	A-8
Map 5 Development opportunities: Downtown Spokane	A-9
Table 5 Housing units by city council district, 2010	A-10
Map 6 Housing units per acre Census block group	A-11
Map 7 Housing units per acre Census block	A-12
Table 6 Median parcel size – Residential Single-family (RSF) zoning district by neighborhood council area	A-13
Map 8 Median parcel size Residential Single-family (RSF) zoning district by neighborhood council area	A-14
Map 9 Parcel size in residential single-family (RSF) zoning district	A-15
B. Public Participation.....	B-1

Infill Development Steering Committee Members

Ben Stuckart, Spokane City Council President
Lori Kinnear, Spokane City Council District 2, Liaison to Plan Commission
Patricia Kienholz, Plan Commissioner
Michael Baker, Plan Commissioner
Mike Ekins, Interface Commercial Capital
Kay Murano, Spokane Low Income Housing Consortium
Darryl Reber, Inland Empire Residential Resources
Michael Cathcart, Spokane Home Builders Association
Asher Ernst, Infill Developer
Evan Verduin, Make Architecture & Design
David Shockley, Spokane Preservation Advocates
Greg Francis, Plan Commission Community Assembly Liaison
Kitty Klitzke, Futurewise
Gail Prosser, Business Owner
Andrew Rolwes, Downtown Spokane Partnership
Patrick Rooks, Community Assembly Representative

Former Members

Cindy Algeo, Spokane Low Income Housing Consortium
Kathryn Burk-Hise, Spokane Preservation Advocates

Problem Definition

Purpose

By 2037, Spokane is projected to grow to a population of more than 236,000 by adding 20,000 new residents (Spokane County Planning Technical Advisory Committee, 2015, p. 9). The City's Comprehensive Plan supports locating these new residents closer to the city core and near designated centers and corridors by filling in and redeveloping vacant and underutilized land near these areas.

This project's purpose is to investigate what options the community has to effectively remove barriers and challenges for development on vacant land in the city core, consistent with the City of Spokane's adopted plans. This project seeks to answer the following question. What resources do we need to make **infill development** as viable to finance, design, build, occupy, and maintain as greenfield development is on the city's outer fringes?

Each year, Spokane experiences infill development – that is, new buildings on vacant spaces, both in built-up areas of the city, and in adjacent land that is designated for urban growth. This activity proves a local market demand exists for new homes and businesses built in close proximity to others. Is it occurring at the levels and in the locations expected by the City's Comprehensive Plan? Is development well-designed to allow higher intensities, without detracting from the character of the existing conditions? Does it offer housing that is affordable to the full variety of income levels, and is it built to sufficient quality for the population?

The most recent addition of infill development tools were created in 2012, following the work of an infill housing task force that met in 2008 and 2011. Those tools were adopted into code but were only minimally applied by the development community. One obstacle to encouraging and promoting these methods appears to be a lack of knowledge and/or confusion regarding how investors, developers, and the general public perceive how the development tools apply.

The city has limited available land and a growing population. Without the ability to provide new housing and business within the core of the city, growth would occur in a manner that results in sprawling development on the urban fringe – a condition which is costlier to the community to provide and maintain public infrastructure. When development is removed from proximity to jobs and services, it affects individual lives as well, resulting in decreased livability, increased travel time, and fewer transportation options.

The City's adopted goals regarding desired development patterns and infill are further described below in Section 2, Goals and Evaluation Criteria.

Permit History

Permits issued by the City of Spokane may be tracked by location. The City's Comprehensive Plan focuses new growth around a number of centers and corridors. These areas are envisioned to have mixed-use development and significantly higher housing densities than other areas designated for commercial or residential uses. These areas are also likely to be surrounded by built-up areas, where any development will be essentially infill. Centers fall into categories of different scales: from smaller neighborhood and district centers, to larger employment centers and the Downtown regional center.

Project staff reviewed building permit data for new construction and various forms of residential and non-residential construction that indicated possible infill development, but excluding accessory structures such as garages or permits with valuations of less than \$100,000 (other than single-family homes). Over the ten-year

period from 2006 to 2015, there were 17 permits for selected categories of new construction issued Downtown (Table 1). Most of these were for non-residential buildings.

In other centers and corridors over the same period, 205 permits were issued for new construction. Of these, 94 permits were for detached or attached housing (such as townhomes) in centers.

Over the same time period of ten years ending in 2015, more than 5,200 housing units were permitted citywide (Table 2). (During most of these years, less than 100 residences were demolished in Spokane, with an average of about 60 per year over the last five years). In Downtown over the ten-year period, there were 55 dwelling units permitted, and 756 units in all other centers and corridors. About 3,000 units, or more than half of the total, were built farther than one-quarter mile from centers or corridors.

Preliminary Inventories of Vacant and Underdeveloped Land

Spokane County and its cities use a regionally adopted methodology to conduct a Land Quantity Analysis (“LQA,” City of Spokane, 2015b). The LQA selection method excludes City owned property and other property needed for a public purpose. Also, the LQA considers any property with an assessed improvement value of \$500 or less to be vacant. For the purposes of sampling for the infill development project, parcels of land with assessed improvement values of \$25,000 or less were considered “vacant or underdeveloped,” using 2016 Spokane County Assessor data, and land in industrial areas was excluded from the analysis.

