City of Spokane



Variance

Application

Planning Services Department

1. Fill out the following information for the variance being requested:

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Front yard setback	15'	0'
Rear yard setback	=	-
Side yard setback	-	
Lot coverage percentage	-	
Lot size	-	-
Lot width	-	-
Height		ν,=
Other (specify):	3 5	æ

2. What physical characteristics of the property interfere with your ability to meet the required standards?

Setbacks

The water dept. owned property at 5903 N. Normandie St. (cross street is Central Ave.) is the site of two existing wells, each located approx. 18' from the property line (one from Normandie St., the other from Central Ave.). Each well is approx. 250' deep and cannot be moved. The proposed building must sit atop the wells and, due to required piping, must be offset such that more than half the building is on the street side of the well thereby pushing the building into the required setback area. See attached sketch.

Heiaht

The building height is determined by the height of the pump/motor. The current motor is submersible. This type of motor is no longer used by the city since it is difficult/expensive/time consuming to maintain. That is, because the motor is under water at the bottom of the 250' well, the entire 250' length of large diameter piping down the well has to be removed to access the motor which is the most likely part of the system to fail.

Current practice at all City wells is for all motors to be above ground. This pump will produce approximately 8,000 gallons per minute which requires both large diameter piping and a 1000 horsepower motor. This results in a motor height approx. 15' above the ground.

3. 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?

The property itself does not differ from similarly zoned properties in the area but rather the location of the existing wells on the property and the fact that the new building must sit atop the existing well is what results in the infeasibility of meeting the setback requirement. Regarding height limitations, it is the use of the subject property (a city drinking water well) and its associated equipment requirements as described above that differentiate it from similarly zoned properties in the area.

4. What hardship will result if the requested variance is not granted?

The City will have to drill new wells at a new location at a cost well in excess of one million dollars each (there are two). That \$1M cost estimate would include the well itself plus property acquisition plus extending the transmission main piping to the new well site.

5. Is the hardship merely economic or self-created? Please explain.

Please refer to the responses for questions #2 - #4.

6. Does compliance with the requirement eliminate or substantially impair a natural, historic, or cultural feature of area-wide significance? If yes, please explain.

No

7. Will surrounding properties suffer significant adverse effects if this variance is granted? Please explain.

While not meeting setback/height requirements will not result in significant adverse effects, there is no doubt that not meeting setback/height requirements is not ideal since most area properties are meeting setback/height requirements. Appropriate architectural design and landscaping can somewhat mitigate these adverse effects.

8. Will the appearance of the property be inconsistent with the development patterns of the surrounding property? Please explain.

The proposed pump stations will be architecturally designed to fit in with the character of nearby residences to the maximum extent possible given the size requirements of the proposed pump station buildings as described above.