Agenda Sheet for City Council Meeting of: 09/16/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitting Dept</th>
<th>PLANNING &amp; DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name/Phone</td>
<td>KEN PELTON 625-6063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact E-Mail</td>
<td>KPELTON@SPOKANE CITY.ORG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item Type</td>
<td>First Reading Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item Name</td>
<td>0650 - ORDINANCE Z1200046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Wording**

An Ordinance relating to Application #Z1200046COMP and amending the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan from "Office" and "Residential 4-10" to "CC-Core" for 9.8 acres located at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast.

**Summary (Background)**

This Application for Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendment is being considered concurrently through the annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle as required by the Growth Management Act. The application has fulfilled public participation and notification requirements. The Plan Commission held a Public Hearing on August 14, 2013 to consider this amendment and has recommended approval of the amendment. Plan Commission Findings & Conclusions are attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Budget Account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals</th>
<th>Council Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept Head</td>
<td>CHESNEY, SCOTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Director</td>
<td>QUNTRALL, JAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>LESESNE, MICHELE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>BURNS, BARBARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the Mayor</td>
<td>SANDERS, THERESA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Approvals</th>
<th>Purchasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Impact**

- Neutral: $
- Select: $
- Select: $
- Select: $

**Budget Account**

- #
- #
- # BudgetAccount3
- #

**Approvals**

- Dept Head: CHESNEY, SCOTT
- Division Director: QUNTRALL, JAN
- Finance: LESESNE, MICHELE
- Legal: BURNS, BARBARA
- For the Mayor: SANDERS, THERESA

**Council Notifications**

- Study Session
- Other: PC 8/14/13 - PCED

**Distribution List**

- lhattenburg@spokanecity.org
- jrichman@spokanecity.org
- schesney@spokanecity.org
- kpelton@spokanecity.org
- sbjordahl@pblaw.biz

---

First Reading of the above ordinance was held on 9/16/2013 and further action was deferred.


ORD C35029
Continuation of Wording, Summary, Budget, and Distribution

**Agenda Wording**

Boulevard; and amending the zoning map from "Office (O-35)", "Office Retail (OR-35)" and "Residential Single Family (RSF)" to "Centers & Corridors Type 2, District Center" (CC-2, DC).

**Summary (Background)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Budget Account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select $</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select $</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmtType7 $</td>
<td>Amount7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmtType8 $</td>
<td>Amount8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution List**

- Email16
- Email17
- Email18
- Email19
- Email20
- Email21
- Email22
- Email23
ORDINANCE NO. C35029

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO APPLICATION #Z1200046COMP AND AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP OF THE CITY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FROM “OFFICE” AND “RESIDENTIAL 4-10” TO “CC-CORE” FOR 9.8 ACRES LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF 29TH AVENUE AND SOUTHEAST BOULEVARD; AND AMENDING THE ZONING MAP FROM “OFFICE (O-35), “OFFICE RETAIL (OR-35)” AND “RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY (RSF)” TO “CENTERS & CORRIDORS TYPE 1, DISTRICT CENTER” (CC-1, DC)."

WHEREAS, the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1990, requiring among other things, the development of a Comprehensive Plan (RCW 36.70A); and

WHEREAS, the City of Spokane adopted a Comprehensive Plan in May of 2001 that complies with the requirements of the Growth Management Act; and

WHEREAS, the Growth Management Act requires continuing review and evaluation of the Comprehensive Plan and contemplates an annual amendment process for incorporating necessary and appropriate revisions to the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, land use amendment application Z1200046COMP was timely submitted to the City for consideration during the City’s 2013 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle; and

WHEREAS, Application Z1200045COMP seeks to amend the Land Use Plan Map of the City’s Comprehensive Plan for a change from “Office” and “Residential 4-10” to “CC-Core” for 9.8 acres located at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast Boulevard; and amending the zoning map from “Office (O-35), “Office Retail (OR-35)” and “Residential Single Family (RSF)” to “Centers & Corridors Type 1, District Center (CC-1, DC); and

WHEREAS, staff requested comments from agencies and departments on December 12, 2012, and a public comment period ran from April 22, 2013 to June 22, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Department of Commerce and appropriate state agencies were given the required 60-day notice before adoption of proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan on August 1, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane City Plan Commission held workshops regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments on May 8, 2013, May 22, 2013 and June 12, 2013; and

WHEREAS, a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance were released on July 29, 2013 for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning Map changes (“DNS”). The public comment period for the SEPA determination ended on August 13, 2013; and

WHEREAS, notice of the SEPA Checklist and Determination, the Land Use Plan Map changes, and the Zoning Map changes, and announcement of the August 14, 2013 Plan Commission Public Hearing were published in the Spokesman-Review on Wednesday, July 31 and Wednesday, August 7, 2013; and

WHEREAS, notice was posted on the property and mailed to all property owners and taxpayers of record, as shown by the most recent Spokane County Assessor’s record, and

As Amended - September 23, 2013
occupants of addresses of property located within a four hundred foot radius of any portion of the boundary of the subject property on July 30, 2013; and

WHEREAS, staff report found that Application Z1200046COMP met all the criteria and recommended approval of the application; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane Plan Commission conducted a public hearing and deliberated on August 14, 2013 for the Application Z1200046COMP and other proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane Plan Commission found that Application Z1200046COMP is consistent with and implements the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of Application Z1200046COMP; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopts the recitals set forth herein as its findings and conclusions in support of its adoption of this ordinance and further adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the Planning Services Staff Report and the City of Spokane Plan Commission for the same purposes; --

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SPOKANE DOES ORDAIN:

1. Approval of Application. Application Z1200046COMP is approved.

2. Amendment of Land Use Map. The Spokane Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map is amended from “Office” and “Residential 4-10” to “CC-Core” for 8.9 acres located at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast Boulevard as shown in Exhibit A.