The modified selection process resulted in a parcel set and maps (Maps 2 through 5) showing the selected sites simply as various “development opportunities.” A number of positive characteristics were also applied to the sites. Parcels in the selection were assigned a combined score based on whether any portion was within a specified distance of the following features, with one point awarded for each feature:

- City of Spokane Water Distribution— Sites at least partially within 350 feet of water lines
- City of Spokane Sanitary Sewer— Sites at least partially within 350 feet of sewer lines
- Centennial Trail – Sites at least partially within one-quarter mile of the Trail
- City of Spokane Existing Bikeway – Sites at least partially within one-quarter mile of an existing bikeway
- City of Spokane Planned Bikeway – Sites at least partially within one-quarter mile of a planned bikeway
- Spokane Transit Authority’s Planned High Performance Transit Network – Sites at least partially within one-quarter mile of the following proposed routes:
 - G1 – Monroe/Grand-29th-Regal
 - G2 – Central City Line
 - G3 – Sprague
 - R1 – Division
 - B1 – Cheney (only west of the Plaza was selected)
 - B2 – I-90 East (only east of the Plaza was selected)
- Sites at least partially within Centers and Corridors

Development Opportunities in Centers: Infill Sites

As stated above, centers fall into categories of different scales: from smaller neighborhood and district centers, to larger employment centers and the Downtown regional center.

The preliminary results of the trial development opportunities methodology, regarding present opportunities in centers and corridors, suggest that there are more than 220 acres of such vacant or undeveloped parcels within centers, about 60 acres of which is located Downtown with approximately 160 acres located in centers and corridors elsewhere in the city (Table 3).

The roughly 60 acres of identified vacant and underdeveloped properties located Downtown are contained on many separate parcels of various sizes. Six of these parcels are larger than 33,000 square feet, or approximately three quarters of an acre, offering relatively large-scale opportunities for multi-story new development. Ninety-three parcels are less than 5,000 square feet, offering smaller scale opportunities, and the remaining 192 parcels are between 5,000 and 33,000 square feet in size.

For the 160 acres located outside Downtown, within the city's other centers and corridors, there are 24 vacant and underdeveloped parcels, containing about 100 acres, that are each larger than 33,000 square feet. One hundred four parcels, encompassing roughly five acres, are smaller than 5,000 square feet, and 284 parcels, encompassing approximately 55 acres, are between 5,000 and 33,000 square feet.

Vacant and Underdeveloped Parcel Size Categories

The different size categories are important to inform what type of development can be expected to occur. Sites less than 5,000 square feet in size may be the right size for some types of development in centers, such as attached housing or a small commercial uses. Also, these sites may be aggregated with adjacent property to build something more substantial.

Sites larger than 5,000 square feet, however, are probably sufficiently large to build any form of development permitted in that particular location. The largest buildings built near Downtown Spokane in recent years have reached 4 to 6 stories and consisted of multi-family residential buildings, mixed-use buildings, and commercial buildings. One recent example built over the last year in the Hamilton Corridor is the Matilda Building, east of Gonzaga University. This mixed-use building was built on 1.8 acres, utilizing four-story concrete construction in a zone with an allowed height of 55 feet.

Limitations and Further Study

This information provides only a partial picture of development opportunities in centers and corridors. Further block-by-block analysis and field verification would be required to more accurately inventory the development opportunities. The Matilda Building site itself was not captured by the analysis because the value of previously existing improvements that were demolished during re-development caused assessed improvement value to exceed the \$25,000 selected threshold. It should be noted that there is a time lag between when changes are made to a given property, and when that change is reflected in the Assessor data. A different practice of comparing land value and assessed improvement value could potentially be applied to such larger sites to predict the presence of additional developable sites.

Another example of the method's limitations is evident on the enlarged view of the development opportunities map in the east portion of Downtown (Map 5), where many instances of additional infill space are shown adjacent to building footprints on partially developed property. In other areas of the city, large, partially developed parcels might also include areas for infill. These areas cannot be captured by the development opportunities method using assessed value of improvements alone because the portion of the parcel that has developed exceeds the \$25,000 threshold, regardless of the fact that a portion of the site is vacant and relatively unimproved. Conversely, many identified sites in centers and corridors may be unusable for development due to difficulties associated with the physical site, past uses, or other factors. Subarea planning in selected centers would provide more certain information.

Development Opportunities Outside and Around Centers

The mapping study described above also found additional vacant and underdeveloped land indicating potential infill growth near centers and corridors in Spokane and its adjacent joint planning areas¹ within the urban growth area. Maps 2 through 5 display the positive characteristics of these lands described above, including proximity to zoned centers and corridors, and to public transit. More than 390 acres of vacant and underdeveloped land comprised parcels that were outside but at least partially within one-quarter mile of both the edges of centers and corridors, and of transit routes.

Large recent construction projects in such areas near Downtown include the 940 North Ruby Apartments, built on a 0.8-acre site in 2015. These apartments are a residential building, six stories high (5-over-1 construction), with parking on the main floor, in a zone with an allowed height of 150 feet. Nearby, the 315 West Mission Apartments were built this year on 0.8 acres. They are of three-story wood construction, in a zone with an allowed height of 150 feet. In another area near Downtown, both the residential and commercial portions of Kendall Yards continue to develop with three-story commercial and mixed-use buildings and a variety of single-family, attached housing, and multi-family residential buildings, reaching as high as four stories.

Development Opportunities in Other Locations

More than 4,000 acres of additional vacant and underdeveloped land was found farther than one-quarter mile from the city's centers and corridors, both within the city and its adjacent joint planning areas within the urban growth area, using the 2016 assessed improvement value data. Of this land, about 25 percent is located on parcels that are at least partially within one-quarter mile of transit routes. Some of these sites will be infill opportunities, while others are "greenfield" sites, located in undeveloped areas.

Some additional land owned by agencies will become available for development by others over the planning horizon of the Comprehensive Plan. The City of Spokane is currently creating a disposition policy with the City Council for review of assets that would, potentially, result in some City-owned parcels becoming available for purchase. These parcels, of course, would be excluded from the analysis above because they are owned by the City and thus automatically excluded.

