I. PROPERTY SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Location:</th>
<th>Citywide, All Properties Designated for Residential Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Use:</td>
<td>Residential Uses and Other Uses by Conditional Permit and/or Legal Nonconforming Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. APPLICANT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Proponent:</th>
<th>The City of Spokane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Contact:</td>
<td>Kevin Freibott, Planning &amp; Economic Development, <a href="mailto:kfreibott@spokanecity.org">kfreibott@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. PROPOSAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Use Designation:</th>
<th>Residential 4-10 (dwelling units/acre), Residential 10-20, Residential 15-30, and Residential 15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Land Use Designation:</td>
<td>Residential Low, Residential Increased, Residential Moderate, and Residential High, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>N/A – No change in zoning designations proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning:</td>
<td>N/A – No change in zoning designations proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA Status:</td>
<td>A SEPA threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued on June 12, 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Commission Hearing Date:</td>
<td>June 14, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Recommendation:</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. General Proposal Description: The City Council previously adopted Ordinance No. C36232, an interim zoning ordinance that was adopted to implement the housing options listed in RCW 36.70A.600. Since then, the State legislature has adopted HB1110, Chapter 332, Laws of 2023. This new law, which goes into effect on July 23, 2023, requires cities to update their development regulations to allow the
housing options implemented by the City in Ordinance No. C36232. Consistent with the foregoing, the City of Spokane is proceeding to amend Chapter 3, Land Use of the City’s Comprehensive Plan to align policy language in the Comprehensive Plan with these developments and to further implement middle housing options that are now required under State law. The proposal comprises a range of text edits to Chapter 3, Land Use, and affects all parts of that chapter, including the community vision and values, certain policies, and the descriptions and category titles for residential Land Use Plan Map designations described in the chapter. Also proposed are additions to the Comprehensive Plan Glossary, found after the principal elements of the document. The proposed amendments are included herein as Exhibit A.

2. **Current Land Use Designation and History:** The current land use plan map (Map LU-1) designations of the properties affected by the proposal are Residential 4-10, Residential 10-20, Residential 15-30, and Residential 15+.

3. **Proposed Land Use Designation:** The proposal would change the names of the four residential land use designations in the chapter, and on Map LU-1, but reviewers should note that no boundary changes are proposed as part of the proposal. The proposal would retain existing boundaries. For example, if a given property is currently designated “Residential 4-10”, it would now be designated “Residential Low” under the proposed amendment. The relationship between current and future land use plan map designations can be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Proposed Land Use Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential 4-10</td>
<td>Residential Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 10-20</td>
<td>Residential Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 15-30</td>
<td>Residential Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 15+</td>
<td>Residential High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Current Zoning and History:** No changes to the zoning map or zoning categories are proposed at this time.

5. **Proposed Zoning:** No change in zoning designations is proposed at this time.

V. **APPLICATION PROCESS AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

1. **Key Steps:** The application is being processed according to SMC 17G.020, including the following steps:

   - Work Program Set...... July 18, 2022
   - Agency/Department Comment Period Ended...... April 17, 2023
   - Department of Commerce Notice of Intent to Adopt Issued...... April 18, 2023
   - Notice of Application Posted...... May 8, 2023
   - Plan Commission Workshop...... May 10, 2023
   - Plan Commission Workshop...... May 24, 2023
   - 30-Day Public Comment Period Ended...... June 7, 2023
   - SEPA Determination Issued...... June 12, 2023
   - Notice of Public Hearing (Scheduled)...... June 14, 2023
2. **Community Engagement**: Community engagement was an essential component of the development of this proposal. Following the adoption of the Building Opportunity and Choices for All (BOCA) interim ordinance\(^1\), internal and external dialogue began on what permanent changes to the comprehensive plan could look like. Below is a list of the numerous blog posts, presentations, community newsletters, tabling events, organization roundtables, resident forums, and additional public workshops with Plan Commission between September 2022 and May 2023 that concerned the proposal. Where documents are available highlighting those events or summarizing them, external web links are provided.

   - **Permit History Shows Missing Middle Housing Gap – Blog**...... September 8, 2022
   - **Five Mile Prairie Neighborhood Council Presentation**...... September 22, 2022
   - **Lincoln Heights Neighborhood Council Presentation**...... October 18, 2022
   - **Plan Commission Workshop**...... October 26, 2022
   - **Help Shape the Future of Housing Policy in Spokane – Blog**...... November 14, 2022
   - **Spokane Low Income Housing Consortium Presentation**...... November 16, 2022
   - **Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter**...... December 6, 2022
   - **Keller Williams Realty Presentation**...... December 6, 2022
   - **Stock House Plans Working Meeting**...... December 7, 2022
   - **Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter**...... December 21, 2022
   - **A Home is a Journey, not a Destination – Blog**...... January 4, 2023
   - **Spokane Preservation Advocates Presentation**...... January 5, 2023
   - **Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter**...... January 6, 2023
   - **Plan Commission Workshop**...... January 11, 2023
   - **WA Trust Bank Presentation**...... January 12, 2023
   - **Lincoln Heights Neighborhood Council Presentation**...... January 17, 2023
   - **Futurewise Housing Coalition Presentation**...... January 19, 2023
   - **Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter**...... January 19, 2023
   - **Community Organization Roundtable**...... January 24, 2023
   - **Plan Commission Workshop**...... January 25, 2023
   - **Housing Journey Survey Opens**...... January 27, 2023
   - **The Future of Housing for All – Blog**...... January 27, 2023
   - **Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter**...... January 30, 2023
   - **Beyond the Housing Binary – Blog**...... February 6, 2023
   - **Black History Month Empowerment and Resource Fair Tabling**...... February 11, 2023
   - **North Indian Trail Neighborhood Council Presentation**...... February 14, 2023
   - **Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter**...... February 16, 2023
   - **Appraisal Institute Presentation**...... February 16, 2023

---

\(^1\) Ordinance C36232, Approved 7-18-2022.
When Providing Housing Increased National Security – Blog...... February 27, 2023
Land Use Subcommittee of the Community Assembly...... March 1, 2023

Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter...... March 2, 2023

2023 Real Estate Market Forum Tabling...... March 2, 2023
Futurewise Housing Coalition Meeting...... March 15, 2023

Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter...... March 16, 2023

Faith-Based Organization Roundtable...... March 16, 2023

Manzanita House Community Event Tabling...... March 22, 2023

El Mercadito Cultural Market Tabling...... March 25, 2023

Shaping Spokane Housing Newsletter...... March 28, 2023

Housing Journey Survey Closed...... March 31, 2023

District 3 Resident Forum – Meeting 1...... April 4, 2023

Spring Break Market Tabling...... April 5, 2023

District 2 Resident Forum – Meeting 1...... April 6, 2023

Shaping Spokane Newsletter...... April 6, 2023

District 1 Resident Forum – Meeting 1...... April 7, 2023

Plan Commission Workshop...... April 12, 2023

One Realty Presentation...... April 18, 2023

District 3 Resident Forum – Meeting 2...... April 18, 2023

District 2 Resident Forum – Meeting 2...... April 20, 2023

Shaping Spokane Newsletter...... April 20, 2023

District 1 Resident Forum – Meeting 2...... April 21, 2023

Plan Commission Workshop...... April 26, 2023

All District Resident Forum – Final Meeting...... April 28, 2023

Shaping Spokane Newsletter...... May 4, 2023

Plan Commission Workshop (Scheduled)...... June 14, 2023

Some of the key community engagement efforts that shaped this proposal are expanded upon below:

Community Organization Roundtable. This event brought together a diverse group of community organizations that work with and for communities that may be disproportionately impacted by housing, including communities of color, aging populations, persons with physical or mental disabilities, immigrant populations, and other marginalized and intersecting identities. Opportunities discussed included accessible housing, mixed-income development, and attainable and retainable housing. A full summary can be found in Exhibit B.

Faith-Based Organization Roundtable. This event brought together members and leaders from a variety of faith-based organizations who provide affordable housing, are interested in providing affordable housing, or who spoke for their congregation and the struggles faced in the housing crisis. The conversation included an exploration into the intersection between faith-based
organizations and housing, identifying concerns that will more appropriately be addressed/considered in the development code work that will follow this proposal. A summary can be found in Exhibit C.

**Housing Journey Survey.** The housing Journey Survey received an unprecedented 3,417 valid responses and aided in forming an understanding of the housing crisis, how it affects residents, their living situations, and the types and sizes of desired housing. Key findings found that the housing crisis is foremost in every community member’s mind, desire exists for increased housing choice and diversity, and some traditional assumptions about residents’ preferences for housing might be incomplete. A full analysis of the results is available in Exhibit D.

**Resident Forums.** Following the survey, City staff invited residents from each District to expand upon their responses in roundtable discussions. Attendees shared their housing experiences and what they hope to see for the future of housing in Spokane. The series of forums started as high-level conversations about what Spokane is like and what it could be, ultimately narrowing in focus to discuss and finalize the draft vision and values language for the proposal. A full summary of these discussions can be found in Exhibit E.

3. **Comments Received:** Following the above community engagement efforts, a Request for Comments was issued to City departments as well as local agencies and departments on April 17, 2023. By the close of agency comment on May 2, 2023, comments were received from the following:

   a. **Mike Nilsson, City of Spokane Engineering:** Stated he has no comments.

   b. **Randy Abrahamson, Spokane Tribe of Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office:** Stated that cultural surveys and monitoring may be required on case-by-case review of projects.

   c. **Ryan Stewart, Spokane Regional Transportation Council:** Stated the proposal is generally consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Full copies of agency and department comments can be found in Exhibit F of this staff report.

Following the agency/department comment period, a Notice of Application was issued on May 8, 2023, to Neighborhood Councils, Community Assembly representatives, and the residents and stakeholders who engaged in the proposal’s development phase. Interested persons who had interfaced with the project in the past, or those who specifically requested it, were also sent the Notice, for a total of more than 160 direct emails. Furthermore, the Shaping Spokane Housing newsletter announced the public comment period and solicited written comments. This newsletter has a subscription list of approximately 2,642 addresses. Given the city-wide nature of this proposal, notice was also published in the Spokesman Review on May 10, 2023.

The 30-day public comment period ended on June 7, 2023. During that time, the following comments were received:

   a. **Carl Bruesch:** Neutral comment—suggests that “protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods” not be removed as a value, suggesting replacement language.
b. **Joey Gunning**: Provided several specific suggestions for Chapter 7 of the Comprehensive Plan.²

c. **Debra Howard**: Supports the proposal, but also lists certain design requirements she recommends be required of new development.

d. **Bob Hyta**: Supports updating the comprehensive plan, citing the age of the document and past amendments.

e. **Alena Izhokhina**: Supports the proposal but wants requirement that original vegetation trees remain when developing.

f. **David Jones**: Opposes the interim zoning regulations (BOCA) and the proposal, feels it is incompatible with the existing comprehensive plan and will cause people to move out of town to find “neighborhoods to live in.”

g. **Betty Krafft**: Supports more housing options. Promotes condos as a path to ownership and a shield against rising rents.

h. **Cynthia Manycolors**: Recommends targeting new development to areas with bus routes and near schools.

i. **Ben Maplethorpe**: Development should be focused on locations with transit. Current parking standards are not sufficient. Opposes “moderate to high density” housing in areas traditionally and historically containing single-family homes.

j. **Adam Marshall**: Feels that the proposal should incorporate requirements that the City ensure concurrency and adequate services before allowing more development.

k. **Rick & Roxanne Messenger**: Concerned about parking impacts from middle housing.

l. **Scott Moore**: Feels the City should concentrate on crime and drugs before considering amendments regarding housing.

m. **Heather Morgan**: Development should be focused on locations with transit. Current parking standards are not sufficient. Feels the word “churches” in the amendment should be replaced with “places of worship.”³

n. **Candace Mumm**: Provided several specific comments on the proposed language, as summarized in the table below (with staff responses to each).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes to the definition of middle housing to remove the number of</td>
<td>The definition is a nearly word-for-word copy of the definition of Middle Housing required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² As Mr. Gunning’s comments concern a chapter of the Comprehensive Plan not currently considered for changes, this information will be retained for the preparation of the next major update to the Comprehensive Plan, expected in 2025-2026.