3. Amendment of Zoning Map. The City of Spokane Zoning Map is amended from “O-35”, “OR-35” and “RSF” to “CC1-DC” for this same area as shown in Exhibit B.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON ________________________ September 23, 2013.

Ben Stuckart, Council President

Attest:

City Clerk

Dated: 10-04-13

David A. Condon, Mayor

Approved as to form:

Assistant City Attorney

As Amended - September 23, 2013
I. SUMMARY OF REQUEST AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This is an application by 29th Street Investments, LLC; Sonnelland Commercial Properties, LLC; and Banner Bank for an amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's comprehensive plan requesting a change from "Office" and "Residential 4-10" to "Center and Corridor Core". The parcels are approximately 9.8 acres in size. The site is located at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast Boulevard. The proposed implementing zoning designation is Centers & Corridors, Type 2 – District Center (CC2-DC).

Note: Site Maps and department and agency comments are attached to this report.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent:</th>
<th>Stacy Bjordahl, 9101 N. Mt. View Lane, Spokane, WA 99218 Phone: (509) 435-3108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Property Owner(s):</td>
<td>29th Street Investments, LLC; Sonnelland Commercial Properties, LLC; and Banner Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Proposal:</td>
<td>The proposal is located at the south of 29th Avenue, west of Southeast Boulevard, east of Martin Street and north of the E. 30th Avenue undeveloped street right-of-way. Already developed properties located in the northwest and southeast corners of this area are not a part of the application and will remain in an Office land use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. FINDINGS OF FACT:

A. Site Description: The site is currently partially developed with office uses and three single family houses. On the east side of the site, at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast Blvd., there is an existing medical office. To the south of this office building there is a Banner Bank branch with drive-thru service to the rear of the building. The middle area of the site, extending in a southwest direction from the frontage on 29th Avenue to the frontage on the unimproved 30th Avenue right-of-way, is undeveloped. The northwest portion of the site, which was approved as a part of the Quail Run Office Park binding site plan, is developed with two office buildings, one is adjacent to 29th Avenue, the other is adjacent to Martin Street. A surface parking lot serving these office uses is also located in this area. The Numerica Credit Union building site, which is not part of this application, is located at the southeast corner of 29th Avenue and Martin Street.

The site slopes slightly from 29th Avenue toward the south. The 29th Avenue and Martin Street frontages have significant tree coverage. The parking lot is well-landscaped. The area of the site that is developed with houses has several trees and other landscaping.

B. Project Description: As authorized by Spokane Municipal Code Section 17G.020, "Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process," the applicant is requesting a comprehensive plan land use plan map designation change from "Office" and "Residential 4-10" to "Center and Corridor Core" for the site area totaling approximately 9.8 acres.
C. **Existing Land Use Plan Map Designations:**

![Existing Land Use Plan Map]

D. **Proposed Land Use Plan Map:**

![Proposed Land Use Plan Map]

E. **Zoning and Land Use Designation History:**

The properties located generally west of vacated Stone/Crestline Street are within the Quail Run Office Park binding site plan that was approved by the Hearing Examiner in 1993 under zoning file number 93-60-ZC/BSP/PUD. The parcel at 2410 E. 29th Ave.
was rezoned to OR-35 as a part of a comprehensive plan land use plan map amendment in 2007 (file number Z2006-074-LU). The Residential Single Family (RSF) zoned parcels have been in a lower density residential zoning category since 1958. The parcels fronting on Southeast Blvd. have been zoned for office use for approximately 20 years. The most recent zoning action was the adoption of the Office zoning category in 2005 and associated rezoning of the site from RO-1 zone to the O-35 zone.

The land use plan map adopted with the comprehensive plan in 2001 designated this area in land use plan map designations that corresponded to the zoning in place at that time. Parcels that were zoned RO-1 Residential Office Category 1 and RO Residential Office Category 2 were designated Office. Parcels that were zoned R1, One Family Residence Zone were designated Residential 4-10.

The former Lincoln Heights Specific Plan adopted in 1990 (rescinded in 2001) designated the land involved in this application Medium Density Residential/Office.

F. Adjacent Land Use:
The existing land use to the north of the site is vacant land, multifamily residences and a drive-thru bank. To the east, the existing land use is retail sales and serves and associated parking lots. To the south, the existing land use is a larger office building and vacant residential lots. To the west, the existing land use is single family residences and vacant land.

G. Applicable Municipal Code Regulations:
SMC 17G.020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedures

H. Procedural Requirements:
- Application was submitted on October 31, 2012;
- Applicant was provided Notice of Application on April 25, 2013;
- Notice of Application was posted, published and mailed on May 1, 2013, which began a 55 day public comment period;
- A SEPA Determination of Non Significance was issued on July 29, 2013;
- Notice of Plan Commission Public Hearing was posted and mailed July 30, 2013;
- Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Spokesman Review on July 31, 2013 and August 7, 2013;
- Plan Commission Public Hearing Date is scheduled for August 14, 2013.