The project team reviewed housing density and parcel size in the Residential Single-family (RSF) zoning district. These maps (Maps 6 through 9) are provided for information. As described below, the Comprehensive Plan designates density depending on location, and for residential areas, often the Comprehensive Plan designates both maximum and minimum densities. The information may be useful for further inquiries into appropriate considerations for unique neighborhood context, while the challenge remains for much of the city and neighborhood subareas to achieve those designated densities for the efficient provision of services and infrastructure.

Process and Stakeholder Input

Steering Committee Members/Former Infill Housing Task Force Members

In early 2016, a subcommittee of four City Plan Commissioners met to discuss the project's process structure. In May, the subcommittee was expanded to include a designated project steering committee of 16 individuals, each representing professions or organizations that have interest in infill development. Two of

¹ Joint planning areas are defined in the Countywide Planning Policies as "areas designated as Urban Growth Areas assigned to a city or town for future urban development but located in the unincorporated county where a coordinated planning process between the cities, towns and the County will be conducted" (Spokane County, 2011, p. 47).

these committee members formerly served as infill housing task force members in 2011. As an essential component of the project, the committee comprised a core group of dedicated stakeholder representatives to facilitate the development of constructive recommendations.

Focus Groups

Six different focus groups, made up of a large number of stakeholder representatives, met with the steering committee members and Planning Services Department project staff in May and June 2016. These meetings enabled a series of focused discussion of issues that various functional groups of stakeholders have in common, though they may be distinct from other types of professionals or organizations. Attendance at each of the focus groups ranged between 15 and 24 stakeholders (not including project staff, steering committee members, and other interested members of the public), with interest areas focusing on finance and real estate; architecture and for-profit developers; non-profit developers; tiny housing; community organizations (including public agencies); and, neighborhood representatives. Four of the steering committee members attended all six focus group meetings.

Following the focus group meeting series, the steering committee participated in four workshops to develop preliminary recommendations. A number of recurring themes emerged at the focus group meetings and workshops. One of these themes was greater housing diversity, or the development of a variety of housing types, such as small single-family lots, attached housing (townhouses), clustering, manufactured housing, and “tiny” housing, for a mixture of family incomes and situations. The project participants identified the ability to separately own units in more locations in Spokane as a principal means of achieving more of these housing options.

Financial incentives and other partnerships, between the public and private sectors, and among agencies, was another theme. Participants supported continuing the City of Spokane’s existing target area incentive strategy as a means of encouraging infill. This strategy uses planning for revitalization and targeted areas in the city, such as Downtown, to support and enhance the development process in these areas.

The third major theme captured in the meetings was that of information brokering and public education. Participants identified a need for broader knowledge of where developable parcels are located, what resources are available to developers and the public, and how infill development can be successful and beneficial to the community.

Finally, a fourth major theme was neighborhood context. Each neighborhood values its individual character; impacts from higher intensity development may be perceived differently in different areas of the city. To improve infill development’s cohesion with neighborhood context, participants identified the use of more effective transition regulations and buffers, additional design standards, and enhanced communication between neighbors, developers, and the City to help improve design and maintain neighborhood character.

The steering committee’s recommendations were prepared based on the focus group meetings and workshops to assess the potential of new implementation measures using the goals and evaluation criteria described below. The recommendations suggest specific further actions based on the suggestions and major themes that the committee believes should be carried forward by the Plan Commission and staff. This report and recommendations provide these recommendations that include potential code amendments, education and promotion strategies, incentive programs, and areas for further study.

As prescribed in the Project Charter, recommendations from the infill development steering committee will be implemented under a separate process, with staff assignments, development timing, and Plan Commission workshop scheduling to be determined, based on further discussion about the scope of each recommendation.

Public Open House and Online Survey

An open house was held August 30, 2016, in Spokane City Hall. The steering committee presented 25 preliminary recommendations for public consideration and discussion. Project staff collected comments and conducted an online survey. The results of the open house and survey are attached in Appendix B, Public Participation.

Plan Commission and City Council

The Plan Commission and City Council will hold public workshops and hearings in September and October. These events will provide additional opportunities to receive and consider additional public comments.

Goals and Evaluation Criteria

Guidance from the Project Charter and Comprehensive Plan

City Planning Department staff, along with a subcommittee of the Plan Commission and others, met between January and April 2016 to discuss the mission and goals of the project.

The team's mission is to enable and promote quality infill development in a manner that meets adopted policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan and other defined criteria. This development should provide a desirable mixture of affordable housing options to people of all income levels (Comprehensive Plan Goals H1 and H2); preserve existing housing stock where appropriate (Policy H3); sustainably realize density objectives (Goal LU 3); be designed to maintain and encourage attractive neighborhood character (Policy DP 3.8); be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, adopted neighborhood plans and subarea plans; and be consistent with existing neighborhood character, and/or the neighborhood character envisioned in adopted neighborhood plans.

The goals of the project are to:

1. Communicate and review today's development standards and tools with descriptive graphics to illustrate implementation potential;
2. Develop recommendations to increase clarity and effectiveness of existing residential infill regulations;
3. Explore opportunities to better promote and encourage infill housing development in desired locations through potential changes in policies, code amendments, education and promotion strategies, and/or incentive programs;
4. Evaluate what, if any, further changes are needed to implement the City's Comprehensive Plan policies, and neighborhoods' visions as reflected in adopted neighborhood and subarea plans, for development of vacant or underdeveloped lots and parcels within an already built-up area; and
5. Establish a system to monitor trends in permit counts and valuation by area, and evaluate performance relative to the economy.