³ Staff concurs that this change would be more inclusive of faiths that do not call their places of worship a “church.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>units and the various home types, as “state law will likely change.”</td>
<td>by House Bill 1110. While state law can change, this definition is the current legal definition. Additionally, there exists mechanisms by which the City can update the definition in the glossary if the law changes in the future. Nothing in this definition would REQUIRE the allowance of these housing types. That is a function of the eventual updates to the Municipal Code (Phase II of this project, currently under development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects to the removal of “controlling urban sprawl” from the value statements.</td>
<td>In numerous conversations with the public, it became clear that “urban sprawl” is not a universally understood concept. The replacement language was crafted with significant input during public workshops to clarify the beneficial intent of growth management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests the term “convenient” be retained in the values.</td>
<td>During the extensive public engagement process repeated comments were made that “convenient” is too subjective to be useful in this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests removal of the value that begins “Balancing stability. . .“</td>
<td>This value statement was crafted in direct consultation with the public and is intended to reinforce the idea that the Comprehensive Plan (and the Municipal Code that implements it) is not a static, set-in-stone document and should rather be updated and amended over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests keeping the three bullets at the end of the Goals and Policies preface.</td>
<td>These bullets are proposed for removal not because they are unimportant, but because this same language is already included in multiple locations throughout the chapter. Additionally, the concepts they describe are a key component of the various goals and policies in the chapter and the overall strategy is self-evident. As a preface, these statements have less force than the policies themselves, which already include these concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests additional language to Policy LU 1.4 calling for new centers via a neighborhood planning process.</td>
<td>Goal 3 and its various policies already includes sufficient details as to the need and method for determining and designating centers and corridors. Nothing in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment | Staff Response
--- | ---

| Proposal would modify or reduce the effectiveness of those policies. As such, including it in this policy would be unnecessarily repetitive. See existing Policy LU 3.3, Designating Centers and Corridors. |

| o. James O'Hare: Supports more housing options. Cites lack of options for those seeking to downsize/move. |

| p. Drew Peterson: Supports the inclusion of churches in the proposed text. Supports the amendment’s strengthening of direction that residential development “within moderate walking distance” of centers and corridors is beneficial. |

| q. Richard Schubach: Neutral comment—feels City should consider impacts on viewpoints and the environment when discussing development. |

| r. Toni Sharkey: Feels the City should focus on downtown before easing development in “historical neighborhoods” and scenic/environmental areas. |

| s. Carol Tomsic: Objects to the removal of the word “neighborhoods” from the Land Use Vision by the proposal. |

| t. Katie Upton: Supports the proposal, citing the value diversity brings to her neighborhood. |

| u. Multiple Commenters: A group of comment emails with similar themes and comments was received from the following individuals: |

- David Camp
- Kari Ann Gaither
- Lila Girvin
- Mark Odegard
- Amy Pistone
- Edward Renouard
- Hannah TeGrotenhuis

These seven commenters expressed concern that the proposal would remove or otherwise modify the focused growth strategy of the Comprehensive Plan, namely the Centers and Corridors concepts in the existing plan.

Full copies of all public comments received up until the end of the Public Comment Period (June 7, 2023), including the comments listed above, can be found in Exhibit G of this Staff Report.

**Staff Response—“Neighborhoods” Terminology**

Some commenters have raised concerns with the removal of the word “neighborhoods” from the vision statement. Staff developed the proposed changes to the vision during the public engagement process and in direct consultation with the participants of the Resident Forums. It was pointed out by the public in those meetings that the original vision is unclear as to whether “neighborhoods” referred to only residential portions of the city or if it included downtown and other centers and corridors. To clarify that the vision applies everywhere in the city, not just within residential areas, the word “neighborhoods” was replaced with the concept of livability in
this proposal. However, even with this change, neighborhoods remain a major component of the Comprehensive Plan—including the Neighborhoods Chapter, chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan (which remains unchanged by this proposal) and the more than 2,000 times the word “neighborhood” appears in the plan.

Staff Response—Centers and Corridors

While some commenters have raised concerns that the proposal would fundamentally change Centers and Corridors, the focused growth strategy in the Comprehensive Plan, it is important to note that the fundamental Centers and Corridors strategy remains a core aspect of the overall growth strategy outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. No part of the proposal is expected to remove or significantly alter the implementation of Centers and Corridors in the plan.

Staff Response—Increased Density

Some commenters have expressed concerns that this proposal will precipitously raise density in the City, adversely affecting service and utility provisions and exceeding the City’s ability to provide and accommodate urban-scale uses. While the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments discussed in this staff report make it clear that multiple housing types can be accommodated in lower intensity residential areas, there are several mitigating factors that will ensure that density (units per acre) does not rise above the ranges originally envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan. They include:

- **Much of the City is already built out**, limiting the amount of new development that might occur overall. In repeated discussions with stakeholders and considering the pre-application meetings of nearly 400 units under the interim ordinance, demolition of existing homes is usually not a part of redevelopment under the interim ordinance. Demolition of existing homes represents additional costs and permitting that makes redevelopment less financially feasible. Accordingly, as a great deal of the city is currently built out and, as demolition is less likely to be a part of any redevelopment, it’s unlikely that any part of the city would experience a precipitous rise in density.

- **Many areas of the city have previously developed below the expected densities called for in the existing Comprehensive Plan.** When some areas that platted and developed in the last 20 years were analyzed by staff, the actual density of development fell below the minimum density described in the original Comprehensive Plan. For instance, when a 52-acre portion of a newer (1990’s) neighborhood in Spokane was analyzed, staff found that the density was 3.9 units per acre, below the minimum of 4.0 called for in the Comprehensive Plan and nowhere near the maximum 10.0 units per acre called for in the plan.

- **Critical Areas, stormwater, utility connection, and other factors still reduce site-by-site development potential.** Nothing in the proposed amendment would reduce or eliminate the existing limitations on development presented by critical areas, wetlands, stormwater/drainage concerns, utility needs, or topography issues. Many currently undeveloped or underdeveloped sites have physical limitations that will prevent them from building larger middle housing types. This proposal would not remove those obstacles.
• Nothing in the proposal would eliminate the existing requirement for future development to show concurrency with service/utility provisions and to offset impacts from development. As future development is proposed following adoption of the proposal (and the Municipal Code amendments implementing these changes, currently under development), those new developments would still be required to show they are adequately served by City services and utilities. Nothing the proposal would bypass the concurrency requirement for future development already in place in the Spokane Municipal Code (see SMC 17D.010).

Staff Response—Development Standards Comments

Some of the public comments concern the development standards of the Municipal Code and not the vision and policy statements of the Comprehensive Plan. These include topics such as parking requirements and other design requirements that future development would be required to adhere to. The proposal that this staff report concerns is limited to policy, goal, and text changes to the Comprehensive Plan—no Municipal Code amendments are proposed at this time. Proposed changes to the Municipal Code are being developed as Phase II of this project and will be subject to additional public engagement, development, and consideration prior to being proposed for adoption. Accordingly, those comments that concern development standards and other implementing actions will be held and considered as part of Phase II.

4. Public Workshops: Public workshops with the Spokane Plan Commission were held on several dates (see section V.2 above). Two workshops were held during the public comment period, on May 10 and May 24, 2023. During those workshops, the particulars of the proposal were presented to the Plan Commission for their consideration and discussion. During the workshop Plan Commission asked questions and suggested changes, all of which were incorporated into later versions of the proposal and marked in the change matrix of Exhibit A.

An online public workshop was held on June 1, 2023. The workshop included a presentation on the proposal and questions were answered and comments received. A summary of that event will be provided to Plan Commission prior to the hearing on the proposal.

VI. APPLICATION REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

1. Guiding Principles: SMC 17G.020.010 provides the following guiding principles for the annual comprehensive plan amendment process:

   A. Keep the comprehensive plan alive and responsive to the community.

   B. Provide for simultaneous review of proposals to allow for cumulative impact analysis of all applications on a City-wide basis and in conjunction with budget decisions.

   C. Make map adjustments based on a foundation in policy language, consistently applying those concepts citywide.

   D. Honor the community’s long-term investment in the comprehensive plan, through public participation and neighborhood planning processes, by not making changes lightly.
E. Encourage development that will enable our whole community to prosper and reinforce our sense of place and feeling of community, in an ecologically, economically and socially sustainable manner.

F. Amendments to the comprehensive plan must result in a net benefit to the general public.

2. Review Criteria: SMC 17G.020.030 provides a list of considerations that are to be used, as appropriate, by the applicant in developing an amendment proposal, by planning staff in analyzing a proposal, by the plan commission making a recommendation on a proposal, and by the city council in making a decision on the proposal. Following each of the considerations is staff’s analysis relative to the proposed amendment.

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.**

   **Staff Analysis:** Staff reviewed and processed the proposed amendment under the current regulations contained in the Growth Management Act, the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the Spokane Municipal Code. Staff is unaware of any recent federal, state, or legislative actions with which the proposal would be in conflict, and no comments were received to this effect from any applicable agencies receiving notice of the proposal. Furthermore, the proposal implements some, but not all, of the modifications called for by House Bill 1110 (2023), recently passed by the State Legislature. The proposal is an important first step towards compliance with HB 1110, though the City has 6 months following the next required comprehensive plan update, which is required by June 30, 2026, to adopt development regulations in conformance with HB 1110.

   The proposal satisfies this criterion.

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

   **Staff Analysis:** The Growth Management Act (GMA) details 13 goals to guide the development and adoption of the comprehensive plans and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.020, “Planning Goals”), and these goals guided the City’s development of its comprehensive plan and development regulations. No comments received or other evidence in the record indicates inconsistency between the proposed land use plan map amendment and the goals and purposes of the GMA. As discussed in criterion 2.A above, the proposal is also generally consistent with HB 1110, which includes amendments to RCW 36.70A (GMA), and has been processed consistent with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.370.

   The proposal satisfies this criterion.

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.**

   **Staff Analysis:** The City did not require, nor did any Agency or City Department comment request or require a traffic impact analysis for the proposal. Renaming the Land Use Plan Map designations
is unlikely to affect access to existing infrastructure for any given site and should be covered by the City’s planned investments in infrastructure expansion over the next 20 years. While the proposal could result in code amendments to increase the number of homes possible on a given site, the fact that the city is largely built out will likely limit any increase in density in most of the city. Accordingly, the proposal is not expected to negatively impact service or utility provisions or vehicle access. Furthermore, under State and local laws, any subsequent development of the sites impacted by the proposal will be subject to a concurrency determination pursuant to SMC 17D.010.020.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

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.

Staff Analysis: No evidence of a potential funding shortfall as a result of this proposal has been found.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

E. **Internal Consistency:**

1. 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.

Staff Analysis: The proposal is internally consistent with applicable supporting documents of the comprehensive plan as follows:

   - **Capital Facilities Program.** As described in the staff analysis of Criterion C above, no additional infrastructure or capital expenditures by the City are anticipated for this non-project action, and it is not anticipated that the City’s integrated Capital Facilities Program would be affected by the proposal.

   - **Development Regulations.** Any future development will be required to be consistent with the development regulations in place at the time of application submittal. Development regulations must also be consistent with the comprehensive plan and will be updated in the second phase of this proposal to ensure consistency.

   - **Neighborhood Planning Documents Adopted after 2001.** The proposal is consistent with or supports the goals and policies in many neighborhood plans that call for livability and diversity of housing types at different affordability levels. Upon review, the proposal does not directly conflict with the remaining neighborhood planning
documents. Any future changes to the development code as a result of the proposed changes would be subject to review and consideration of the neighborhood plans at the time of proposal.

**Housing Action Plan.** The proposal is consistent with the Housing Action Plan adopted in July 2021. Strategies A1, A4, and C1, in particular, informed the development of this proposal which would permanently allow more housing types and affordability levels throughout neighborhoods while planning for higher density housing around transit and services. The full Housing Action Plan can be found [online](#).

**Miscellaneous Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies.** Comprehensive plan goals and policies—apart from policies LU 1.3 and LU 1.4—are supportive of expanded housing choice, diverse affordability levels, and access to services in every neighborhood. For a list of comprehensive plan goals and policies which support the proposal, see Exhibit H. As shown in that Exhibit, several policies in the current comprehensive plan support greater housing choice and diversity while some, namely those amended by this proposal, seem to support a more homogenous housing stock in most of the City. Resolving this tension between the existing policies in Chapter 3 (and elsewhere) represents one of the goals of the overall proposal.