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORTS and PUBLIC COMMENT:

Notice of this proposal was sent to City departments and outside agencies for their review. Department comments are included in the file. There were a significant number of comments received during the public comment period. All of the comments are in the file for this application. During the initial public comment period there was a significant amount of opposition to the amendment application, especially the proposal involving changing the land use plan map from a Residential 4-10 designation to Residential 15-30. The applicant has withdrawn the request to change the land use plan map designation of the land area lying to the south of E. 30th Avenue/E. 31st Avenue.
V. CONCLUSIONS:

SMC 17G.020.030 provides the criteria for decisions on amendments to the comprehensive plan. Following the review criteria is an analysis of the consistency of the proposal with the review criteria.

Section 17G.020.030 Review Criteria

The following is a list of considerations that shall be used, as appropriate, by the applicant in developing an amendment proposal, by planning staff in analyzing a proposal, and by the plan commission and city council in determining whether a criterion for approval has been met.

A. Regulatory Changes.
   Amendments to the comprehensive plan must be consistent with any recent state or federal legislative actions, or changes to state or federal regulations, such as changes to the Growth Management Act, or new environmental regulations.

   Relevant facts: The proposal is consistent with the Growth Management Act, and the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the Spokane Municipal Code as discussed in this report.

B. GMA.
   The change must be consistent with the goals and purposes of the state Growth Management Act.

   Relevant facts: 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 as recommended by staff would be consistent with these goals.

   Based on the evaluation provided in this report, staff concludes that the application is consistent with the Growth Management Act because it is consistent with the comprehensive plan.
C. Financing.
In keeping with the GMA’s requirement for plans to be supported by financing commitments, infrastructure implications of approved comprehensive plan amendments must be reflected in the relevant six-year capital improvement plan(s) approved in the same budget cycle.

**Relevant facts:** This proposal has been reviewed by city departments responsible for providing public services and facilities. No comments have been made to indicate that this proposal creates issues with public services and facilities. Specific traffic impact mitigation is provided in the SEPA mitigated determination of non-significance related to this application.

D. Funding Shortfall.
If funding shortfalls suggest the need to scale back on land use objectives and/or service level standards, those decisions must be made with public input as part of this process for amending the comprehensive plan and capital facilities program.

**Relevant facts:** Staff has concluded that this criterion is not applicable to this proposal. There are no funding shortfall implications.

E. Internal Consistency.
The requirement for internal consistency pertains to the comprehensive plan as it relates to all of its supporting documents, such as the development regulations, capital facilities program, shoreline master program, downtown plan, critical area regulations, and any neighborhood planning documents adopted after 2001. In addition, amendments should strive to be consistent with the parks plan, and vice versa. For example, changes to the development regulations must be reflected in consistent adjustments to the goals or policies in the comprehensive plan. As appropriate, changes to the map or text of the comprehensive plan must also result in corresponding adjustments to the zoning map and implementation regulations in the Spokane Municipal Code.

**Relevant facts:** The proposal does not result in the need for other amendments to the comprehensive plan or development regulations.

The proposal presented by the applicant is consistent with policies of the comprehensive plan based on the following analysis:

**Comprehensive Plan Policies:**

**LU 1.2 Districts**
*Identify districts as the framework for providing secondary schools, larger park and recreation facilities, and more varied shopping facilities.*

**Discussion:**
Districts are composed of logical and contiguous groupings of several neighborhoods having a population of 30,000 to 60,000 people. Within a district, the size and scale of schools, parks, and shopping facilities are larger because they serve a larger portion of the city. For example, within a district, there is usually a centrally located high school, one or two well-located middle schools, and one or
more well-located community parks.

The core area of the district, known as the district center, is usually located at the intersection of arterial streets. District centers offer a wide range of retail and service activities including general merchandising, small specialty shops, personal and professional services, offices, food, and entertainment. They should also include plazas, green space, and a civic green or park to provide a focal point for the center. Urban design guidelines of the comprehensive plan or a neighborhood plan are used to guide architectural and site design to promote compatible mixed land uses. Housing density should decrease as the distance from the district center increases.

**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.*

**Discussion:**

Suggested centers are designated where the potential for center development exists. Final determination is subject to the neighborhood planning process.

**Neighborhood Center**

Neighborhood centers designated on the Land Use Plan map have a greater intensity of development than the surrounding residential areas. Businesses primarily cater to neighborhood residents, such as convenience businesses and services. Drive-through facilities, including gas stations and similar auto-oriented uses tend to provide services to people living outside the surrounding neighborhood and should be allowed only along principal arterials and be subject to size limitations and design guidelines. Uses such as a day care center, a church, or a school may also be found in the neighborhood center.

Businesses in the neighborhood center are provided support by including housing over ground floor retail and office uses. The most dense housing should be focused in and around the neighborhood center. Density is high enough to enable frequent transit service to a neighborhood center and to sustain neighborhood businesses. Housing density should decrease as the distance from the neighborhood center increases. Urban design guidelines of the comprehensive plan or a neighborhood plan are used to guide architectural and site design to promote compatible, mixed land uses, and to promote land use compatibility with adjoining neighborhoods.

Buildings in the neighborhood center are oriented to the street. This encourages walking by providing easy pedestrian connections, by bringing activities and visually interesting features closer to the street, and by providing safety through watchful eyes and activity day and night. Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of these pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding neighborhoods. Parking lots should be located behind or on the side of buildings as a rule.

To promote social interaction and provide a focal point for the center, a central gathering place, such as a civic green, square, or park, should be provided. To
identify the center as the major activity area of the neighborhood, it is important to encourage buildings in the core area of the neighborhood center to be taller. Buildings up to three stories are encouraged in this area. Attention is given to the design of the circulation system so pedestrian access between residential areas and the neighborhood center is provided. To be successful, centers need to be integrated with transit. Transit stops should be conveniently located near commercial and higher density residential uses, where transit service is most viable.