Finally, the project was organized according to four distinct phases to address its implementation. The first phase is to communicate and review today's standards. The second phase is gathering stakeholder input. Third, the project would identify citywide opportunities, and fourth, the project would identify geographic- or location-specific opportunities. Accordingly, the committee's recommendations are arranged according to these last two phases, citywide and location based, to acknowledge and assist this phasing.

Recommendation Impact/Feasibility Criteria

The project's purpose and desired communication outcomes from the public participation program (Appendix B) were used by groups within the committee in initial consideration during the workshops of the suggestions of the focus groups.

Impact is rated according to the following criteria:

- **How well does the recommendation address the infill project's purpose:**
 - Enable and promote quality development on vacant and underdeveloped lots and parcels in developed areas of the city and its urban growth area in a manner that:
 - Provides a desirable mixture of affordable housing options to people of all income levels, and sustainably realizes density objectives;
 - Is designed to maintain and encourage attractive neighborhood character;
 - Is consistent with the City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan, as well as adopted neighborhood plans and subarea plans; and,

- Is consistent with existing neighborhood character, and/or the neighborhood character envisioned in adopted neighborhood plans.
- **How well does the recommendation address one or more of the project’s communication objectives:**
 - Produce useful documents to describe today’s development standards and tools.
 - Increase public awareness of the infill tools and allowable development products.
 - Dialogue with stakeholders that results in productive recommendations to increase opportunities for development and new housing on vacant or underdeveloped sites in built-up areas.
 - Develop an easy-to-follow report and recommendations for future action based on the project’s findings.
 - Develop a plan for monitoring the effectiveness of infill development strategies developed through this process.

Feasibility is rated according to these following criteria:

- **How likely is the recommendation to be accomplished/implemented?**
 - Financial feasibility: Does the recommendation require new financial investment? Will it be possible to fund it? How?
 - Operational & legal feasibility: Is the recommendation legally and practically feasible?
 - Political feasibility: Are there political considerations that would prevent the recommendation from being viable? Is it sustainable in the event of a major leadership change?
 - Social feasibility: Would the recommendation be supported by the public?
 - Community partners: Are there community partners who are willing/able to collaborate?

City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan Policy

The City’s Comprehensive Plan contains a land use plan map and policies to guide the City’s activities in programming improvements, conducting business to form partnerships, and regulating development. A collection of relevant policies was prepared to assist in responding to the comments received in the focus group meetings. A portion of that list appears below. The full text of the City of Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan may be found online:

static.spokanecity.org/documents/business/resources/mostrequested/comp-plan-2015-full.pdf

The following five goals and their supporting and related policies are particularly relevant to the infill development project. These goals were used in guiding the discussions in the focus group meetings and work materials:

H 1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Goal: Provide sufficient housing for the current and future population that is appropriate, safe, and affordable for all income levels.

Related Policies:

- H 1.16 Partnerships to Increase Housing Opportunities - *Create partnerships with public and private lending institutions to find solutions that increase opportunities and reduce financial barriers for builders and consumers of affordable lower-income housing.*

H 2 HOUSING CHOICE AND DIVERSITY

Goal: Increase the number of housing alternatives within all areas of the city to help meet the changing needs and preferences of a diverse population.

Related Policies:

- H 2.3 Accessory Dwelling Units - *Allow one accessory dwelling unit as an ancillary use to single family owner-occupied homes in all designated residential areas as an affordable housing option.*
- H 2.7 Taxes and Tax Structure - *Support state consideration of property tax reform measures that provide increased local options that contribute to housing choice and diversity.*

H 3 HOUSING QUALITY

Goal: Improve the overall quality of the City of Spokane's housing.

Related Policies:

- H 3.2 Property Responsibility and Maintenance - *Assist in and promote improved and increased public and private property maintenance and property responsibility throughout the city.*
- H 3.3 Housing Preservation - *Encourage preservation of viable housing.*

DP 3 FUNCTION AND APPEARANCE

Goal: Use design to improve how development relates to and functions within its surrounding environment.

Related Policies:

- DP 1.4 New Development in Established Neighborhoods - *Ensure that new development is of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.*
- DP 2.2 Zoning and Design Standards - *Utilize zoning and design standards that have flexibility and incentives to ensure that development is compatible with surrounding land uses.*
- DP 3.1 Parking Facilities Design - *Make aesthetic and functional improvements to commercial areas in order to improve their image, appeal, and sales potential.*
- DP 3.8 Infill Development - *Ensure that infill construction and area redevelopment are done in a manner that reinforces the established neighborhood character and is architecturally compatible with the surrounding existing commercial and residential areas.*

LU 3 EFFICIENT LAND USE

Goal: Promote the efficient use of land by the use of incentives, density and mixed-use development in proximity to retail businesses, public services, places of work, and transportation systems.

Related Policies:

- LU 1.3 Single-Family Residential Areas - *Protect the character of single-family residential neighborhoods by focusing higher intensity land uses in designated centers and corridors.*
- LU 1.4 Higher Density Residential Uses - *Direct new higher density residential uses to centers and corridors designated on the land use plan map.*
- LU 3.1 Coordinated and Efficient Land Use - *Encourage coordinated and efficient growth and development through infrastructure financing and construction programs, tax and regulatory incentives, and focused growth in areas where adequate services and facilities exist or can be economically extended.*
- LU 3.2 Centers and Corridors - *Designate centers and corridors (neighborhood scale, community or district scale, and regional scale) on the land use plan map that encourage a mix of uses and activities around which growth is focused.*
- LU 3.11 Compact Residential Patterns - *Allow more compact and affordable housing in all neighborhoods, in accordance with neighborhood based design guidelines.*
- LU 3.12 Maximum and Minimum Lot Sizes - *Prescribe maximum, as well as minimum, lot size standards to achieve the desired residential density for all areas of the city.*
- LU 4.1 Land Use and Transportation - *Coordinate land use and transportation planning to result in an efficient pattern of development that supports alternative transportation modes consistent with the*

transportation chapter and makes significant progress toward reducing sprawl, traffic congestion, and air pollution.