The proposal is generally consistent with current comprehensive plan policies. There is an existing tension between the interpretation of policies LU 1.3 and LU 1.4 in Chapter 3, Land Use of the comprehensive plan and the rest of the policies in the comprehensive plan, as identified in Exhibit H, and further described in the staff analysis of Criterion K.1 below. In accordance with the considerable public engagement effort, City and state direction for housing policy, and the intent of the original values in Chapter 3, this proposal aims to ease this tension in the comprehensive plan and improve overall internal consistency.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

2. **If a proposed amendment is significantly inconsistent with current policy within 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.**

**Staff Analysis:** The proposal is generally consistent with the comprehensive plan as discussed in item 1 above.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

**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.

**Staff Analysis:** This proposal is consistent with countywide planning policies (CPPs), specifically affordable housing policies 1, 4, and 6, which call for jurisdictions to provide a diverse mix of
housing types and affordability through inclusionary zoning practices and the development of higher density housing near employment. No comments have been received from any agency or neighboring jurisdiction which would indicate that this proposal is not regionally consistent.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

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.

**Staff Analysis:** This proposal is the only proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan this year. Private applications for comprehensive plan amendments were suspended to focus on the permanent replacement of the Building Opportunity and Choices for All (BOCA) interim ordinance before it expired. As the only proposal for 2023, there is no cumulative impact to consider.

This proposal satisfies this criterion.

H. **SEPA:** SEPA Review must be completed on all amendment proposals and is described in Chapter 17E.050.

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).

**Staff Analysis:** The application is under review in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), which requires that the potential for adverse environmental impacts resulting from a proposal be evaluated during the decision-making process. Based on the information contained in the environmental checklist, 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 Determination of Non-
Significance was issued on June 12, 2023 (see Exhibit I). It is worth noting that adoption of ordinances and other non-project actions taken by a city to implement the middle housing options encouraged by the State legislature and Ordinance C36232 are not subject to administrative or judicial appeals under Chapter 43.21C RCW.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

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.

Staff Analysis: As the proposal retains the density ranges of development in residential land use designations that were used for the planning of facilities and services, it is not expected to impact the City’s ability to provide those facilities or services at the planned level of service.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

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.

Staff Analysis: The proposal does not include an expansion to the Urban Growth Area, thus this criterion does not apply.

This criterion does not apply.

K. Demonstration of Need:

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.

Staff Analysis:

Following on the heels of the Building Opportunity and Choices for All (BOCA) interim ordinance, as well as the Mayor’s proclamation of a housing emergency⁶, the city has undertaken an extensive public engagement process exploring the topic of housing and the performance/effect of the comprehensive plan on the development of diverse housing types and opportunities throughout the city (see section V above). Throughout this process it has become clear that amendments to the comprehensive plan are necessary to address the community’s needs and to resolve certain tensions within the polices and language of the comprehensive plan. These tensions center on the many policies calling for greater housingdevelopment diversity versus a few that seem to press for more uniform residential

⁶ Mayor’s Proclamation – July 26, 2021
types in most areas (see discussion under criterion E.1 above and Exhibit H for more information).

Accordingly, this proposal aims to clarify and enhance the current comprehensive plan in three key areas:

1. Update the vision and values to clarify their intent and meet the current and future needs of the community;
2. Bring development policy into alignment with other policies in the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the originally designated density of residential development; and
3. Clarify the relationship between Centers and Corridors and development of smaller scale housing, with gradual transitions between intensities.

Area 1: Community Need

While many of the guiding principles established by the community during the 2001 Comprehensive Plan still apply, review of Chapter 3, Land Use, with community members has indicated that adjustments are necessary to bring the document into alignment with the community’s vision and values. Existing value language like “protect”, “character”, and “sprawl” mean different things to residents than they might have when originally written. Accordingly, the proposed amendment was developed to be clearer about the intent of the values, to make the language more inclusive, and to highlight what current residents want to see for Spokane. However, none of the proposed amendments are intended to supplant or substantially shift the existing community vision provided by the original comprehensive plan. Rather these refinements have been developed to clarify and enhance the existing land use strategy.

Area 2: Density

By indicating that middle housing is appropriate in all residential areas, the proposal may appear to provide for an increase in the possible development intensity within existing residential land uses. However, recent analysis has indicated that the currently adopted language (as well as implementing Municipal Code provisions) and an overemphasis on policies LU 1.3 and LU 1.4 has contributed to a general reduction in development densities in recent years, in some cases below the City’s density minimums. This has occurred in part because density is considered on a lot-by-lot basis via restrictions placed on housing type and unit counts in the municipal code. The proposal seeks to remedy this overemphasis on density while still calling on new development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods. Any increase in development following adoption of this proposal would serve to bring the densities of each land use designation within the intended range originally adopted in the comprehensive plan. Any overall increase in density or development intensity would be moderated citywide by the fact that the vast majority of the city is already developed—the effect of this proposal is largely on infill development.

The proposal does include significant text amendments to the names and descriptions of various residential land uses. However, while the naming conventions for the residential
land use plan map designations would be changed by the proposal, the assumed density for those designations remain. The descriptions added for the various residential land uses are more in line with existing policy in the Comprehensive Plan calling for diversity and choice in all parts of the City, and do not represent a new paradigm in land uses or their preferred development types.

Area 3: Transitions to C&C

In addition to the discussion of housing diversity, some minor amendments have been included that make it clearer that residential intensity should rise as development nears Centers and Corridors. Centers and Corridors have been the cornerstone of the City’s adopted focused growth strategy since the 2001 Comprehensive Plan. The intent of focused growth is to develop higher density housing around Centers and Corridors where amenities, facilities, services, and employment are highest. However, existing language leaves some uncertainty where Centers and Corridors begin and end and whether growth should occur only in these areas, or just more growth than in single family residential areas. This uncertainty has historically made some comprehensive plan amendments difficult to process.

The intent of this proposal is to clarify some of the existing language on this topic by establishing a range of development that can occur within each land use plan map designation and calling for a gradual transition between the lowest intensity uses in residential neighborhoods and the highest intensity uses in Centers and Corridors. The proposed updates to the names and descriptions of the residential land use designations on the land use plan map aim to solidify this concept in accordance with goals of this project.

In summary, the intent and effect of the proposal is to refine the existing vision of the comprehensive plan and to provide enhanced language that results in better implementation of that vision throughout the city.

This proposal satisfies this criterion.

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 and subarea plans better than the current map designation.

   Staff Analysis: The proposal is not changing any boundaries on the existing land use plan map. Residential land use plan map designations would be updated to reflect the new naming conventions described above but no other map changes are proposed.
This proposal satisfies this criterion.

3. **Rezones, Land Use Plan 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.

**Staff Analysis:** As the proposal would not change the land use plan map designation of any parcel, no rezone is required. Nor is a rezone of any property a part of the proposal.

The proposal satisfies this criterion.

**VII. CONCLUSION**

The proposal has been processed and considered according to the requirements of the Spokane Municipal Code. According to the information provided above and the whole of the administrative record, the proposal is consistent with the approval criteria set forth by SMC 17G.020.

Following the close of public testimony and deliberations regarding conclusions with respect to the review criteria and decision criteria detailed in SMC Chapter 17G.020, Plan Commission will need to make a recommendation to City Council regarding the proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan map of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

**VIII. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Considering the above information and the whole of the administrative record, staff recommends that Plan Commission and the City Council **approve** this proposal.

**IX. LIST OF EXHIBITS**

A. Proposed Text Amendments  
B. Community Organization Roundtable Summary  
C. Faith-Based Organization Roundtable Summary  
D. Housing Journey Survey Summary  
E. Resident Forum Summary  
F. Agency Comments  
G. Public Comments  
H. Comprehensive Plan Policies  
I. SEPA Determination & Environmental Checklist
Exhibit A

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Chapter 3, Land Use Text Changes (Tracked Changes and Matrix of Changes)
3.2 VISION AND VALUES

Spokane volunteers working to develop the 2001 Comprehensive Plan identified important themes in relation to Spokane’s current and future growth. A series of visions and values was crafted for each element of the Comprehensive Plan that describes specific performance objectives. From the Visions and Values document, adopted in 1996 by the City Council, the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies were generated. In 2023, the City endeavored to explore these visions and values further, seeking to refine them in the face of an ongoing housing crisis (see the Spokane Housing Action Plan). Accordingly, the City held numerous meetings and roundtable discussions with the public and key housing stakeholders in the region and crafted updates to the vision and values herein.

Land use is defined as the general location of various uses of land, concentrations of population density, and building intensities, of development (size, height, lot coverage, etc.).

Vision

Growth will be managed to allow a mix of land uses that fit, support, and enhance Spokane’s neighborhoods livability, protect the environment, and sustain the downtown area, and broaden the economic base of the community.

Values

The things that are important to Spokane’s future include:

- Acquiring and preserving and enhancing the natural areas inside and outside the city;
- Controlling urban sprawl in order to managing urban growth to ensure development results in equitable, livable, community-oriented neighborhoods, contributes positively to the City’s financial resources, and to protects outlying rural areas;
- Developing and maintaining convenient access and opportunities for shopping to amenities, services, education, and employment for people of all ages and abilities in all parts of the city;
- Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods, celebrating the uniqueness of each neighborhood while allowing for growth and diversity everywhere;
• Ensuring equitable housing supply by encouraging diversity of housing choice, mitigating the
effects of displacement on existing residents, and ensuring attainable and accessible housing for
all members of the community;

• Guaranteeing a variety of densities that support a mix of land uses; and

• Utilizing current residential lots before developing raw land. Encouraging development in built
areas while promoting complementary changes in all parts of the city; and

• Balancing stability and flexibility by reviewing and amending standards in an orderly and
thoughtful fashion as needs change in the city.

3.3 GOALS AND POLICIES
Goals and policies provide direction for planning and decision-making. Overall, they indicate desired
directions, accomplishments, or aims in relation to the growth and development of Spokane. The land
use goals and policies establish a framework for future growth and development of the city.

Much of the future growth will occur within concentrated areas in Neighborhood
Centers, District Centers, Employment Centers, and Corridors, and Downtown (the Regional Center), as
designated on the Land Use Plan Map. Significant growth occurs in these Centers and
Corridors, established single-family with changes in other areas (like existing residential neighborhoods
will remain largely unchanged) guided towards more compatible uses and scales that fit well into those
existing areas.

The Centers and Corridors contain a mix of uses, including higher density-intensity housing centered
around or above retail and commercial establishments, office space, and public and semi-public activities
(parks, government, and schools). In addition to these uses, areas designated as Employment Centers
emphasize a strong employment component such as major offices or light industrial uses. Street patterns
within the Centers and surrounding neighborhoods enable residents to walk or bicycle for their daily
service needs and to access each center’s transit stop. Higher density-intensity housing within and around
the Centers supports business in the Center and allows for enhanced transit service between Centers,
along Corridors, and to the downtown area. Center designations on the Land Use Plan Map may change
to reflect neighborhood planning decisions.

Other important directives of the land use goals and policies include:

• limiting commercial and higher density development outside Centers and Corridors to support
growth and development of Centers and Corridors;

• directing new higher density housing to Centers and Corridors and restricting this type of
development in single-family areas; and

• using design guidelines to ensure that commercial buildings and higher density housing are
compatible with existing neighborhood character in and around Centers and Corridors.

--- No other proposed changes until page 3-8 ---
residential uses in every neighborhood while ensuring that new development complements existing development and the form and function of the area in which it is located.

**Discussion:** The city’s residential neighborhoods are one of its most valuable assets. They are worthy of protection from the intrusion of incompatible land uses. Centers and Corridors provide opportunities for complementary types of development and a greater diversity of residential densities. Diversity in both housing type and residents in these areas is essential for the wellbeing and health of the city’s neighborhoods. Lower intensity residential uses, from detached homes to middle housing types, are generally compatible with each other and can be incorporated effectively into all neighborhoods. Accordingly, some residential areas would benefit from slightly increased intensities of residential use (e.g., somewhat taller buildings, more lot coverage), dependent on the context and nature of the surrounding neighborhood. These areas of increased residential development should focus on those parts of the neighborhood where proximity to adequate transportation (such as frequent transit), parks, schools, shopping, and other services already exists and where conditions allow for accommodation of increased utility/service needs and other impacts such as parking or the need for public green space.

Complementary types of development may include places for neighborhood residents to walk to work, shop, eat, and recreate. Complementary uses include those serving daily needs of residents, including schools, churches, grocery stores, recreation facilities, and small-format retail and medical uses. Development of these uses in a manner that avoids negative impacts to surroundings is essential. Creative mechanisms, including design standards, must be implemented to address these impacts so that potential conflicts are avoided.

The following graphics are provided as a conceptual guide to different intensities envisioned by this policy. These are schematic representations of possible development intensities and are not intended to call for specific structure designs or architectural details.