The size and composition of neighborhood centers, including recreation areas, vary by neighborhood, depending upon location, access, neighborhood character, local desires, and market opportunities. Neighborhood centers should be separated by at least one mile (street distance) or as necessary to provide economic viability. As a general rule, the amount of commercial space and percent devoted to office and retail should be proportional to the number of housing units in the neighborhood. The size of individual commercial business buildings should be limited to assure that the business is truly neighborhood serving. The size of the neighborhood center, including the higher density housing surrounding the center, should be approximately 15 to 25 square blocks. The density of housing should be about 32 units per acre in the core of the neighborhood center and may be up to 22 units per acre at the perimeter.

**District Center**
District centers are designated on the land use plan map. They are similar to neighborhood centers, but the density of housing is greater (up to 44 dwelling units per acre in the core area of the center) and the size and scale of schools, parks, and shopping facilities are larger because they serve a larger portion of the city. As a general rule, the size of the district center, including the higher density housing surrounding the center, should be approximately 30 to 50 square blocks.

As with a neighborhood center, buildings are oriented to the street and parking lots are located behind or on the side of buildings whenever possible. A central gathering place, such as a civic green, square, or park is provided. To identify the district center as a major activity area, it is important to encourage buildings in the core area of the district center to be taller. Buildings up to five stories are encouraged in this area.

The circulation system is designed so pedestrian access between residential areas and the district center is provided. Frequent transit service, walkways, and bicycle paths link district centers and the downtown area.

**Employment Center**
Page 18, Comprehensive Plan
District Center

District centers are designated on the land use plan map. They are similar to neighborhood centers, but the density of housing is greater (up to 44 dwelling units per acre in the core area of the center) and the size and scale of schools, parks, and shopping facilities are larger because they serve a larger portion of the city. As a general rule, the size of the district center, including the higher density housing surrounding the center, should be approximately 30 to 50 square blocks.

As with a neighborhood center, buildings are oriented to the street and parking lots are located behind or on the side of buildings whenever possible. A central gathering place, such as a civic green, square, or park is provided. To identify the district center as a major activity area, it is important to encourage buildings in the core area of the district center to be taller. Buildings up to five stories are encouraged in this area.

The circulation system is designed so pedestrian access between residential areas and the district center is provided. Frequent transit service, walkways, and bicycle paths link district centers and the downtown area.

LU 4.5 Block Length

Create a network of streets that is generally laid out in a grid pattern that features more street intersections and shorter block lengths.

Discussion: Excessively long blocks and long local access residential streets result in fewer alternative routes for pedestrian and vehicle travel and generally result in increased vehicle speeds. A grid pattern featuring more street intersections and shorter blocks provides more alternative routes for pedestrian and vehicle travel and tends to slow traffic. Block lengths of approximately 250 to 350 feet on average are preferable, recognizing that environmental conditions (e.g., topography or rock outcroppings) might constrain these shorter block lengths in some areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Development Services staff review of Soneland Comp Plan Amendment - Lincoln Heights District Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comp Plan policy for district center core area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.2: District center core area is located at the intersection of arterial streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.2: District centers offer a wide range of retail and service activities including general merchandising, small specialty shops, personal and professional services, offices, food, and entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.2: District centers should also include plazas, green space, and a civic green or park to provide a focal point for the center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.2: Urban design guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan or a neighborhood plan are used to guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architectural and site design to promote compatible mixed land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 1.2: Housing density should decrease as the distance from the district center increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>areas of the 19 original center and corridor locations, including Lincoln Heights, were zoned in a Center and Corridor (CC) zoning category.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU 3.2 District Center discussion on Page 18: District centers are similar to neighborhood centers, but the density of housing is greater (up to 44 dwelling units per acre in the core area of the center) and the size and scale of schools, parks, and shopping facilities are larger because they serve a larger portion of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 18: As a general rule, the size of the district center, including the higher density housing surrounding the center, should be approximately 30 to 50 square blocks.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existing CC zoned area consists mostly of relatively older single story buildings with parking areas located between the building and the street. The intensity of the existing development is substantially less than is allowed by the zoning code. Infill of vacant land and redevelopment of underdeveloped land is envisioned by the comprehensive plan and the zoning code. The applicant is proposing to rezone the site from Office (O), Office Retail (OR) and Residential Single Family (RSF) to Center and Corridor Type 2 (CC-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Zone</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>height</th>
<th>uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>office,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Retail Zone</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>height</th>
<th>uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>office, residential, small scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-2 DC Zone</td>
<td>- .8 non-res.</td>
<td>55 ft.</td>
<td>office, residential, retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1.5 res.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-1 DC Zone</td>
<td>- 1 non-res.</td>
<td>55 ft.</td>
<td>office, residential, retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 res.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CC-2 zone allows uses such as motor vehicle sales, rental, repair or washing; automotive parts and tire (with exterior storage or display); gasoline sales (serving more than six vehicles); and, self-storage or warehouse. These uses are not appropriate on the site of the proposed amendment. If the amendment is approved, staff recommends a CC-1 Zone rather than a CC-2 zone for the site.