- TR 2.4 Parking Requirements - *Develop and maintain parking requirements for vehicles that adequately meet the demand for parking yet discourages dependence on driving.*
- TR 2.6 Viable Walking Alternative - *Promote and provide for walking as a viable alternative to driving.*
- TR 3.1 Transportation and Development Patterns - *Use the city's transportation system and infrastructure to support desired land uses and development patterns, especially to reduce sprawl and encourage development in urban areas.*

In addition to the policy text, the Land Use Plan Map of the Comprehensive Plan guides the location of development. This is important to what housing types are generally appropriate for development based on the location. For example, the highest densities possible with attached houses, according to The Housing Partnership (2003, p. 2) are about 22 units per acre. Center and Corridor designations in the Comprehensive Plan provide for mixed-use development and high-density housing, with units per acre constrained only by building height and floor area ratio, which varies according to the type of center (Spokane Municipal Code [17C.122.080](#)). The Comprehensive Plan targets 32 units per acre for housing in the core of neighborhood centers, such as the one at South Perry Street and 9th Avenue, and up to 22 units per acre at the perimeter (Policy LU 3.2). For employment centers such as the nearby center along Sprague Avenue, the Comprehensive Plan designates a core of 44 units per acre transitioning again to 22 units per acre at the perimeter.

Other Adopted Policy

Subarea plans adopted as elements of the Comprehensive Plan by the City Council include the Fast Forward Spokane: Downtown Plan Update (2008). This subarea plan identifies several opportunity sites, interrelated strategies for different districts, and an overall complete streets model for implementation of a multi-modal transportation system Downtown.

Recommendation Priorities and Evaluation

The steering committee developed the following three groups of recommendation related to next-level planning efforts around infill development. The committee presents these for future research and planning efforts that will require further inquiry into the implementation methods, and identification of time and resources needed.

Each regulatory change proposed would require a separate, future public involvement process in addition to this recommendation by the subcommittee and acceptance by the Plan Commission and City Council.

The committee’s individual recommendations are evaluated below. Recommendations were considered a higher priority if they help implement more of the relevant goals and if they score high on the impact-feasibility matrix. Higher priorities were identified by groups within the committee using a set of criteria to that achieve both high impact and feasibility, as described at right. As a next step, further discussion is required to analyze the feasibility of each item evaluated here, as the Plan Commission, City Council, and identified agencies consider how or whether to implement these recommendations.

The evaluation matrices below are the committee’s recommendations arranged in three groups. The first group is assigned to those items for new processes ranked high-impact and high-feasibility. A second group of priority recommendations does not have both high impact and high feasibility. Finally, the third group regards adjustments or commitments to existing processes.

HIGH
FEASIBILITY
LOW

Quick wins: “Low Hanging Fruit” with relatively small demands that may be worth pursuing	No Brainer – biggest bang for your buck
To be avoided: Difficult to implement with little impact, rarely worth pursuing.	Tough, but worthwhile

LOW IMPACT HIGH

Evaluation of impact and feasibility made use of the matrix above and the criteria described under the Goals and Evaluation Criteria section, above.

High Impact | High Feasibility Recommendations

New processes ranked high-impact and high-feasibility.

Recommendation	Lead Dept. or Agency, if Implemented	Location	Notes	Initial Steering Committee Evaluation		
				Goals Implemented	Impact • Addresses project purpose/objective	Feasibility • Likely to be accomplished
<p>Equal Ownership Opportunities C-7 Development regulations should provide equal opportunities for fee-simple divisions, owner and rental occupancy of individual higher-density housing units, such as attached housing and cottage housing, and accessory dwelling units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit Lot Subdivision for New Development C-3 Amend unit lot subdivision policy to allow new development for separately owned units that do not directly front on a public street and that addresses lot coverage, more permissive setbacks, and allows alley-only, private driveway, or alternative access (like cluster developments) for project sites with frontage on a street. Dimensional Standards C-8 Review and update dimensional and other standards such as smaller lot sizes to support attached housing and more efficient use of land, provided the overall maximum density of the development does not exceed its designated density. 	City of Spokane – Planning; City Council	Citywide	<p>Dimensional standards should be made the same for fee-simple attached housing as for multi-family structures. Examples include allowing attached housing on the same lot width as multi-family housing in the Residential High-Density (RHD) zoning district. See SMC Table 17C.110-3</p> <p>There is moderate feasibility for the dimensional standards aspect of this recommendation.</p>	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice DP 3 Function LU 3 Efficient	High	High

Definitions: **Code Recommendations (“C”)** are those that suggest changes to existing sections of Spokane Municipal Code.
Programmatic Recommendations (“P”) are those that involve changes to existing or new programs, and may initiate new sections of Spokane Municipal Code.
Improvement Recommendations (“I”) are identified improvements to include as projects in an appropriate Capital Improvement Program or Local Improvement District.

High Impact | High Feasibility Recommendations

New processes ranked high-impact and high-feasibility.