![Low Intensity and Increased Intensity](image)

For specific guidance as to the land use plan map designations guided by this policy—“Low Intensity Residential” and “Increased Intensity Residential”—see Section 3.4 below.

**LU 1.4 Higher Density Intensity Residential Uses Areas**

Direct new higher density-intensity residential uses to areas in and around Centers and Corridors designated on the Land Use Plan Map and to areas where existing development intensity is already consistent with development of this type.

**Discussion:** Higher density-intensity housing of various types is the critical component of a Center. Without substantially increasing population in a Center’s immediate vicinity, there is insufficient market demand for goods and services at a level to sustain neighborhood-scale businesses. Higher density residential uses in Centers range from multi-story condominiums and apartments in the middle to small-lot homes at the edge. Other possible housing types include townhouses, garden apartments, and housing over retail space—more intense commercial development. Residential uses in and around Centers...
Generally consist of multi-story condominiums and apartments. In some cases, smaller-scale residential development may be interspersed among those higher intensity uses, but generally uses of higher scale and height should predominate in these areas, especially as proximity to designated Centers or Corridors increases. Likewise, residential development should increase in height, mass, and lot coverage as properties are located closer to commercial areas or where employment is higher.

To ensure that the market for higher density intensity residential use is directed to Centers, future higher density housing of higher scale and form is generally limited in other areas. The infill of Residential 15+ and Residential 15-30 residential designations located outside Centers are confined to the boundaries of existing multi-family residential designations where the existing use of land is predominantly higher density residential. Whenever more intense residential uses are proposed outside the general vicinity of Centers and Corridors, topics such as the proximity of those areas to uses like commercial or downtown uses should be considered. Design and site requirements should be considered that minimize conflict between these areas and other uses.

The following graphics are provided as a conceptual guide to different intensities envisioned by this policy. These are schematic representations of possible development intensities and are not intended to call for specific structure designs or architectural details.

--- No other proposed changes until page 3-24 ---

**LU 3.6 Compact Residential Patterns**

Allow more compact and affordable housing in all neighborhoods, in accordance with design guidelines.

**Discussion**: Compact and affordable housing includes such choices as townhouses, accessory dwelling units (granny flats), live-work housing, triplexes, zero-lot line, starter, small-lot, and row houses. Middle housing types such as these are compatible with all residential areas, commensurate with policy LU 1.3 above.

--- No other proposed changes until page 3-28 ---

**LU 5.5 Compatible-Complementary Development**

Ensure that infill and redevelopment projects are well-designed and compatible with complement surrounding uses and building types.
Discussion: New infill development and redevelopment should be designed and planned to seek compatibility with its location. Consideration should be given to multiple scales of compatibility, from the site on which the use will be constructed to the wider area in which it will reside. New development/redevelopment should seek to expand the choices available in the area while complementing existing use and form of surrounding properties. For example, middle housing types provide for diverse choices in scale and form while also maintaining a high level of compatibility with existing residential neighborhoods.

3.4 DESCRIPTION OF LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Much of the future growth will occur in District Centers, Employment Centers, Neighborhood Centers, and Corridors. A key component of each of these focused growth areas is higher density housing centered around or above service and retail facilities. This enables residents near the Center or Corridor to walk or bicycle for their daily needs. Higher density housing also provides economic support for the businesses and allows for more efficient transit service along the Corridor and between mixed-use Centers and downtown Spokane.

Focusing growth results in a more compact urban form with less land being used at the fringe of the city. It provides city residents with more housing and transportation choices. New policies, regulations, and incentives allow mixed use in designated Centers and Corridors and assure that these areas are designed to be compatible with surrounding lower density residential areas.

The following land use plan map designations are necessary for development and growth in the city to achieve the vision and values discussed at the beginning of the chapter. These land use designations are shown on the following map, LU-1 Land Use Plan Map, which apply the requirements of land use and the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to the physical environment, describing the types of development expected in each area. The overall strategy, as described above, is that development mass, height, and lot coverage be concentrated in focused growth areas (Centers and Corridors) while the remaining parts of the city remain occupied by lower intensity uses. Furthermore, future changes to the land use plan map should seek to achieve a transition between areas of lower and higher development mass and form and should avoid locations where the lowest intensity uses immediately transition to the highest intensity uses.

There is expected to be some variation in residential zones within each residential land use plan map designation. Contextual factors such as proximity to services, transportation options, and existing land use patterns should be considered when assigning a zoning category.

The land use designations and their general characteristics are as follows:

Note: the following items have been reordered to list them from lowest to highest intensity. That change is not shown in the “tracked changes” below.

Residential 4-10: This designation allows single-family residences, and attached (zero-lot line) single-family residences. The allowed density is a minimum of four units and a maximum of ten units per acre. Allowed structure types are single-family residences, attached (zero-lot line) single-family residences, or two-family residences in appropriate areas. Other residential structure types may be permitted through approval of a Planned Unit Development or other process identified in the development regulations.
**Residential Low:** The Residential Low land use designation should focus on a range of housing choices built at the general scale and height of detached houses. This includes both detached and attached homes and housing categorized as middle housing (duplex, triplex, etc.). Combinations of these types should also be allowed, such as a duplex with an accessory dwelling unit. Other non-residential uses should be allowed conditionally, provided they integrate into the nature and context of the neighborhood. This would include uses such as schools, churches, grocery, small-format retail and medical services, and other resident serving uses.

Residential Low areas are appropriate in parts of the city where amenities and services are scaled for a lower level of development intensity.

**Residential 10-20:** This designation allows single-family residences or two-family residences on individual lots or attached (zero-lot line) single-family residences. The allowed density is a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 20 units per acre. Allowed structure types are single-family residences or two-family residences on individual lots or attached (zero-lot line) single-family residences. Other residential structure types may be permitted through approval of a Planned Unit Development or other process identified in the development regulations. **Residential Increased:** Uses in the Increased Intensity Residential designation are largely similar in type to low intensity residential areas. However, the overall development scale of those uses should be slightly higher, including possible design allowances like increased lot coverage, height, and other similar design requirements. The intent of Increased Intensity Residential areas is to provide a gradual increase in intensity, height, and overall context as the lower intensity areas transition into the more intense uses found in Centers and Corridors or significant commercial areas.

Residential Increased areas are appropriate whenever predominately lower scale residential is located near or around more intense uses like commercial locations or designated Centers and Corridors. Factors to be considered in designating such areas should include proximity to arterials and collectors, availability of transit, the nearness of more intense development, available capacity in systems and infrastructure, and any other factors that help ensure the proposed land use designation integrates well into the existing built environment.

Development allowed in these areas is expected to be larger in form (height, lot coverage, etc.) than those in the Low Intensity Residential areas, while still maintaining a high level of continuity and consistency between the two less intense residential areas.

**Residential 15-30:** This designation allows higher density residential use at a density of 15 to 30 units per acre. **Residential Moderate:** Residential Moderate areas provide increased intensity of development more appropriate to areas in the vicinity of designated Centers and Corridors and those served by substantial commercial or employment opportunities. The typical type of residential development appropriate to this designation include larger apartment buildings while also including a mix of the lower intensity areas where warranted. Example apartment types include the three-floor walkup and traditional apartment complexes as well as larger townhome and condo complexes. If neighborhood serving uses are included, such as churches or community centers, those non-residential uses can be of a higher scale and intensity than those conditionally permitted in Low and Increased Intensity Residential areas.

Residential Moderate uses should be generally limited to within moderate walking distance of a Center, Corridor, or major employment/commercial area. Placement of Moderate Residential outside walking distance of these more intense areas is acceptable if sufficient rationale exists to place them further out—such as proximity to high-capacity or frequent transit service (aka Transit Oriented Development).
**Residential 15+:** This designation allows higher density residential use at a density of 15 or more units per acre or more. **Residential High:** The Residential High designation allows for the highest intensity of residential uses, including construction types found in the Moderate Intensity Residential designation but also including taller and more intense apartment complexes. High Intensity Residential areas are intended to focus residential intensity in the near vicinity of downtown and other Centers and Corridors in the city, where sufficient services and employment opportunities exist nearby. A focus on accessibility, walkability, and equitable housing provisions should be provided in this area, including incentives and other bonuses for more affordable/attainable units as these areas are also located near to services and essential facilities like frequent transit.

--- No other proposed changes until page 3-41 ----

Note: the four residential intensities listed in table LU 2 have been reordered to list them from lowest to highest intensity. That change is not shown in the “tracked changes” below.

The following table, LU 2, “Description of Land Use Designations,” provides the names of the Land Use Map designations, a description of the typical land uses found in each designation, and some of the applicable development standards. While the following table provides the approximate range of residential density expected in some areas, this is not intended to be a site-by-site maximum limit for development. The number is provided here for the planning and provision of services and utilities in these areas (see Chapter 5, Capital Facilities and Utilities) and represents the average density one might expect in these areas. Conversely, where minimum densities are listed, implementing codes and practices should seek to achieve or exceed those minimums in general. The table is followed by the Land Use Plan Map which shows the location of the various land use designations that are described in the following table:

**TABLE LU 2 – DESCRIPTION OF LAND USE DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Typical Land Use</th>
<th>Assumed Density (Units per Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>Heavier Industrial uses. No residential uses.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>Light industrial uses, limited commercial and residential uses.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial and residential uses, warehouses.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Center (Downtown)</td>
<td>Variety of goods, services, cultural, governmental, hospitality, and residential uses. Downtown plan provides detail of planning for this area.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Retail</td>
<td>Neighborhood-Serving Business and residential use. Maximum containment area of two acres.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Mini-Center</td>
<td>Same uses as Neighborhood Retail.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Offices and residential use.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designations</td>
<td>Typical Land Use</td>
<td>Assumed Density (Units per Acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Includes uses such as middle and high schools, colleges, universities, and large</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>governmental facilities.</td>
<td>standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or as allowed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 4-10 Low</td>
<td>Attached or detached single-family and</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residence and middle housing types.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 10-20</td>
<td>Attached or detached single-family and</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>two-family residences. Middle housing types of greater scale or intensity than in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower intensity areas, with potential for mixed-use, neighborhood scale retail and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 15-30</td>
<td>Higher density residences. A mix of more intense middle housing types and</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>moderate-sized apartment, condo, townhome developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 15+ High</td>
<td>Higher density residences. Large apartment, condominium, townhouse developments,</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potentially on multiple sites with site planning and features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agricultural lands of local importance.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Areas that are publicly owned, not developed and designated to remain in a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>natural state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Areas that are not currently publicly owned, not developed and expected to remain in</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>a natural state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Major publicly or privately owned open space areas such as golf courses, major</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parks and open space areas, and cemeteries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Neighborhood-oriented commercial uses, offices, mixed-type housing, parks, civic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uses in a master-planned, mixed-use setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Center</td>
<td>Community-oriented commercial uses, offices, mixed-type housing, parks, civic uses</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in a master-planned, mixed-use setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Community-oriented commercial uses, mixed-type housing in a master-planned, mixed-use</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>Major employment uses, community-oriented commercial uses, mixed-type housing in a</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>master-planned, mixed-use setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE LU 2 – DESCRIPTION OF LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Typical Land Use</th>
<th>Assumed Density (Units per Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center &amp; Corridor Core</td>
<td>Commercial, office and residential uses consistent with type of designated Center</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Corridor.</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center &amp; Corridor Transition</td>
<td>Office, small retail, and multi-family residential uses. Office and retail uses are required to have residential uses on the same site.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following changes are proposed for the Glossary, located at the end of the Comprehensive Plan. These will be placed in their proper alphabetical order if adopted.

**Glossary**

**Intensity (of Development)**

Development intensity refers to factors beyond simple density (e.g., units per acre). Instead, the concept of development intensity focuses on the mass, form, and function of development. A tall building with many floors, covering a large proportion of the site, and requiring a high level of service/utility connections would be considered a “high intensity” use. A small building, covering less of the lot, of less height, and integrated into the physical environment in which it is located would be a lower intensity use. In the case of housing, middle housing types are considered “low intensity” while multi-story apartment buildings are considered “high intensity.”