| Page 18: To identify the district center as a major activity area, it is important to encourage buildings in the core area of the district center to be taller. |
| The existing CC2-DC zoned area to the east of the site on the east side of SE Boulevard allows a maximum building height of 55 feet. The maximum building height currently allowed on the Sonneland site is 35 feet. |
| If the proposed land use plan amendment is approved, the maximum building height allowed on the site is 55 feet. |
| The maximum building height is required to transition to a lower building height when a site is located adjacent to a RSF zone. The area to the south of the site is zoned RSF. |
| Buildings up to five stories are encouraged in this area. | The site is bounded by 29th on the north, Southeast Boulevard on the east and Martin Street on the west. These streets are improved with sidewalks and paving. On the south boundary of the site there is an existing unimproved public right-of-way running generally east-west. This right-of-way extends from the intersection of Martin Street and 30th Avenue to the intersection of Southeast Boulevard and 31st Avenue. Near the center of the site there is an existing unimproved right-of-way extending approximately half way through the site. This right-of-way aligns with unimproved Crestline Street right-of-way which is located to the south. | There is no site plan for the development of the site. The applicant has indicated that existing public rights-of-way will be retained as the site is developed. The required improvements to streets will be determined at the time of site development. | The retention of the public rights-of-way will allow the circulation system to be consistent with the comprehensive plan. |

| Page 18: The circulation system is designed so pedestrian access between residential areas and the district center is provided. Frequent transit service, walkways, and bicycle paths link district centers and the downtown area. | LU 4.5: Create a network of streets that is generally laid out in a grid pattern that features more street intersections and shorter block lengths. | Much of the Lincoln Heights District Center is developed with a grid street pattern that provides the potential for connectivity for a variety of modes of transportation. Improvements in infrastructure are definitely feasible and necessary. | The land area included in this application is partially undeveloped. Street rights-of-way exist within the property. Future layout of the site would be determined at the time of project approval. | The street pattern is generally established on the basis of the existing public rights-of-way within the site. The blocks are larger than are encouraged by the comprehensive plan. The ability to create smaller blocks is limited because of the existing development of the site in the portions of the site adjacent |
| Excessively long blocks and long local access residential streets result in fewer alternative routes for pedestrian and vehicle travel and generally result in increased vehicle speeds. A grid pattern featuring more street intersections and shorter blocks provides more alternative routes for pedestrian and vehicle travel and tends to slow traffic. Block lengths of approximately 250 to 350 feet on average are preferable, recognizing that environmental conditions (e.g., topography or rock outcroppings) might constrain these shorter block lengths in some areas. | See discussion above. | See discussion above. | See discussion above. |

F. Regional Consistency.
All changes to the comprehensive plan must be consistent with the countywide planning policies (CWPP), the comprehensive plans of neighboring jurisdictions, applicable capital facilities or special district plans, the regional transportation.
improvement plan, and official population growth forecasts.

**Relevant facts:** This amendment will not impact regional consistency.

G. Cumulative Effect.
All amendments must be considered concurrently in order to evaluate their cumulative effect on the comprehensive plan text and map, development regulations, capital facilities program, neighborhood planning documents, adopted environmental policies and other relevant implementation measures.

1. Land Use Impacts.
   In addition, applications should be reviewed for their cumulative land use impacts. Where adverse environmental impacts are identified, mitigation requirements may be imposed as a part of the approval action.

2. Grouping.
   Proposals for area-wide rezones and/or site-specific land use plan map amendments may be evaluated by geographic sector and/or land use type in order to facilitate the assessment of their cumulative impacts.

**Relevant facts:** The impacts of this proposal are limited to the area generally surrounding the site. The other comprehensive plan amendments being processed as a part of the current comprehensive plan amendment cycle are relatively small and are far enough separated to have no impact on the site of the proposed amendment. The Carlberg application (file number Z1200044-Comp) located at the northeast corner of 32nd Avenue and Grand Blvd, about 1 mile to the west, is .64 acres in size. The Alton application (file number Z1200045-Comp) located at the southeast corner of 29th Avenue and Fiske Street, about .44 miles to the east, is .28 acres in size. The Cancer Care NW application (file number Z1200043-Comp) is geographically isolated approximately 2 miles from the site of the Sonneland application.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

H. SEPA.
SEPA review must be completed on all amendment proposals.

1. Grouping.
   When possible, the SEPA review process should be combined for related land use types or affected geographic sectors in order to better evaluate the proposals' cumulative impacts. This combined review process results in a single threshold determination for those related proposals.

2. DS.
   If a determination of significance (DS) is made regarding any proposal, that application will be deferred for further consideration until the next applicable review cycle in order to allow adequate time for generating and processing the required environmental impact statement (EIS).

**Relevant facts:** The application has been reviewed in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) that requires that the potential for adverse environmental impacts resulting from a proposal be evaluated during the decision-
making process. On the basis of information contained in the environmental checklist, the written comments from local and State departments and agencies concerned with land development within the city, and a review of other information available to the Director of Planning Services, a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) was issued on July 29, 2013.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

I. Adequate Public Facilities
The amendment must not adversely affect the City’s ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services (as described in CFU 2.1 and CFU 2.2) citywide at the planned level of service, or consume public resources otherwise needed to support comprehensive plan implementation strategies.

Relevant facts: Staff finds the proposed amendment will not have a substantial impact on the City’s ability to provide services. All affected departments and outside agencies providing services to the subject properties have had an opportunity to comment on the proposal. No one indicated that there were issues with the provision of services to the expanded “Center and Corridor Core” designation.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

J. UGA.
Amendments to the urban growth area boundary may only be proposed by the city council or the mayor of Spokane and shall follow the procedures of the countywide planning policies for Spokane County.

Relevant facts: This criteria is not applicable.