Recommendation	Lead Dept. or Agency, if Implemented	Location	Notes	Initial Steering Committee Evaluation		
				Goals Implemented	Impact • Addresses project purpose/objective	Feasibility • Likely to be accomplished
<p>Utility Rates and Connection Fees P-11 Restructure utility rates and/or connection fees for multifamily development so that they do not favor single-family development over multi-family.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning/Utilities; City Council	Citywide		H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Infill Development Education Campaign P-3 Prioritize the development and implementation of a robust Infill Development Education Campaign and Communication Plan that will increase awareness and understanding of the benefits of infill housing through consistent and ongoing communication with developers, property owners, and neighbors.</p> <p>Include additional marketing tools to promote infill development and dispel myths regarding infill housing; and, develop presentation and education materials regarding infill housing and its role as a tool to development quality, attractive housing for all income levels.</p>	City of Spokane Office of Neighborhood Services; Community, Housing and Human Services (“CHHS”) Affordable Housing Committee Planning re: Code amendments and Affordable housing	Citywide	A key component of the Education Campaign will be citizen involvement in the education process, and not only education by agency employees.	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality DP 3 Function LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Land Aggregation Entity P-7 Explore options to aggregate, hold, reuse, and/or resell existing and newly foreclosed, abandoned, and nuisance properties for better community use/benefit (e.g., a land bank).</p>	City of Spokane – Office of Neighborhood Service/Asset Management; City Council Planning re: Code Change Private Organization	Citywide or Location-Specific	A new or existing nonprofit organization or agency might assume the role of a land bank or similar entity. A different, regulatory tool to encourage assembly of land large enough to redevelop is graduated density zoning.	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Cottage Housing C-10 Cottage housing should allow for a portion of units with a higher maximum size and the ability to attach units and mix housing types.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning; City Council	Residential Single Family (RSF) and Residential Agricultural (RA) Zones Citywide	Minimum unit size is set by the International Building Code. SMC 17C.110.350 currently limits all cottage units to a maximum of 1,000 square feet, including any attached garage, and units must be single, detached residences. Link to zoning map	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice LU 3 Efficient	High	High

Other Recommendations for New Processes

These items would not have both a high impact and high feasibility. These items are ranked starting with highest feasibility to identify the ‘low-hanging fruit’ actions that might be readily integrated into a work program.

Recommendation	Lead Dept. or Agency, if Implemented	Location	Notes	Initial Steering Committee Evaluation		
				Goals Implemented	Impact • Addresses project purpose/objective	Feasibility • Likely to be accomplished
<p>Housing Choices Gap Analysis P-4 Coordinate an analysis of gaps in housing choice with the intent of identifying tools, incentives, and code amendments necessary to encourage the development of housing forms that would reduce gaps in housing choice.</p>	City of Spokane Planning	Citywide		H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	Moderate	High
<p>Land Management P-7d Improve management of existing and newly foreclosed, abandoned, and nuisance properties through code enforcement and other measures.</p>	City of Spokane – Office of Neighborhood Service/Asset Management; City Council Planning re: Code Change	Citywide	<p>This recommendation has a strong link to Land Aggregation Entity (P-7), which could offer more resources for cleanup of foreclosed properties. The City of Spokane (2016) Civil Enforcement Unit identified several measures to improve property management. Link to white paper. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with lenders/owners to clear title on properties • Pursuing nuisance abatement 	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality	Low	High
<p>Pocket Residential Development C-11 Pocket Residential Tool should be allowed outright in Residential Single-family (RSF) or with a conditional use permit rather than through a zoning change to Residential Single-family Compact (RSF-C).</p>	City of Spokane – Planning; City Council	Residential Single-family (RSF) Zone Citywide	Link to zoning map	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice LU 3 Efficient	Moderate	High
<p>Transit-Oriented Parking Reductions C-5 Study reducing parking requirements for transit-oriented uses near bus routes with 15-minute weekday service.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning	Near 15-Minute Weekday Transit Routes - Citywide	Currently, SMC 17C.230.130 provides that the planning director may approve reducing the minimum spaces required, considering proximity to transit. Such approvals are conditioned upon the project contributing toward a pedestrian and transit supportive environment next to the site and in the surrounding area. Parking reductions related to proximity to this type of transit should be made standard, rather than at the director’s discretion.	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice DP 3 Function LU 3 Efficient	Moderate	High
<p>Manufactured Homes C-15 Review and update the manufactured home age and minimum size standards on lots outside of a manufactured home park; and, explore modifications to local mobile home park size and ownership models.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning; City Council	Citywide	Current manufactured home regulations require that only new manufactured home units are allowed outside manufactured home parks. Only a unit comprised of two or more fully enclosed parallel sections each of not less than 12 feet wide by 36 feet long (864 SF). Roofing and siding material and roof pitch are regulated, with requirements to be set upon a permanent foundation and meet State energy code. Additional residential design standards may be warranted, but would be required to apply to all homes by State law. New manufactured home parks must be at least ten acres in size. SMC 17C.345 . This recommendation should be closely linked to Design Standards C-2.	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice	Moderate	Low/Moderate
<p>Defer Development Fees C-6 Explore paying development fees (all development fees – permits, connection, GFCs, etc.) at the end of the project instead of the beginning to assist by reducing the carrying cost (Note: define “end of project” and explore the timing for payment of fees).</p>	City of Spokane – planning/Utilities/ City Legal; City Council	Citywide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation impact fees currently can be deferred. This process should be looked at as an example to enacting this recommendation. • Section 17D.075.040 C Assessment of Impact Fees 	H 1 Affordable	High	Low

Other Recommendations for New Processes

These items would not have both a high impact and high feasibility. These items are ranked starting with highest feasibility to identify the ‘low-hanging fruit’ actions that might be readily integrated into a work program.