**Livability**

Livability in the Comprehensive Plan encompasses the positive attributes that make places feasible and enjoyable to live, work, and visit. The values that support livability include but are not limited to:

- **Equity**
- **Diversity (both physical and social)**
- **Accessibility (physical, cognitive, and financial)**
- **Attainability**
- **Walkability and Transit Access**
- **Environmental Sustainability**
- **Integration Between Different Uses**
- **Greenery and Canopy Coverage**
- **Connected Community**
Middle Housing

In accordance with state law, middle housing includes buildings that are compatible in scale, form, and character with single-family houses and contain two or more attached, stacked, or clustered homes such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, sixplexes, townhouses, stacked flats, courtyard apartments, and cottage housing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref#</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Change Made/Proposed</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goals and Policies Preface</td>
<td>Include &quot;downtown&quot; in the list of areas where future growth should occur.</td>
<td>Downtown is a regional center but isn't in the list.</td>
<td>PC President Francis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goals and Policies Preface</td>
<td>&quot;the highest intensity&quot; should read &quot;higher intensity&quot;</td>
<td>Highest may be misconstrued to equate to &quot;only.&quot;</td>
<td>PC President Francis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goals and Policies Preface</td>
<td>&quot;. . . within concentrated areas in and around Neighborhood Centers . . .&quot;</td>
<td>Similar changes were made elsewhere to this effect.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy LU 1.3</td>
<td>Remove &quot;single-family&quot; from &quot;single-family detached homes&quot; in the discussion.</td>
<td>Could be misinterpreted as &quot;single family residential&quot; zone.</td>
<td>Commissioner Beyreuther</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy LU 1.3</td>
<td>The sentence describing areas where increased residential development should be considered should be modified to be in a positive rather than restrictive voice.</td>
<td>As an aspirational document, positive language is more appropriate.</td>
<td>Commissioner Beyreuther &amp; Commissioner Patterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy LU 1.3</td>
<td>Proximity to schools should be a factor in increased intensity development.</td>
<td>The presence of schools nearby is also a sound rationale for increased development.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy LU 1.3</td>
<td>Include a sentence clarifying what kinds of uses are complimentary to residential.</td>
<td>A description will help reviewers understand the types of uses expected.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>Policies LU 1.3 and LU 1.4</td>
<td>Replace placeholder boxes with approved graphics.</td>
<td>The concept of intensity could be better explored graphically.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Policies LU 1.3 and LU 1.4</td>
<td>Add an introduction paragraph for the new graphics.</td>
<td>The need exists to make it clear these are conceptual and not meant to depict ideal/required designs.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policy LU 5.5</td>
<td>Remove &quot;maximum&quot; from discussion.</td>
<td>&quot;Maximum&quot; could lead to exclusionary practices.</td>
<td>Commissioner Williams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 3.4 Preface</td>
<td>Remove &quot;single&quot; from &quot;detached single homes.&quot;</td>
<td>Could be interpreted as &quot;single family&quot; only.</td>
<td>Commissioner Beyreuther</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Change Log -- Building Opportunity for Housing Phase I

**Version Date:** 5/17/2023

"Page" refers to the page number on the current version of the proposed language, not the full chapter text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref#</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Change Made/Proposed</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Suggested by:</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 3.4 Preface</td>
<td>Add a paragraph making it explicit that more than one residential zoning is appropriate in each land use designation.</td>
<td>Reinforcing this concept is helpful when considering future possible amendments.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Use Descriptions</td>
<td>Correct names of residential land uses to match current version (i.e., &quot;residential low&quot; instead of &quot;low intensity residential.&quot;)</td>
<td>Typographical error.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Description of &quot;Residential Low&quot;</td>
<td>Clarify that grocery as well as small format retail and medical are appropriate.</td>
<td>This change reinforces the added language in LU 1.3 above.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Description of &quot;Residential Moderate&quot;</td>
<td>A more positive sentence structure is possible in the second paragraph.</td>
<td>Changes made to use a positive voicing.</td>
<td>Commissioner Beyreuther &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land Use Table Preface</td>
<td>Add a sentence making it clear that minimum density is still an important consideration.</td>
<td>This was not clear in the previous language.</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Land Use Table</td>
<td>Remove &quot;single-family&quot; from &quot;single-family residences&quot;</td>
<td>Could be interpreted as &quot;single family detached&quot; only.</td>
<td>Commissioner Beyreuther</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;I&quot; Definitions</td>
<td>Retain definition of intensity</td>
<td>Helpful to readers and reviewers.</td>
<td>CA Representative Winkes &amp; Commissioner Bank</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Building Opportunity for Housing community roundtable

Event Summary

January 2023
We would like to take the opportunity to thank all of the agencies and individuals who were able to attend our Community Roundtable at the City Central Library on January 24, 2023. We were thrilled to hear from so many of you and we continue to consider the many points raised during the discussion. In an effort to ensure we’ve captured some of the main points, as well as an attempt to help keep these topics moving forward throughout the process, the following summary was created.

Community Roundtable Overview

Following on the heels of the successful Building Opportunity and Choices for All interim ordinance, the Building Opportunity for Housing project intends to develop lasting Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code amendments that increase housing choice and diversity in the city. A significant component of those updates is robust community engagement to inform the vision of housing in Spokane. One spoke of that engagement wheel was a community roundtable held on January 24, 2023.

For this event we purposefully reached out to organizations that work with and for communities that may be disproportionately impacted by the housing crisis. This includes communities of color, aging populations, persons with physical or mental disabilities, immigrant populations, and other marginalized and intersecting identities. Planning Staff is appreciative of the 33 participants who showed up and spent their afternoon talking with us about housing in Spokane.

Identified Opportunities

Participants at the roundtable were asked: “What opportunities are out there for Spokane that we might be missing?” Identified opportunities included:

- Repurposing of existing structures for affordable housing (e.g., hotels);
- Development of incentives for supportive services and food security;
- Inclusion of accessible housing into the conversation, not just affordable;
- Encouragement of mixed-income developments and neighborhood nodes;
Considering “retainable” housing in addition to “attainable” housing by improving community connections and providing support;
Developing vacant or abandoned properties, with the ability for the communities historically pushed out of the neighborhood to direct use and potential development;
Viewing housing as a way to retain and increase diversity;
Identifying barriers to housing for mixed-status families and immigrants;
Focusing on quality of life, beyond just providing a roof over someone’s head;
Providing housing and resources to both low income and low-middle income residents;
Educating the community on the process of changing the development code and providing feedback to the City;
Improving the transparency within the development code process;
Addressing the impact of Short-Term Rentals (Air BnB, VRBO, etc.) on the housing market;
Considering the special needs of pregnant individuals and adults leaving foster care;
Paying community members to participate in community planning, which leads to cultural sustainability; and
Protecting and assisting renters just as much as homeowners.

Identified Barriers

During the roundtable discussion, the group identified and discussed some barriers to the housing opportunities discussed in the first part.

Access to transit, specifically when the focus of all growth is within Centers & Corridors, transit is less likely to expand within neighborhoods;
Building Code requirements making 3+ units infeasible due to costs (Commercial Review);
Restrictive HOA covenants and historic deed restrictions;
Gentrification in Spokane pushing all-income residents out, both historically and today;
Unclear regulatory process and how community members can advocate for themselves;
Stormwater standards—the lack of allowed new technologies;
Design standards that don’t necessarily improve quality of life;
The view of housing as a business, rather than a human right; and
Socially exclusive Neighborhood Council meetings disenfranchising renters and marginalized communities.
Accountability

At the end of the roundtable discussion, participants were asked what accountability looks like for City staff. As in, how can staff ensure participants feel heard and that their input was going to be considered when making recommendations to the appropriate decision makers? The ensuing conversation included the following recommendations and thoughts:

- Continue the conversation, both internally and externally;
- Maintain connections with the community organizations;
- Work to break down any barriers by working internally and externally;
- Do not say “we can’t do that”, but rather find out who can;
- Ensure a transparent process by explaining the next steps and reasonings;
- Provide clear intent of every action; and
- Create change that is innovative and not recycled placation.

To that end, the Building Opportunity for Housing Community Roundtable Summary document is the first step in showing accountability, by ensuring transparency and continuing the conversation. However, staff knows there is additional work to be done.

Parking Lot

During the conversation, specifics concepts were brought up that are not within the purview of the Building Opportunity for Housing project. However, there is recognition that successful community planning relies on the interconnection and collaboration of services. As such, a “parking lot” was established to capture these ideas so they could be sent to the appropriate project teams, City Department, or decision maker. Where we have already identified which department or City function is either currently addressing those issues or will be in the future, we have included their name in parentheses after the item.

- Re-evaluate the concept and purpose of Centers and Corridors designations (Planning & Economic Development¹);
- Provide adequate staffing to ensure robust consideration of all planning or other city-led projects (City Council and Mayor’s Office);
- Create a robust mechanism for land banking, particularly with the direction of historically disenfranchised communities;

¹ Already underway. Contact Colin Quinn-Hurst with questions at cquinnhurst@spokanecity.org.
o Connect the concept of attainability to homelessness and providing unhoused individuals with housing attainable to their situation (CHHS);

o Invest in more supportive programs, particularly wrap-around support (CHHS);

o Improve rental support and how Section 8 is distributed (CHHS); and

o Support the health of residents, recognizing the financial ramifications of medical needs.

Next Steps

The first part of the Building Opportunity for Housing project involves an update of Shaping Spokane, the city’s comprehensive plan. The updates will be targeted to the vision of housing and related policies that are necessary to improve access to housing choice in Spokane. Once the comprehensive plan is updated, development regulations within the Spokane Municipal Code will be updated to modify housing requirements and allowances.

Both the comprehensive plan and development code amendments will first go to Plan Commission for recommendation of approval, before going before City Council for the final decision. City Council decisions are then sent to the Mayor, to sign, veto, or leave unsigned. Of course, we will also keep in touch with you throughout the process and let you all know when there are opportunities to speak/write to City Council as they consider the changes.

As far as engagement, the community roundtable was the first stage in an engagement plan aimed to increase participation in the process. Department staff intends to follow-up with organizations that were unable to attend, as well as further conversations that occurred at the roundtable. Additional engagement efforts for the project will include a multilingual survey, focus group conversations by District, and one-on-one meetings with organizations and agencies that can inform the project. Informational open houses will occur as milestones are met during the process. Department staff is also available to answer questions or receive feedback anytime, at developmentcode@spokanecity.org.
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Building Opportunity for Housing Faith-Based Roundtable

Event Summary

March 2023
Thank you to everyone who was able to attend the Faith-Based Roundtable on March 16, 2023 and thank you to Salem Lutheran Church for hosting the discussion. We are grateful for the useful feedback from religious institutions and affiliated organizations who either provide housing for the community, are interested in providing housing in the future, or simply work with congregations made up of people who are affected by the current housing climate. In an effort to ensure we’ve captured some of the main points, as well as in hope of keeping these topics moving forward throughout the process, the following summary is provided.

Faith-Based Roundtable Overview

Following on the heels of the successful Building Opportunity and Choices for All interim ordinance, the Building Opportunity for Housing project intends to develop lasting Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code amendments that increase housing choice and diversity in the city. One component of the work being undertaken by the Building Opportunity for Housing project is to ensure that the City’s Comprehensive Plan aligns with updated regulations recently passed by the State Legislature. Passed in 2019, House Bill 1377 provided an avenue for religious organizations to request additional density for affordable housing developed on property owned or controlled by the organization. The intent of the bill was to provide religious institutions with more opportunities to redevelop their land with long-term, income-restricted affordable housing. Because Spokane is home to so many faith-based organizations, some of which both desire and are well placed to provide essential housing to those in need, the City is seeking to explore this option and to determine how best to fold it into the overall housing actions the City is contemplating. This is one facet of the many different strategies currently being considered by the City but is an important component in the overall housing picture in Spokane.

As a key exploration into the relationship between faith-based organizations and housing, a faith-based roundtable discussion was arranged with the help of Drew Peterson of Knox Presbyterian and held on March 16, 2023. For this event, faith-based organizations were invited who either actively provide affordable housing, have indicated interest in providing housing in the future, own sufficient land to potentially provide housing on their existing properties, and/or currently provide community services that tie into the topic of housing. Additional organizations with similar focus were also invited to ensure
a diversity of opinion and community to which they serve. In total, 24 participants were able to attend, and those groups spent the afternoon talking with us, and each other, about housing in Spokane.

What is your relationship to housing?

In order to frame the discussion, roundtable participants were first asked to explain their current relationship to housing. Attendees experience with housing ranged from organizations currently providing housing to those who had not yet considered it but whose mission included community support and care for those in need. Of those organizations that currently provide housing, those efforts ranged in type and location, including:

- Housing on the same property as the main church building;
- Housing on property owned by the Church but located separately; or
- By financing/managing programs managed developed by others.