K. Consistent Amendments.

1. Policy Adjustments.
Proposed policy adjustments that are intended to be consistent with the comprehensive plan should be designed to provide correction or additional guidance so the community’s original visions and values can better be achieved. The need for this type of adjustment might be supported by findings from feedback instruments related to monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the comprehensive plan. Examples of such findings could include:

a. growth and development as envisioned in the plan is occurring faster, slower or is failing to materialize;

b. the capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased;

c. land availability to meet demand is reduced;

d. population or employment growth is significantly different than the plan’s assumptions;

e. plan objectives are not being met as specified;

f. the effect of the plan on land values and affordable housing is contrary to plan goals;
g. transportation and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected;

h. a question of consistency exists between the comprehensive plan and its elements and chapter 36.70A RCW, the countywide planning policies, or development regulations.

**Relevant facts:** This proposal is a request for a comprehensive plan land use plan map amendment, not a policy adjustment.

Staff concludes that this criterion is not applicable to this proposal.

2. Map Changes.
Changes to the land use plan map (and by extension, the zoning map) may only be approved if the proponent has demonstrated that all of the following are true:

a. The designation is in conformance with the appropriate location criteria identified in the comprehensive plan (e.g., compatibility with neighboring land uses, proximity to arterials, etc.);

b. The map amendment or site is suitable for the proposed designation;

c. The map amendment implements applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.

**Relevant facts:** The applicable comprehensive plan policies have been addressed previously in Criterion E. above.

Staff concludes that the proposed amendment is generally consistent with the comprehensive plan Staff is providing alternatives for consideration by the Plan Commission.

d. The map amendment or site is suitable for the proposed designation;

**Relevant facts:** The site is adjacent to properties that are designated General Commercial. The site has access to urban services and has frontage on 29th Avenue, which is a principal arterial, and Southeast Blvd., which is a minor arterial. The site contains no significant slopes, water features, critical areas or cultural resources that would inhibit development of the site. Further review of site features will be a requirement of any future site-specific development applications.

e. The map amendment implements applicable comprehensive plan policies better than the current map designation.

**Relevant facts:** Staff finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan policies. The proposed center and corridor zoning allows an increased variety of land uses that will support improved development opportunities for the site. In addition, the development standards for centers and corridors will require development that is compatible with the surrounding area.

Staff concludes that this amendment would implement the comprehensive plan better than its current land use plan designation.

3. Rezones, Land Use Plan Map Amendment.
Corresponding rezones will be adopted concurrently with land use plan map amendments as a legislative action of the city council. If policy language changes have map implications, changes to the land use plan map and zoning map will be made accordingly for all affected sites upon adoption of the new policy language.
This is done to ensure that the comprehensive plan remains internally consistent and to preserve consistency between the comprehensive plan and supporting development regulations.

**Relevant facts:** See staff recommendation below.

L. Inconsistent Amendments.

1. **Review Cycle.**
   Because of the length of time required for staff review, public comment, and plan commission’s in-depth analysis of the applicant’s extensive supporting data and long-term trend analysis, proposals that are not consistent with the comprehensive plan are addressed only within the context of the required comprehensive plan update cycle every seven years pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(4)(C) and every other year starting in 2005.

2. **Adequate Documentation of Need for Change.**
   The burden of proof rests entirely with the applicant to provide convincing evidence that community values, priorities, needs and trends have changed sufficiently to justify a fundamental shift in the comprehensive plan. Results from various measurement systems should be used to demonstrate or document the need to depart from the current version of the comprehensive plan. Relevant information may include:
   a. growth and development as envisioned in the plan is occurring faster, slower or is failing to materialize;
   b. the capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased;
   c. land availability to meet demand is reduced;
   d. population or employment growth is significantly different than the plan’s assumptions;
   e. transportation and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected;
   f. conditions have changed substantially in the area within which the subject property lies and/or Citywide;
   g. assumptions upon which the plan is based are found to be invalid; or
   h. sufficient change or lack of change in circumstances dictates the need for such consideration.

**Relevant facts:** This year (2013), the Plan Commission may consider proposals that are inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. Usually inconsistent amendments require amendments to the text of the comprehensive plan to achieve consistency with policies of the comprehensive plan. However, no changes to the text of the comprehensive plan are necessary for the approval of this application.

3. **Overall Consistency.**
   If significantly inconsistent with the current version of the comprehensive plan, an amendment proposal must also include wording that would realign the relevant parts of the comprehensive plan and its other supporting documents with the full range of changes implied by the proposal.
Relevant facts: The proposed application has been determined to be consistent with the comprehensive plan. The criteria listed above are intended to be used to evaluate applications that are inconsistent with the comprehensive plan.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff concludes that the proposed amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan and the Spokane Municipal Code criteria for amendments to the comprehensive plan and recommends approval.

The CC-2 zone allows uses such as motor vehicle sales, rental, repair or washing; automotive parts and tire (with exterior storage or display); gasoline sales (serving more than six vehicles); and, self-storage or warehouse. These uses are not appropriate on the site of the proposed amendment due to the adjacency of the site to an area that is designated Residential 4-10 on the land use plan map. If the amendment is approved, staff recommends a CC-1 Zone rather than a CC-2 zone for the site.
CITY PLAN COMMISSION FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE 2012-2013 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

FILE NO. Z1200043COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Mike Stanicar, on behalf of Cancer Care Associates, LLC, to amend the land use plan map designation from “Residential 15-30” to “Office”. The total size of the proposed land use plan map amendment is 3.25 acres. The site is located east of Sheridan Street and south of 5th Avenue. The recommended implementing zoning designation is Office (O-35) for all parcels.

