SHORELINE PERMIT APPLICATION

Attach an additional sheet if needed

The proposed action requires approval of:

- X Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP)
- ☐ Shoreline Conditional Use Permit (SCUP)
- ☐ Shoreline Variance (SV)

All Shoreline Permits must provide the following information:

1. Identify the name of the shoreline (water body) with which the site of the proposal is associated.
   
   **Spokane River**

2. Provide a general description of the proposed project, including the proposed use or uses and the activities necessary to accomplish the project.

   *The River Inn Hotel was built in the 1970’s and minimal changes or updates to the exterior have occurred since it’s construction. The landscape and site features are dated and in poor condition. This proposal includes overall site improvements which will likely include a new pool, a new restaurant patio, repair and repaving of the existing trail, new landscape and new or adjusted irrigation. This proposal also includes upgrades to the west building exterior including an entry canopy and new siding. The eastern most pool may be a future phase, with upgrades to the existing pool and addition of a children’s splash pad. The proposed use of the property in question will not change from the existing use, a commercial hotel. Activities included in the development plan are consistent with existing hotel activities.*

3. Provide a general description of the property and adjacent uses, including physical characteristics, intensity of development, improvements, and structures.

   *The property is approximately 7.21 acres along the north bank of the Spokane River. Rock river bank is present along many portions of the south trail. The site generally slopes up to the east. Physical characteristics include rolling grassy areas south of the building with thick, overgrown vegetation in many locations along the river bank. Large expanses of asphalt are found north of the buildings. Adjacent uses include Gonzaga University Property to the east, the Arc of Spokane building to the north and Division Street, Highway 2 to the west.*

4. What is the estimated total Fair Market project cost within the Shoreline Jurisdiction?

   *The fair market value of the project’s exterior improvement components is estimated between $675,000-$775,000.*

5. Will the proposed development intrude waterward of the ordinary high water? ☐ YES  X NO  If yes, describe the intrusion:

   *All work will occur above/north of the ordinary high water mark.*

6. Will the proposed use or development affect existing views of the shoreline or adjacent waters? ☐ YES  X NO  If yes, describe:

   *Improvements or changes to the building exterior and vertical features are minimal between the existing building footprint and the river. It is not anticipated that existing views will change or be affected.*

7. Explain how the proposed use will not unreasonably interfere with the normal public use of public shorelines.
The property in question is private property and does not include public shoreline land however the property owner has historically allowed the continued use of a trail along the north of the Spokane River edge and the south of the property border. Although the existing trail may shift slightly, it is anticipated that public use of the trail will continue to be encourage and the development would not adversely affect the existing use.

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

The proposed work is consistent with the SMP due to no change in the current use. Permanent structures will not extend southward (waterward) of the existing building footprints. Ground disturbance will occur at the patio and pool areas however both locations have history of previous disturbance and are not locations of native or natural habitat. This proposal also does not plan to change the existing public trail use, nor does it propose ground disturbance south (waterward) of the existing trail.

9. A detailed narrative of how the impacts of the proposal have been analyzed to achieve no net loss of shoreline ecological functions, including each step of the mitigation sequencing process, as defined in Section 17E.060.220 SMC.

A large majority of the vegetation located between the existing trail and shoreline is either non-native or invasive species. Clean up of this vegetation was submitted and approved through a City of Spokane Variance. While additional vegetation near the buildings, north of the trail may be removed due to overgrowth and poor maintenance it is anticipated that new vegetation will replace that which is removed at an equal to or greater ratio. The river bank south of the existing trail will not be developed beyond what currently exits or was approved through the variance.

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

General permits that may be required for work within this property may include grading and building permits through the City of Spokane and Health Department review of the pool areas. Tenant improvements to the existing kitchen are currently in for permit with the City of Spokane under application #B181858BLDC and an Exempt from SSDP was issued under application #z18-837SDET. We don’t anticipate any permits required by outside agencies other than DOE review of the SSDP and health department review of the pool.

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

11. List the provisions of the land use code that allows the proposal.

N/A – Not a conditional use permit.

12. Please explain how the proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation and goals, objectives and policies for the property.

N/A – Not a conditional use permit.

13. Please explain how the proposal meets the concurrency requirements of SMC Chapter 17D.010.
14. Please explain any significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties the proposal will have and any necessary conditions that can be placed on the proposal to avoid significant effects or interference with the use of neighboring property or the surrounding area, considering the design and intensity of the proposed use.

*N/A – Not a conditional use permit.*

15. Please explain how the cumulative impact of several additional conditional use permits on the shoreline in the area will not preclude achieving the goals of the shoreline master program.

*N/A – Not a conditional use permit.*

In addition to Questions 1-15, all Shoreline Variance Applications must provide the following additional information:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*N/A – Not a conditional use permit.*

18. How does this property physically differ from other similarly zoned properties in the area and how do the physical characteristics of the subject property prevent developing to the same extent?

*N/A – Not a conditional use permit.*
19. What hardship will result if the requested variance is not granted?

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}

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

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}

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

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}

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

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}

23. Variance permits for development that will be located \textit{landward} of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), and/or landward of any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:

a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property.

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}

b. That the hardship described in (a) of this subsection is specifically related to the property, and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, size, or natural features and the application of the master program, and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant’s own actions.

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}

c. That the design of the project is compatible with other authorized uses within the area and with uses planned for the area under the comprehensive plan and shoreline master program and will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

\textit{N/A – Not a conditional use permit.}
d. That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area;

_N/A – Not a conditional use permit._

e. That the variance requested is the minimum necessary to afford relief.

_N/A – Not a conditional use permit._

f. That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.

_N/A – Not a conditional use permit._

24. Variance permits for development that will be located **waterward** of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), or within any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:

a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes all reasonable use of the property.

_N/A – Not a conditional use permit._

b. That the proposal is consistent with the criteria established under WAC 173-27-170(2)(b) through (f).

_N/A – Not a conditional use permit._

c. That the public use of the shorelines will not be adversely affected.

_N/A – Not a conditional use permit._