The discussion was wide ranging and illustrative of the range of ongoing efforts and needs. Below are some high-level elements of that discussion:

- Organizations received most the funds available from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in the 1970s and 1980s, allowing for asset purchases;
- Organizations that gained such assets are now able to refinance to provide funds to build housing on the existing property or to purchase new property;
- While much of the funding has come from HUD, program requirements and reporting for HUD programs are currently very difficult for some attendees to navigate;
- Many participants required separate property management services, which could include lending support;
- A desire to provide housing, while maintaining the church use was prevalent;
- Providing housing can serve as an identity-forming activity for the religious organization and the created living community;
- Many are currently providing senior housing, with a desire to create low-income housing for multiple generations; and
- Collectively, religious institutions own a significant amount of property with Spokane city limits, allowing for potential collaboration.

Participants wanted to emphasize that they saw faith-based organizations as part of the housing conversation. While there were differences of opinion on the overall role, faith-based organizations in general were viewed as a small component of the physical aspect of providing housing, but one whose
role could be much larger if more opportunities were available. To the participants, the story of housing needed to be connected to the story of healing, examining community aspects that can lead to a lack of housing.

Identified Opportunities

During the roundtable discussion, the group identified and discussed some barriers to faith-based organizations providing housing and what opportunities exist to mitigate those barriers.

- Reduce parking requirements for church uses on properties also providing housing, to allow for a better use of available space;
- Faith-based organizations are well placed to provide housing in coordination with social services ("housing plus community");
- Due to the difficulty of relying on federal funding, allow both affordable and market-rate housing to open the opportunity for private financing, making projects easier to develop;
- Provide guidance and training to demystify the planning and building process to institutions without significant existing knowledge and comfort with City processes;
- Improve or streamline the process to rezone a property to allow for increased density and/or allow for more mixed-used opportunities;
- Exemptions to faith-based organizations or other non-profit organizations should consider the different ways ownership can impact whether those exemptions apply or not (e.g. property may be owned by the church or by an LLC, the church may be providing financing but not own the property, etc.);
- Exemptions to faith-based organizations should be applied to the organizations and not just the property, to avoid the buying of church properties by developers for housing-only developments;
- Consider religious institutions that own existing property that they want to redevelop, in addition to institutions that want to purchase separate property for housing;
- Develop a program/method for the release of surplus City property for development of housing by faith-based organizations;
- Create a housing benefit district along the freeway where vacant WSDOT property currently exists;
- The desire to “right size” existing church buildings provides the opportunity for more available space for housing on these properties—for churches with smaller congregations, a smaller church building could be sufficient and allow for reuse of the remainder of the property;
- Consider allowing density bonuses for any actions that provide value to the community (community gathering space, social services, affordable housing, etc.); and
o Acknowledge that the City needs to incentivize affordable housing for larger developers, but also needs to make providing affordable housing feasible for entities who already want to provide that resource.

**Continuing the Conversation**

A common theme throughout the roundtable discussion was the group’s desire to keep the conversation going, recognizing that they all shared many of the same goals. As such, Department staff has asked permission from each attendant to share their contact information with the group. Below are some items that were brought up as potential “next steps” for the faith-based organizations:

- Share lessons learned with the group;
- Share financing opportunities;
- Form an interfaith coalition that comments on relevant state legislation, such as HB 1628, HB 1111, HB 1695, and SB 5334;
- Consider how faith-based organizations can provide services and support to persons of all faiths and ideologies;
- Form an interfaith coalition to combine financial resources to allow for larger developments; and
- Collectively or individually consider the social role of faith-based organizations in the conversations.

**Parking Lot**

During the conversation, specifics concepts were brought up that are not within the purview of the Building Opportunity for Housing project. However, we recognize that successful community planning relies on the interconnection and collaboration of services across many topics. As such, a “parking lot” was established to capture these ideas so they could be sent to the appropriate project teams, City Departments, or decisionmakers.

- Unhoused persons should be provided with trash services, or faith-based organizations should be provided with additional services to accommodate the additional need;
- Ensure that youth suffering from homelessness, not just adults, is part of the conversation when providing homeless services;
- Ensure all growth projections and housing needs anticipate continued unprecedented growth, rather than following the current curve; and
- Allow for the ability to use technological advancements (e.g. 3D printing or modular housing) to provide more affordable housing options.

Next Steps

The first part of the Building Opportunity for Housing project involves an update of Shaping Spokane, the city’s comprehensive plan. The updates will be targeted to the vision of housing and related policies that are necessary to improve access to housing choice in Spokane. Once the comprehensive plan is updated, development regulations within the Spokane Municipal Code will be updated to modify housing requirements and allowances. We anticipate this overall effort will be completed by the end of 2023.

Both the comprehensive plan and development code amendments will first go to Plan Commission for recommendation of approval, before going before City Council for the final decision. City Council decisions are then sent to the Mayor, to sign, veto, or leave unsigned.

As far as engagement, the faith-based roundtable was just one opportunity for the participants to stay engaged in the ongoing project. Department staff will continue to be out in the community sharing about the project, both related to the religious institution discussion and beyond. Public comments will be accepted for both phases of the project, to be sent on to the Plan Commission and/or City Council for review during decision making. Department staff is also available to answer questions or receive feedback anytime, at developmentcode@spokanecity.org.
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The following report provides an initial summary of responses to the Housing Journey survey recently issued by the Planning & Economic Development Department. This survey is only part of a larger public engagement strategy around a Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code amendment currently under development by the department, known overall as Building Opportunity for Housing (BOH).

The Housing Journey survey was issued online via the Survey Monkey software between January 23 and March 31 of this year. The survey asked a combination of multiple-choice and text answers exploring topics of past, present, and future housing as well as some general economic and demographic information. Questions were chosen to be understandable and easy to answer by most residents.

**Survey Response Rates and Valid Submittals**

The survey was available online for a total of 68 days via an online form. Respondents were not required to answer every question if they did not want to. The survey was issued in seven languages common in the Spokane region, including English, Spanish, Arabic, Russian, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Marshallese. The survey was originally drafted in English and then translated into these additional languages by Spokane International Translation, a local agency that provides both voice and text translation services. Similarly, text responses that were received in languages other than English were translated by the same firm into English for the consideration of decisionmakers.

During the survey period, the City received 5,226 responses, a record number for a City of Spokane survey. Of those, the following non-English responses were received:

- 31 in Spanish;
- 9 in Arabic;
- 3 in Russian; and
- 3 in Marshallese.

Upon completion of the survey period, staff undertook an overall review and analysis of the responses. During this review, several responses were identified that showed a high probability they were not genuine responses and had been generated by a bot or script. Various criteria were used to confirm this determination, including:

- Completion times of less than one minute;
- Grouped simultaneous submittals that provided identical responses to all questions; and
- Responses in individual records that contradicted answers later in the same survey response.

These suspect responses were analyzed by staff and found to be sourced from international servers in countries known to have issues with internet security. Accordingly, these flagged responses were removed from the results pool and are not represented in the following analysis. A total of 1,809 responses were invalidated, leaving 3,417 valid responses. Those 3,417 will be used going forward for all analysis and discussion.

**Result Fidelity and Census/ACS Comparison**

In the case of this report, fidelity connotes the approximate degree to which the 3,700 responses are representative of the Spokane community. This is not as exact as statistical validity but is a reasonable approach for determining the applicability of results for purposes of the BOH project. To measure the
fidelity of the collected responses, staff compared certain questions in the survey to similar questions asked by the American Communities Survey ("ACS", a product of the US Census Bureau). If the proportion of answers were similar to those given by ACS the survey is considered to have fidelity and readers can reasonably assume that the survey results were not unduly influenced by one part of the community to the detriment of others. To test this, seven ACS variables are presented in the following table alongside the response rates from survey responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked Full Time</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Part Time</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work from Home</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Their Home</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Their Home</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom Home</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom Home</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ACS = 5-year 2021 American Community Survey Results, retrieved from data.census.gov

All response rates between the ACS and the survey were within +/- five percent, suggesting survey results are reasonably representative of the community. However, no part of this analysis is meant to indicate that these results are scientifically or statistically accurate. This is an optional survey whose respondents chose for themselves whether they were sufficiently interested in the topic to respond. As such, the results should not be considered alone and should instead be evaluated alongside other engagement efforts underway by the City (and others) around the topic of housing.

**Current Housing Characteristics**

The first round of questions provided input into the respondents and their current living conditions. As shown in the chart below, the survey asked respondents to indicate their current home type. Responses indicate most live in a house, with the second most living in apartments. The low number of respondents living in duplexes, triplexes, and ADUs may correlate to the low number of units of those types present in the city.

Respondents were also asked to write in an answer if they felt that the available categories did not reflect their current home. Of these “other” responses, several indicated townhomes, while others stated they were living with friends or relatives. Several others indicated “trailer” or “RV.” All told, only 52 respondents felt the need to select the “other” option.

Next, the survey explored the number of bedrooms in the homes of respondents (see next page). The overwhelming majority of
respondents reported either two or three bedrooms. However, both larger and smaller residences are still fairly common. Only 17 percent of respondents were from homes with one or no bedroom, indicating that smaller homes were somewhat less prevalent in the responses.

In addition to the physical characteristics of the home, it is helpful to understand the tenure of current housing—whether respondents rent or own their home. The proportion of responses is shown at right. More than half the respondents, 55 percent, own their home. Nearly 40 percent rent and the remaining live with friends or relatives, or answered “other”.

When reviewing the above results, readers should note that these answers do not indicate the desired condition—some respondents may be living in 3-bedroom homes but are seeking more or fewer bedroom homes. See the “Housing Desire” section later in this report for a comparison between home types in which respondents are currently living and their desired home type.

**Adults and Children in the Home**

The survey asked respondents to report the number of children in their home as well as the number of adults. Children were defined in the survey as those under 18. With these two factors, it is useful to compare the answers together. The following table shows the responses to both questions and how they compare. For sake of clarity, responses of four or more adults or children are combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Data shown in table represent the number of children reported by respondents who also reported that number of adults. For example, to determine the number of times a respondent reported both 1 adult and 2 children, find the intersection of the “1 adult” row and the “2 children” column to find 20 total respondents.
As shown in the table on the previous page, the most common combination was two adults with zero children, though respondents who reported children in the home made up 43 percent of all responses. While responses of more than two children made up only a small percentage of responses (6 percent), a much larger number of responses indicated more than two adults in the home (48 percent). This, combined with the high percentage of responses indicating zero children (57 percent), could indicate that the need for housing options for adults is higher in Spokane than for those with children. However, more study is required to make this determination. Approximately 50 percent of responses to the survey represented households with two or fewer adults and two or fewer children.

Employment Responses

Relatively few questions in the survey concerned economic aspects of housing and need, though some general questions were included. Firstly, respondents’ employment status was requested (results at left). Nearly two-thirds of respondents work full time, coupled with an additional five percent that are “self-employed.” One fifth of the respondents work part time as well. These proportions match, within five percent, similar data provided by the ACS (see the “Fidelity” section above).

The survey next asked respondents to report the location of their work. Fifty percent of respondents work in the City of Spokane, while the remainder either works elsewhere or does not work at all. Of note, four percent of respondents reported “not working” while a further three percent are actively looking for work.

The survey also asked respondents for their typical form of commute. The largest proportion of respondents drive to work (41 percent), but other commute methods are well represented in the responses. Also of note, 11 percent of respondents work from home, a number that is assumed to be much larger after the COVID pandemic than before. As the world continues to
recover from the fallout of a global pandemic and the rise of new technologies that allow many more work from home opportunities, the working environment may continue to change. This number should be monitored in the future, but this survey only provides a point-in-time picture of current employment here.

The survey also asked in what general industries respondents are currently employed (those who are employed). Because there is a very large list of possible industries in common usage, the survey utilized grouped responses that conform to typical Census reporting. As shown below, respondents reported working in a wide range of industries, with all possible industry groups represented. One in five respondents work in the Education/Health industry, with a further ten percent in the Professional/Business Services realm.

Overall, respondents reported a broad range of employment industries, commute types, status, and place of work. Accordingly, responses to other questions are expected to represent a similarly broad range of residents and community members.

### Residence and Mobility

To better understand the degree to which responses are from long-time residents of Spokane or those that have moved here in recent years, the survey asked respondents to report how long they have lived in Spokane (see at left). The survey did not define the term “born here” further, so some respondents may have reported longer times if they lived here in the past, left, and have since returned.