FILE NO. Z1200044COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Dwight Hume, on behalf of Tim Carberg, to amend the land use plan map designation on two lots from “Office” to “Center and Corridor Core” and on two additional lots from “Residential, 4 to 10 units per acre” to “Center and Corridor Core”. The total size of the proposed land use plan map amendment is .64 acres. The site is located at the northeast corner of 32nd Avenue and Grand Boulevard. The recommended implementing zoning designation for all lots is Centers & Corridors, Type 1 – District Center (CC1-DC).

FILE NO. Z1200045COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Dwight Hume, on behalf of Alton Properties to amend the land use plan map designation from “Residential 15-30” to “Center and Corridor Core”. The total size of the proposed land use plan map amendment is .29 acres. The site is located at the southeast corner of 29th Avenue and Fiske Street. The recommended implementing zoning designation is Centers & Corridors Type 2, District Center (CC2-DC) for all parcels.

FILE NO. Z1200046COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC; and Banner Bank. The proposed amendment is to the Land Use Plan Map of the City’s Comprehensive Plan recommending a change from “Office” and “Residential 4-10” to “Center and Corridor Core”. The parcels are approximately 9.8 acres in size. The site is located at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast Boulevard. The recommended implementing zoning designation is Centers & Corridors, Type 1 – District Center (CC1-DC).

FINDINGS OF FACT:
A. The Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1990, requiring among other things, the development of a comprehensive plan (RCW 36.70A).

B. The City of Spokane adopted a comprehensive plan in May of 2001 that complies with the requirements of the Growth Management Act.

C. Under the Growth Management Act, comprehensive plans may be amended no more frequently than once a year. All amendment proposals must be considered concurrently in order to evaluate for their cumulative effect. Also, the amendment period should be timed to coordinate with budget deliberations.
D. All four of the subject comprehensive plan amendment applications were submitted by the October 31, 2012 deadline for Plan Commission review during the 2013 amendment cycle.

E. Staff requested comments from agencies and departments on December 10, 2012. No adverse comments were received from agencies or departments. For the Sonneland Application, File No. Z1200046COMP, additional information was requested related to impacts on the transportation facilities. The traffic studies were reviewed by city staff and determined to be adequate to address these impacts.

F. A public comment period ran from April 29, 2013 to June 22, 2013 which provided a 55 day public comment period. There were no negative comments received regarding File No. Z1200043COMP, File No. Z1200044COMP, and File No. Z1200045COMP. For File No. Z1200046COMP (Sonneland), during the initial public comment period there was a significant amount of opposition to the amendment application, especially the proposal involving changing the land use plan map from a Residential 4-10 designation to Residential 15-30 for the land area lying to the south of E. 30th Avenue/E. 31st Avenue. The applicant withdrew this part of the requested land use plan map amendment on May 31, 2013.

G. The Community Assembly received a presentation regarding the draft proposed 2012-2013 comprehensive plan amendments on May 3, 2013 and have been given information regarding the dates of Plan Commission workshops and hearings.

H. The Spokane City Plan Commission held workshops to study the amendments on May 8, May 22, and June 12, 2013.

I. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklists and Determinations of Non-Significance were distributed on July 29, 2013 for the comprehensive land use plan map and zoning map changes; File No. Z1200043COMP, File No. Z1200044COMP, and File No. Z1200045COMP.

For FILE NO. Z1200046COMP (Sonneland), a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist and Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance were distributed on July 29, 2013. The mitigation measures are as follows:

1. Any new intersection/driveway at 29th/Stone (south side of 29th) shall be evaluated at the time of a specific project is proposed to the City for such intersection/driveway. The applicant is advised that a new intersection/driveway at this location may be limited to "right-in, right-out only" in order to maintain the function of 29th Avenue and Southeast Boulevard intersection.

2. The east-west connectivity between Martin Street and Southeast Boulevard, generally in the alignment of E. 30th Ave./E. 31st Ave., shall be addressed either as a part of a development agreement or as a part of a traffic study and mitigation for project specific proposals.

The public appeal period for the SEPA determination ended on August 13, 2013.
J. On August 1, 2013, the Washington State Department of Commerce and appropriate state agencies were given the required 60-day notice before adoption of proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

K. Notice of the SEPA Checklist and Determination of Non-Significance, the comprehensive plan land use map amendment, and announcement of the August 14, 2013 Plan Commission Public Hearing were published in the Spokesman-Review on July 30 and August 7, 2013 and the Official City Gazette on July 24, 2013 and August 7, 2013.

L. Notice of Public Hearing and SEPA Determination was posted on the property and mailed to all property owners and taxpayers of record, as shown by the most recent Spokane County Assessor’s record, and occupants of addresses of property located within a four hundred foot radius of any portion of the boundary of the subject property on July 30, 2013.

M. The staff reports found that the four comprehensive plan amendment application met all the decision criteria for approval of a comprehensive plan amendment as prescribed by SMC 17G.020. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedure.

N. The Plan Commission held a public hearing on the four comprehensive plan amendment applications on August 14, 2013.

O. The early and continuous public participation standards of the Growth Management Act (GMA, RCW 35.70A) and of the City of Spokane development regulations have been met during the consideration of these comprehensive plan amendment applications and persons desiring to make comments and provide testimony have had the opportunity to do so.

By motion and second and a recorded vote, the Plan Commission approved Finding of Facts A through O.

CONCLUSIONS:
A. The Plan Commission adopted the staff recommended findings for the decision criteria and review guidelines for comprehensive plan amendments, as listed in SMC 17G.020.030:

B. The proposed amendments have been reviewed by the City Plan Commission and found to be in conformance with the goals and policies of the City's 2001 Comprehensive Plan, as well as the Spokane Municipal Code Chapter 17G.020.