Recommendation	Lead Dept. or Agency, if Implemented	Location	Notes	Initial Steering Committee Evaluation		
				Goals Implemented	Impact • Addresses project purpose/objective	Feasibility • Likely to be accomplished
<p>Design Standards C-2 Create a committee of knowledgeable stakeholders who would facilitate the exploration of form-based, point-based or other system of menu options that extends design standards to all residential development types (including residential structures for which the predominant use/feature is a garage/shop). The development must comply with subarea plans and city design standards (Note: Encourage a committee of developers, designers and neighbors to facilitate the creation of a form-based, point-based or menu of options system).</p>	City of Spokane – planning; City Council	Citywide	<p>The committee is divided on this recommendation, with some committee members believing that further study and analysis is needed on the underlined text and applicability to all residential development types.</p> <p>The City/council should set aside funds to hire a consultant to work holistically on a set of design standards for all residential units, from single family to multi-family, and centers and corridors design standards.</p> <p>This recommendation should be closely linked to Manufactured Homes C-15.</p>	H 3 Quality DP 3 Function	Moderate	Moderate
<p>Foreclosure Properties P-7b Find tools to make upside-down/foreclosure (zombie) properties available for re-use or redevelopment.</p>	City of Spokane – Office of Neighborhood Services (“ONS”); CHHS; City Council SNAP (Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners)	Citywide	<p>This recommendation has a strong link to Land Aggregation Entity (P-7), which could offer more resources for re-use or development of foreclosed properties. The City of Spokane (2016) Civil Enforcement Unit identified several measures to redevelop foreclosure and bank real estate owned properties. Link to white paper. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GRIPS – a geographical real property information system to see scope and investment opportunities Streamlining or expediting foreclosures Public entity could acquire properties, give priority sales to neighbors, and credit documented landscaping and maintenance through partial lien forgiveness 	H 1 Affordable H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	High	Low
<p>Form Based Standards C-9 Enact a form-based strategy in appropriate locations, rather than standards for specific housing types.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning; City Council	Likely Residential Areas near Downtown and Areas Near Centers - Citywide	<p>Form-based standards for established neighborhoods are usually prescriptive to the desired form of construction. This strategy could be implemented through subarea planning in residential neighborhoods to allow additional housing types, such as attached, duplex, triplex, etc., as well as small retail uses, as appropriate, that respond to the neighborhood context because their form or appearance is similar.</p> <p>Form based strategies could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing owner-occupancy requirement for accessory dwelling units Creating a 4-12 Unit Building Multi-Family Zone in Transition Areas <p>This recommendation is less about use and more about form.</p>	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality DP 3 Function LU 3 Efficient	High	Low - Moderate

Other Recommendations for New Processes

These items would not have both a high impact and high feasibility. These items are ranked starting with highest feasibility to identify the ‘low-hanging fruit’ actions that might be readily integrated into a work program.

Recommendation	Lead Dept. or Agency, if Implemented	Location	Notes	Initial Steering Committee Evaluation		
				Goals Implemented	Impact • Addresses project purpose/objective	Feasibility • Likely to be accomplished
<p>Financing Solutions P-10 To reduce barriers and encourage infill development, pursue strategies that mitigate the impact of low-value market areas on new development. Areas with large numbers of deteriorating houses can impact property appraisal of more well-kept homes and create barriers to new development.</p>	<p>City of Spokane – CHHS/Planning/Code Enforcement; City Council</p> <p>Neighborhood stakeholders</p>	<p>Likely Residential and/or Commercial Areas in Neighborhoods with Unusually Low Property Values</p>	<p>There are many potential tools available to combat the impact of low-value market areas, including, but not limited to, local target areas. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) may be a general funding source for many potential programs.</p> <p>Code enforcement can impact appraisals as well – this needs to be connected/linked to any new programs impacting appraisals.</p>	<p>H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>
<p>Integrated Parking Strategy P-1 Develop an Integrated Parking Strategy for Downtown Spokane. This could include expanding City Parking Services role in parking, the development of publicly owned parking structures, offering incentives for the development of structured parking or integrated structured parking, and/or developing a coalition of interested parties.</p>	<p>Downtown Spokane Partnership (“DSP”); City of Spokane</p>	<p>Downtown</p>	<p>Investigate potential to link to the Multiple Family Tax Exemption (C-14) recommendation and other strategies. An integrated parking strategy is currently being pursued in the University District.</p>	<p>H 1 Affordable DP 3 Function LU 3 Efficient</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>
<p>Incentivizing Redevelopment of Existing Surface Parking and Underdeveloped Land P-2 Study the feasibility of creating a non-residential highest and best use taxation, or alternative use category other than undeveloped land, to address vacant lots, underdeveloped land, and surface parking lots Downtown.</p>	<p>City of Spokane –City Council/Admin</p> <p>Greater Spokane Incorporated; DSP</p>	<p>Downtown</p>	<p>Types of parking taxes include commercial parking taxes, which apply to priced parking, and non-residential parking taxes, which apply to both priced and unpriced parking.</p> <p>House bill HB2186 proposes to enable a non-residential parking tax statewide. Link to House Bill</p>	<p>H 1 Affordable DP 3 Function LU 3 Efficient</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Moderate</p>
<p>Pave Unpaved Streets & Alleys near Centers I-1 Unpaved streets and alleys, specifically alleys near Centers and Corridors and the Targeted Incentive Areas, should be paved to encourage infill development. Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) are a revenue source for paving streets and alleys in any location – reconsider recent changes to the LID ordinance that set a higher threshold for approval of LIDs.</p>	<p>City of Spokane – Planning/Integrated Capital management; City Council</p>	<p>Areas around Centers, Corridors, and the Targeted Incentive Areas</p>	<p>Link to zoning map; link to interactive Target Area Incentives map</p> <p>LID may be the only reliable source of revenue for unpaved streets and alleys. In order to impact targeted areas, consider a wholesale re-evaluation of LID program, including resetting locally adopted requirements to State levels.</p>	<p>H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>
<p>Increased Code Enforcement Activities P-12 Increase the ability of code enforcement to respond to complaints and develop other possible solutions for code violations, degrading properties and unmaintained vacant land. Explore establishing proactive code enforcement and / or revising substandard building code as possible options with ONS working with the Community Assembly as a partner.</p>	<p>City of Spokane – ONS / Community Assembly</p>	<p>Citywide</p>		<p>H 3 Quality</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Moderate</p>

Recommendations to Ongoing Processes

These recommendations relate to adjustment to or continuation of an existing City of Spokane program or Spokane County process. The items may be monitored for effectiveness in enabling infill development.