Of note, only 19 respondents indicated that they do not currently live in Spokane. For the remaining responses,
only 300 lived here less than three years (9 percent). More than a quarter of respondents have lived here more than a decade, not including a further 20 percent that reported being born here. Responses span the range of possible residencies, indicating that no one group has overly influenced the survey data. Those not living in the region are not well represented, but they were not the direct target of this outreach effort. Regardless, some of these respondents may benefit from the overall project if they decide to move to the region in the future.

For those that live here, the survey also asked respondents to report the general reason they moved to Spokane in the first place. Responses are shown at right. More than half of respondents were either born here or came to Spokane for work. Perhaps indicating a social aspect to housing need, nearly 20 percent of respondents (622) indicated they moved here to be closer to family.

There is an apparent inconsistency when comparing length of residence to their reason for moving to Spokane. While 692 respondents reported their length of residence as “Born Here,” many more (898) reported that they moved to Spokane because they were born here. There are two possible explanations for this.

Firstly, as is often said, “Spokane is a great place to move back to.” Many residents who have interacted with staff as part of other public engagement efforts have indicated that they were born here, left for employment or school, and moved back to Spokane later. Accordingly, some of these respondents may have answered “born here” on both questions, while others may not have. Secondly, it was not explicit in the survey questions that “born here” as a reason for moving here or as a length of stay indicates that they have lived only here their whole lives. Respondents’ answers to these two questions were left to each respondent’s judgment, thus there is some variability in possible responses.

### Housing Desire and Factors in Securing It

The survey sought to understand better the relationship between where respondents live and where they desire to live. Firstly, the survey asked respondents to report their preferred housing type, with the overall results shown at right. The survey then asked respondents to report what kind of housing they would occupy if cost were not a factor.

If respondents selected “other” as their preferred home type, the survey asked them to enter their preferred type. These ranged widely and included several responses that were outside the concept of “type” as envisioned in this question. That said, many people mentioned ADUs and duplexes as a preferred home type. Co-housing was also a
frequent answer, as was mention of a senior/retirement community. Only four percent of respondents selected “other” as a response here.

The relationship between existing housing and preferred housing can shed light on the overall demand for certain housing types in the city. By comparing these answers, we might better understand those parts of the community that remain in undesired housing types, and how they might migrate to other types if that type of home became available. Results also potentially speak to the potential that smaller, more affordable housing is sometimes occupied by those that seek to move to larger/different housing. Residents vacating a smaller, more affordable unit would then free that unit up for someone who is seeking smaller or more affordable options.

Some adjustment of responses is required to directly compare existing and desired home types. Most of the possible answers to both questions match, but some (like “triplex” or “duplex”) cannot be matched perfectly between the two questions. For the following discussion, any answers that match between the two questions (i.e. house, apartment, condo) are retained, while any that are unique to one question or the other are grouped into the “other” category. The resulting comparison overall is shown in the figure below.

As a rule of thumb, differences in the “live in now” and “wish to live in” answers in the chart provide an approximation of demand for that type. If the second column is greater, then we can assume that demand for that type is greater than our current capacity. Likewise, if the righthand column is lower, then demand is lower than our current supply.

Using this basic comparison as a guide, the chart above indicates that demand for houses is somewhat the same while demand for apartments and rented rooms is significantly lower. In contrast, demand for condos and dormitories is increased. Perhaps most significantly for the considerations of the project at hand, demand for “other” types of housing (including duplexes, triplexes, etc.) is significantly higher. Those seeking these other types of housing are twice those currently living in those types. In general, these responses would seem to indicate a moderate shift in demand from more “traditional” forms (e.g., houses and apartments) to types not currently seen in large numbers in Spokane, like middle housing types.
To further illuminate these comparisons, three charts are provided at right, indicating the home type desired by those currently living in a house, an apartment, and a rented room, in that order. These data are distinct from the comparison on the previous page because they are limited only to the answers of one type of current home type.

Of the 1,648 respondents living in houses now, only 1,197 reported they wish to remain in a house, a reduction of 27 percent. This is a telling difference that may indicate the desire for more housing types in the city outside the “traditional” single-family detached house. It could also point to a desire by many house dwellers to change their housing type, while those living in apartments or other home types might still want to occupy houses. To explore this, the next chart is provided.

The second chart indicates desired housing types reported by apartment dwellers. When asked where they live now, 681 respondents answered “apartment.” Of those 681, only 206 reported wishing to continue living in an apartment (30 percent). However, not all of those wished to leave apartment living for a house. Only 37 percent of apartment dwellers are seeking a house. A further 18 percent are seeking a condo or townhome. This may indicate that ownership of some kind is more important to some apartment dwellers than the physical type of home.

Lastly, the third chart indicates the desired housing type of those who reported they currently live in a rented room. A total of 410 respondents currently live in a rented room. Of those, desire is split nearly evenly among houses, staying in a rented room, and apartments (approximately 23 percent each). A further ten percent desire to live in dormitories (pointing to possible students) and another 10 percent desire a condo situation.
There are more factors involved than just the type of home, of course. The yard and the property on which that home sits have been frequently reported as a factor in choosing a home.

When discussing this topic in the community and with decisionmakers, the assumption is often expressed that most people want a big green lawn with lots of space. To explore that assertion, the survey asked respondents to classify how large their ideal yard would be. Possible answers were subjective, using terms like “average” and “small,” as this question intended to delve into personal attitudes, not specific measured sizes of yards. An option was included for “no yard”, as not everyone was expected to want one.

As shown at right, a range of answers were provided, but the peak was for an “average” yard size. More telling, however, is the high number of “small” responses as well as a notable number of “none/very small.” Approximately 37 percent of respondents are seeking a small, very small, or no yard, potentially speaking against traditional detached home subdivisions with large yards, and more towards middle housing types with shared or smaller yards per lot.

To further explore this group of responses, the chart at right provides the housing types sought by only those that want either a small yard or no yard at all. Of those 1,199 respondents, a quarter are also seeking a house, further supporting the concept that a large house with a large yard may not represent the main desire of Spokane residents as it may have in the past.

In addition to comparisons of house type and yard size, it is useful to consider that the answer might differ depending on the phase of life of the respondent. For instance, the question has arisen whether retired persons in general desire smaller yards. US Census data has shown that the share of the population 65 years old and older has increased in Washington and is expected to continue increasing. If retired persons do in fact desire smaller yards, the increasing share of the population that is retired could directly affect the overall answers to the survey. To account for this, the chart at the top of the next page separates out yard size desired by retired persons from all others.

While there is some variation between retired and non-retired respondents, the two sets of answers show a similar curve. Answers of “Very Large” or “Large” seem less prevalent among retirees, perhaps
supporting the assumption that many retirees desire smaller yards. However, retirees also seem to desire average yards more often than non-retired persons.

Barriers and Challenges Faced by Respondents

The survey not only asked respondents what they desired, but also to report on their experiences in the past. As a general indicator of difficulty, respondents were asked to grade the relative ease or difficulty they experienced when finding both their current and past residences.

As shown in the chart at right, it made little difference if respondents were considering their current housing or their previous home. The answers in each category largely conformed regardless. Of note is that the fewest respondents felt either experience was extremely difficult (11 percent), while nearly three quarters of respondents felt that their experiences were between somewhat easy and somewhat difficult.

Somewhat surprisingly, the highest number of respondents reported that their current and past housing was somewhat easy to obtain. However, because this survey includes both people who recently moved to Spokane and those that have lived here a long time (or all their lives), it is helpful to break these results down by respondents’ length of residency. The second chart indicates answers to the “current housing” question, limiting respondents to only those that have lived in Spokane less than two years or those that have lived here three to five years.

By looking closer at recent residents, some interesting conclusions can be reached. Most cogent to the considerations of this project, it appears that...
recent residents (those less than two years) reported a more difficult time finding housing than those that moved her three to five years ago. What cannot be determined from this survey is the effect the COVID epidemic had on this response. However, it is sufficient to assume that the ease by which recently arrived residents find housing in Spokane is worsening of late.

The survey also asked respondents to choose from a list of common housing hardships and provide the top three they experienced when seeking and securing housing. Respondents were also provided an opportunity to enter something else if they felt something was missing from the selected answers. The chart at left provides the various difficulties reported by respondents.

High cost, lack of choice, and lack of availability were each reported the most. A low number of “other” responses were reported as well (approximately 6 percent of the time). Among answers of “other” to this question, respondents often indicated difficulties that are closely related to the choices already listed—such as cost, difficulty finding homes, and availability in a preferred neighborhood. However, some unique difficulties were mentioned, including the inability to find a place that would accept pets, difficulty securing a loan, and rising interest rates. Some also mentioned that cash buyers were making it hard for those with loans to purchase homes in Spokane.

In an effort to explore desire and need further, the survey also asked respondents to indicate the best thing about their life by choosing from a list of possible answers. The various answers received from respondents are shown below.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the most respondents by far listed family as the best thing about their life. Only about 11 percent listed their home as their answer, potentially indicating need for improvement in housing conditions in the city. As a secondary concern, the high “family” response rate indicates a possible focus on community and social aspects over physical housing needs. However, home is a critical component of community and society—a safe home is generally understood to be a critical component in the happiness of any person, family, or group.

“Other” responses to this question ranged widely. The vast majority of these “other” answers relate to the other possible answers (i.e., “time with family” could also be classified under the “family” response). However, some unique responses stood out, including
mentions of work/life balance and topics of religion or faith. Still others mentioned that the best thing in their life was that they were now retired.

As a follow up question to the best thing about life, the survey also asked respondents to report the top thing in their life they would change if they could (see results at right). Possible answers were chosen by staff to somewhat coordinate with the previous question. The chart at right provides the response from respondents.

The most frequent request to this question was “a better home.” Considering the low number of respondents who indicated in the last question that home was the best thing about their life, respondent satisfaction with their home is both important and relatively low at this time.

A follow up question was asked as well regarding the topic of happiness and satisfaction. This open-ended question asked respondents to describe the one thing in their life has had the most influence on their happiness, not including job or family. The survey did not specify if that thing should be positive or negative. Using a word cloud association tool, the following terms arose most frequently (see below). As shown in the graphic, home and housing were two of the most frequent words that showed up in the 1,793 answers provided to this question. Community was also prevalent in answers as well as God or other terms of faith.

Note: The more often a term appeared in the text answers to the question, the larger the word appears in the word cloud above. The top terms in this word cloud, those most frequently included in responses, were “home, living, and housing, in that order.

To provide some analysis of the responses, staff used various word searches for key topics/terms and recorded the frequency those topics appeared in the responses to this question. Please note that some respondents answered with more than one theme or topic. Major themes identified by staff analysis are shown in the table on the following page.
### Final Conclusions

This effort overall resulted in one of the largest public engagement response rates of any effort to date by the City of Spokane. Accordingly, several major takeaways have arisen from the analysis above for consideration. To provide a summary for decisionmakers, the largest outputs from the Housing Journey survey can be summarized as follows:

1. **The housing crisis is foremost in the community’s mind.** Collected responses make it clear that housing is both important and in crisis in Spokane. A combination of factors, chief among them lack of choice and high prices, have contributed to this condition. Housing is both the highest need as well as the largest factor when achieving happiness and wellbeing in the region.

2. **Choice and diversity of housing type is truly a major factor in the local housing situation.** A significant part of the community still seeks a single family detached home, but the desire for middle housing types is high enough to warrant the development of more middle housing. To put it bluntly, no single housing type can serve the immediate needs or desires of the entire Spokane community.

3. **Demand in the housing market is nuanced.** It would be incorrect to assume that purchasing a detached house with a big yard is the dream of almost all residents. The survey delved deeply into respondents’ desires and found that the dream for many has evolved from the traditional detached house to a range of living situations. Furthermore, respondents’ needs change over time and thus safe, secure housing should be seen as a journey, not a destination.
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Resident Forum Summary
District Resident Forums
Summary

May 2023
We would like to take the opportunity to thank the 22 residents who participated in the Building Opportunity for Housing Resident Forum series. The time spent discussing housing in Spokane and telling personal stories was invaluable. In an effort to formally document the diverse experiences and perspectives shared during these discussions, as well as an attempt to help keep these topics moving forward throughout the process, the following summary has been assembled.