By motion and second and a recorded vote, the Plan Commission approved Conclusions A through B.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
FILE NO. Z1200043COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Mike Stanicar, on behalf of Cancer Care Associates, LLC. By a vote of 9 to 0 the Plan Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of a proposed
amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan for a change from "Residential 15-30" to "Office" for approximately 3.25 acres including the block bounded by E. 5th Avenue; S. Sheridan Street; E. Hartson Avenue; and S. Hatch Street; and four parcels located at the southeast corner of S. Hatch Street and E. 5th Avenue. The recommended implementing zoning designation is Office (O-35) for all parcels.

FILE NO. Z1200044COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Dwight Hume, on behalf of Tim Carlberg. By a vote of 9 to 0, the Plan Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of a proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan for a change from "Residential 15-30" and "Office" to "CC Core" for approximately .64 acres generally located on the east side of S. Grand Blvd between E. 31st Avenue and E. 32nd Avenue. The recommended implementing zoning designation is for all lots is "Centers & Corridors, Type 1 – District Center (CC1-DC)."

FILE NO. Z1200045COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Dwight Hume, on behalf of Alton Properties. By a vote of 8 to 1, the Plan Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of a proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan for a change from the land use plan map designation "Residential 15-30" to "CC Core". The total size of the proposed land use plan map amendment is .29 acres. The site is located at the southeast corner of 29th Avenue and Fiske Street. The recommended implementing zoning designation is Centers & Corridors Type 2, District Center (CC2-DC) for all parcels.

FILE NO. Z1200046COMP: A proposed comprehensive plan amendment application by Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC; and Banner Bank. By a vote of 9 to 0, the Plan Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of a proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan for a change from "Office" and "Residential 4-10" to "Center and Corridor Core". The parcels are approximately 9.8 acres in size. The site is located at the southwest corner of 29th Avenue and Southeast Boulevard. The proposed implementing zoning designation is Centers & Corridors, Type 1 – District Center (CC1-DC).

Recommendations:

By motion and second and a recorded vote, the Plan Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of the proposed Finding of Fact, Conclusion and Recommendation for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, as written.

Michael Ekins, President
Spokane Plan Commission

August 14, 2013
Public Comment received for:

Z1200046-COMP – Sonneland

This application, when first made received significant public comment. After the size of the application was reduced, there have been two public comments from one individual received on this application; these are attached.

The earlier comments focused exclusively on the area that has been removed from the application and are not attached.
Following the Spokane Plan Commission workshop on June 12, 2013 - we would add the following input regarding the Sonneland Amendment proposal to the input that has already been submitted:

- Along with our neighbors, we are pleased that the original proposal was revised to a 9.8 acre proposal that removes the remaining residential area of Quail Run from consideration.
- We support that the 9.8 acres should all be zoned the same, so the zoning of the three R4-10 lots should be the same as the surrounding property which is currently zoned as Office.
- We do not have the information to support that the area should be zoned CC Core - Centers & Corridors, Type 2 - District Center (CC2-DC)
  - As we understand it, designation of the Lincoln Heights District Center has not been finalized and will be a focus in the pending review of the City's Comprehensive Plan. We understand from Scott Chesney's remarks at the Lincoln Heights Neighborhood Council meeting and also remarks made at the workshop that there needs to be a clear center and edges to a designated District Center. In the summary report provided for the workshop, the Lincoln Heights Center is suggested at 29th and Regal. We assume that the review process would determine the center and edges of the Lincoln Heights District Center. The proposed 9.8 acres may or may not be included.
  - The summary report, in reference to Policy LU 3.2 Centers and Corridors, states: "Suggested centers are designated where the potential for center development exists. Final determination is subject to the neighborhood planning process." It seems, then - that an amendment that zones a Center prior to the process required to establish a Center is out of sequence. While we can see that amendments may be proposed after a Center has been established in the City's Comprehensive Plan, using the Amendment process to establish a Center contradicts the policy and the required process for the designation of Centers and Corridors.
  - It may be more in sequence if the Sonneland Amendment would be considered as part of the Comprehensive Plan process to establish the Lincoln Heights District Center.
  - If zoning of an area as CC2 requires that adjacent property be rezoned as a transition zone that does not include R4-10, then we oppose the CC2 zoning and support zoning the entire proposed area as Office.
  - We think that the Plan Commission should make formalization of the Lincoln Heights District Center a priority.
- During the workshop, commissioners asked whether or not covenants should be part of their consideration of rezoning proposals. We do think that the Plan Commission should consider covenants as they are established based on the zoning code in place, and are legal, binding agreements. It would seem that an amendment applicant could reasonably be asked what other legal agreements or restrictions apply to the property under consideration. The Commission could then determine whether or not the city has potential liability in changing a zoning code.
Thank you for the opportunity for input -
Joan and David Kingrey
2306 E 32nd
Spokane, WA 99223
Mr. Pelton and Ms. Black -

Please accept my sincere thank you for the capable and responsive character of the Planning and Development Services as exhibited throughout the Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Land Use Map Changes process. For me, and my neighbors - there was always a quick and thorough response to inquiries, and we were kept well informed throughout. I particularly appreciate that Planning and Development Services recommended a CC1 designation, instead of the requested CC2, for the Sonneland/29th Street Investments proposal. As I have revisited the city municipal code documents, I feel that your recommendation honored the input received regarding the original and revised Sonneland proposals, and respected the future of the single family residential neighborhood to the south of the proposed rezoning area.

I know that this process is not complete until City Council approval of the amendment recommendations occurs. In the interim, please accept my appreciation for the quality of your work in service to this community.

Joan Kingrey
2306 E 32nd
Spokane, WA 99223