Recommendation	Lead Dept. or Agency, if Implemented	Location	Notes	Initial Steering Committee Evaluation		
				Goals Implemented	Impact • Addresses project purpose/objective	Feasibility • Likely to be accomplished
<p>Developable Lands P-6 Produce and promote a developable lands inventory and map to assist developers in identifying sites with infill development potential and explore methodologies to capture data on availability of developable lands.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning/Info. Technology; Spokane County, cities	Citywide	Available lands inventory is in process with Assoc. of Realtors and Spokane County. City of Spokane Planning Department is studying how to make existing data accessible to the public in 2016 via online mapping.	H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Targeting Infill Incentives C-1 Incentivize infill within and in close proximity (quarter-mile) of historically urban and urban core centers and corridors with current and new incentives. Continue to confine some incentives to or increase incentives in these areas and support the next phase of economic development and incentive work underway at the City.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning (Economic Development Team); City Leadership/Council	Target Areas within and near Urban and Urban Core Centers and Corridors	<p>This recommendation should be strongly tied to both the Multiple-Family Tax Exemption C-14 and Targeted Investment Strategy P-5 recommendations. Link to interactive Target Area Incentives map</p> <p>The committee would recommend reductions to or elimination of transportation impact fees in targeted areas.</p>	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Multiple-Family Tax Exemption C-14 Maintain and expand the Multiple-Family Tax Exemption to targeted qualifying sites. Expand the program through education. Explore extension of 12-year program to apply to workforce housing (i.e., household incomes above low-income) and consider using the City’s authority under MFTE to increase opportunities for mixed-income development based on area context.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning; City Council	Target Areas to Be Determined	<p>Link to the map of the Multiple Family Tax Exemption Area - SMC 08.15.030(E)</p> <p>Mayor’s Housing Quality Task Force discussed a recommendation that is opposite/more difficult.</p> <p>This recommendation should be strongly linked to both the Targeting Infill Incentives C-1 and Targeted Investment Strategy P-5 recommendations.</p>	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Targeted Investment Strategy P-5 Continue to identify additional potential areas for development and incentivize development in those areas, such as the targeted investment areas.</p>	City of Spokane – Planning (Economic Development Team); City Council	Target Areas to Be Determined	The targeted investment strategy should be strongly tied to both the Targeting Infill Incentives and Multiple Family Tax Exemption recommendations.	H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	High	High
<p>Pedestrian Infrastructure I-2 Increase and prioritize, when possible, public investments in streets to create walkable, safe public right-of-ways that conform to City standards and facilitate infrastructure in accordance with the City of Spokane’s (2015c) Pedestrian Master Plan “Pedestrian Priority Zones” and target areas (bike/pedestrian-related infrastructure).</p>	City of Spokane – Integrated Capital Mngmnt, Engineering and Streets/ Interdepartment (LINK)	Pedestrian Priority Zones and Target Areas	This recommendation should be coordinated with work by the Plan Commission transportation subcommittee to review of Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4, Transportation. This work should also be coordinated with the projects funded by the vehicle tab fees and selected by the Citizen’s Transportation Advisory Board.	H 1 Affordable H 2 Choice H 3 Quality LU 3 Efficient	Moderate	High

Note: The committee recognized the need for the School District to identify and implement more efficient patterns of development and land use. However, it was agreed that such recommendation to the school district was outside of the purview of this sub committee’s role.

References

- Housing Partnership, The. (2003). *Filling in the spaces: Ten essentials for successful urban housing*. Retrieved September 7, 2016, from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/projects/infillhousing/filling-in-the-spaces.pdf>
- Spokane, City of. (2016). *Abandoned opportunity: White paper*. Retrieved September 15, 2016, from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/projects/mayors-housing-quality-task-force/additional-materials/abandoned-opportunity-white-paper.pdf>
- _____. (2015a). *City of Spokane's comprehensive plan*. Retrieved September 2, 2016 from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/business/resources/mostrequested/comp-plan-2015-full.pdf>
- _____. (2015b). *Draft land quantity analysis result and methodology*. Retrieved September 7, 2016, from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/business/resources/studies/other/city-spokane-2015-land-quantity-analysis-report.pdf>
- _____. (2008). *Fast forward Spokane: Downtown plan update*. Retrieved September 9, 2016, from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/business/resources/compplan/subarea/fast-forward-downtown-plan-update.pdf>
- _____. (2015c). *Pedestrian master plan*. Retrieved October 4, 2016, from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/projects/pedestrianplan/spokane-pedestrian-plan-adopted-2015-11-02.pdf>
- Spokane County. (2011). Countywide planning policies for Spokane County. Retrieved October 4, 2016, from <https://www.spokanecounty.org/DocumentCenter/View/1209>
- Spokane County Planning Technical Advisory Committee. (2015). *Population forecast and allocation: Periodic update under the Growth Management Act 2017 to 2037*. Retrieved September 8, 2016, from <https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/projects/shapingspokane/population-forecast-and-allocation.pdf>