Through the District Resident Forum series, participants put together the puzzle of what a livable and thriving community that supports all members of the community looks like and how we might reach that goal together. No one piece is enough to improve housing in Spokane—it will take many efforts on more than one front. Full details of the extensive conversations held with a diverse range of residents can be found in the following pages. In general, participants identified that:

- “Community” is essential to provide and support housing stability
- Many people’s current housing strategy is limited to “luck”
- People are focusing more on affordability than safety
- The uniqueness of Spokane’s neighborhoods can lead to greater security
- Diversity of housing, which leads to a diversity of income and life experiences, is key
- People are more concerned about complimentary buildings in a neighborhood than what “type” of housing it is—size, height, scale, appearance, etc. is more important than unit count
- Everyone is experiencing difficulties with housing, not just first-time homebuyers or the income constrained
- It’s not only about the building that someone lives in, its about the entire neighborhood
Resident Forum Overview

Following on the heels of the successful Building Opportunity and Choices for All interim ordinance, the Building Opportunity for Housing project intends to develop lasting Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code amendments that increase housing choice and diversity throughout the city. A significant component of those updates is robust community engagement to explore and inform the vision of housing in Spokane.

One strategy of the engagement plan involved district-by-district conversations. These Resident Forums were held to hear from residents about housing in Spokane. The open discussions helped identify opportunities to increase housing and diversity of housing choice, while allowing for community collaboration with the process and between each other. Participants of the Resident Forums were randomly selected from the over 3,000 respondents to the Building Opportunity for Housing survey and were also invited through the Neighborhood Council system. Information about the Resident Forums was also posted on the Building Opportunity for Housing webpage.

Separate meetings were set with each of the three City Council Districts. A final celebratory meeting was then hosted to bring all of the District participants together to celebrate all that was learned and to review possible language refinements to the Comprehensive Plan. Due to the considerable time commitment requested from attendees, compensation for participant efforts was provided.
City Council District 1 is located in northeast Spokane and is represented by Council Members Michael Cathcart and Jonathan Bingle. Resident Forum meetings were held on April 7 and April 21, 2023 at the Northeast Community Center.

The first Resident Forum meeting in each District revolved around sharing participants’ housing journeys and personal experiences, as well as their opinions about housing. Questions were asked to help Planning staff identify what can improve the housing situation in Spokane, but also how the City can improve engagement and other processes to avoid potential reservations held by participants.

**Question 1 – Why did you choose to come tonight?**

- "Housing is out of control"
- "I’m invested in Spokane"
- "Concerned how new development can impact existing neighborhoods"
- "Want to have input on what potential change may look like"
- "Want to learn about the work the City is doing directly from the City"
Question 2 – What is your ideal neighborhood?

- Central courtyards, shared garden space to bring people together
- Enough parking to avoid neighbors being mad at one another
- Monthly neighborhood get-togethers
- Being a close community without excluding newcomers
- Close to schools
- Walkable, improved sidewalks
- Houses not boarded up/condemned
- Mix of densities, but all “house” size (no large apartment complexes)
- Grocery stores/shops within walking, biking, and rolling distance
- Available community spaces
- Self-contained “village” feel

Question 3 – Recall a time when you struggled to find housing. What ultimately tipped the scales (or could have tipped the scales) towards finding your next place?

- A small landlord willing to view the renter as a person instead of a number
- Wages not keeping up with rental prices has led to a current struggle
- Ultimately had to choose the house and not the neighborhood because housing stock throughout the city was in bad condition
- Support from federal financing programs

Question 4 – What does safe and secure housing look like to you? How do we get there?

- Being able to rehab and maintain your home; “houses rot out from under people”
- Structurally safe
- Student-only housing that is vacant all summer is not safe (vacant = no eyes on the street); a diversity of living experiences and housing types can increase safety
- A cleaner neighborhood is a safer neighborhood, so make it easy to dispose of trash

Question 5 – What role do existing residents play in housing new neighbors?

- Landlords can give people a chance or be willing to be a part of Section 8
- Talking to neighbors and providing support
- Connecting good tenants with good landlords
- Encouraging the City to fulfill neighborhood needs, through code enforcement and community policing
• Building community through investments in park benches, public garbage cans, and other human scale investments that make places more livable; “making it easier to be human”

Question 6 – When you heard about this project, what doubts or reservations came to mind? What would keep those doubts from coming true?

• Any engagement is appreciated and better than some past planning efforts
• Concerned about going too far without considering impact on neighborhoods
• Concerned that the project was “just a bunch of city workers making decisions and not caring about people”; participant noted that their perception changed during the meeting

During the conversation, participants identified additional barriers and opportunities for housing in Spokane. The following summarizes those concepts:

- Rentals are not affordable partially because of fees (first and last rent, security deposits, application fees, etc.)
- People do not report bad conditions because they need a place to live and fear retaliation
- Pressure to build/convert to multifamily is not appealing to everyone
- Concerned over multifamily housing bringing a nonstable, rotating group of residents which can prevent community building
- Housing diversity, including a mix of rentals and ownership, can create neighborhood stability
- Impact fees affect smaller developers more than larger developers
- Affordable housing is bought and flipped, leaving out first time homebuyers
- It is often the lack of management of rentals, not the rentals themselves, that cause concerns

The second Resident Forum in each District dug deeper into the participants’ vision for the future of Spokane. To help inform specific updates to the Shaping Spokane Comprehensive Plan, specific language from Land Use, Chapter 3 was presented and discussed.
Question 1 – What have you continued to think about or what is something that has stuck with you from the first meeting?

- Diversity = community
- Concerns over renters not taking pride in the neighborhood; many renters move frequently because of increased rents, not a desire to move
- How to maintain pride in ownership, for homeowners and landlords
- Single-family homes can be tall/imposing just like “multifamily” buildings can; it’s more about form than function

Question 2 – Whether you’ve lived here in Spokane for 20 days or 20 years, what is the biggest change you have seen in the community?

- Growth, more sprawl, reduced homeownership, gradual shift (not sudden change)
- Feels less safe, people are less polite, lack of community
- Planning process now includes more people, less active Neighborhood Councils

Question 3 – What is one positive attribute of Spokane that should be maintained?

- Parks
- Bikeable
- Colorful characters
- Murals/artistic signs
- Teachers and educational institutions
- Unique neighborhoods
- Services and amenities
Once the group discussed the past and present of Spokane, it was time to think about the future. The Comprehensive Plan is the 20-year vision for the city that helps guide decision makers. Resident Forum participants were provided with the existing vision and values found within Chapter 3, Land Use and Chapter 6, Housing of the Comprehensive Plan and asked to explore it with the group. The currently adopted Vision and Values can be found attached in Exhibit A.

**Question 4 – Do you see the current land use values advocating for the type of city you believe Spokane should be? What is missing?**

- Missing stability/consistency, anxiety is caused by not knowing when or how things will change
- Need to emphasize sustainability, particularly in regard to water conservation and wildland fire prevention
- Maintain and foster a small-town feel
- Enhance regional coordination
- Maintain existing housing stock (rehabilitation in addition to redevelopment)
- Physical accessibility to housing and connectivity should be prioritized
- Embrace the unknown and be comfortable with change
- Ensure access to transit
- Use people first language

Next, participants went line by line reviewing the existing Land Use, Chapter 3 values. The following observations were made:

- “Acquiring and preserving the natural areas inside and outside the city”
  - Upkeep and improvements are important, go beyond preservation
  - How are natural areas defined?
- “Controlling urban sprawl in order to protect outlying rural areas”
  - Control is a strong word that doesn’t allow for flexibility
  - Regulate, strategize, or manage may be more appropriate
- “Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods”
  - What is the character of a single-family neighborhood?
    - Architecture?
    - Walkable, safe to play outside and walk dogs?
  - This can prevent density that can make neighborhoods more active, vibrant, and safe
Notes taken during Resident Forum meetings to document the discussions. Much of the conversation focused on people and telling individual stories.
District 2 is located in southern Spokane and is represented by Council Members Betsy Wilkerson and Lori Kinnear. Resident Forum meetings were held on April 6 and April 20, 2023 at the Liberty Park Library.

**Question 1 – Why did you choose to come tonight?**

- “I care because I have to care”
- The details matter when it comes to planning and housing regulations, want to be part of the details
- “To help solve the problem instead of just complaining about it”
- Came to represent people who look like me to insure different voices are included in the conversation when changes are made
- Everyone is currently living in “housing musical chairs”, moving around making decisions based purely on affordability and it is not sustainable
- “You must participate to make things better”
Question 2 – What is your ideal neighborhood?

- Mix of uses
- Ways for people to bump into each other exist
- Small or no lawns, nearby open space
- Strong community connections
- Let people move around equally, within all neighborhoods
- Diverse – people, incomes, housing types, and both renters and owners
- Community gardens
- Trees and shading canopies
- Safe
- Flexible
- Walkable
- Affordable
- “Playable” for children

Question 3 – Recall a time when you struggled to find housing. What ultimately tipped the scales (or could have tipped the scales) towards finding your next place?

- Roommates chose to leave and couldn’t afford to stay – no control over my own housing situation
- Working full time but not finding affordable options
- “Luck is not a housing strategy”, yet it is what many must rely on
- Homebuyer training tipped the scales, avoided a bank taking advantage
- Rent to own opportunities
- Veteran housing services

Question 4 – What does safe and secure housing look like to you? How do we get there?

- Having control over your own housing situation
- Housing that can be kept up, maintained
- Structurally sound, no mold or failing infrastructure
Question 5 – What role do existing residents play in housing new neighbors?

- Create community and a sense of belonging in the neighborhood; host block parties, talk to neighbors
- Model what you want, on a small scale
- Tell our own stories, take away shame and make it easier for others to share their stories
- Talk to City Council, be active in the community and decision-making process
- Building additional units when financially possible (accessory dwelling unit, duplex)

Question 6 – When you heard about this project, what doubts or reservations came to mind? What would keep those doubts from coming true?

- How will these changes affect existing neighborhoods?
- Is the project ignoring past work done in the City?
- Continue being transparent, engaging multiple areas of the community
- Be clear on how the project is leveraging prior work and engagement

Below are identified barriers and opportunities for housing in Spokane that were in addition to the above questions:

- Intersection of housing needed to maintain neighborhood communities; need a mix of renters and homeowners
- Ability to purchase homes downtown desired by younger populations
- People who age out of a single-family homes (larger family, downsizing, etc.) keep it as a rental instead of selling, reducing the stock for first time homebuyers
- “You don’t invest in communities you don’t get to stay in”
- All concerns about neighborhood compatibility is labeled as NIMBY, being weaponized by developers
- Lack of entry level homes to buy
- Neighborhood Council (NC) rules that limit who can be a voting member leaves out parents, people with busy lives and disincentivizes participating in the NCs
- “If you don’t become a landlord, you can’t afford to retire”
- “Create communities people want to invest in” – both socially and physically
During the second Resident Forum, participants dug deeper into their vision for the future of Spokane.

**Question 1 – What have you continued to think about or something that has stuck with you from the first meeting?**

- Importance of community
- Emphasis on cost of housing first, safety and quality of housing second
- Public greenspace is needed to build community
- If everyone keeps their house for a rental as they move to a new house, prices will continue to rise and create a “wealth bottleneck”. On the flip side, rentals are also a nest egg for many people
- What IS affordable?
- Diversity is key for ideal neighborhoods
- More people in a neighborhood can increase random interactions and support community connections

**Question 2 – Whether you’ve lived here in Spokane for 20 days or 20 years, what is the biggest change you have seen in the community?**

**Increased housing prices, decreased housing quality, less open land, stable compared to other places**

**Seclusion, less people talk to each other, more traffic, wages have not changed**

**Downtown, Park, and Library improvements, growing business districts (e.g. Perry and Garland)**
Question 3 – What is one positive attribute of Spokane that should be maintained?

- Community
- Access to nature
- Walkable areas
- Sense of a city but small-town feel
- Arts and culture
- Distinct neighborhoods
- Events and activities

Question 4 – Do you see the land use values advocating for the type of city you believe Spokane should be? What is missing?

- Transit access/transit oriented development
- Sustainability, emphasis on water conservation
- Higher density is not specifically mentioned
- A city built for people, not cars – “Sprawl works for a car centric city, but doesn’t look into the future”
- 20 years goes by fast – how does the plan look further ahead?

The following observations were made as the participants went line by line reviewing the Land Use, Chapter 3 values:

- “Controlling urban sprawl in order to protect outlying rural areas”
  - Feels aggressive without providing solutions (incentivizing building up instead of out should also be included)
- “Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods”
  - “Protect” creates an us-against-them mentality
  - Why are single-family homes the only type of neighborhood/housing being protected?
  - Balance “protect” with new development
  - Biggest investment is someone’s home, so they want to protect it
  - “Character” has historically been used to exclude marginalized communities from neighborhoods
  - There is no agreement of what character means (vibe, architecture, or something else?)
  - Each neighborhood has its own character; there is no such thing as a “single-family neighborhood character”
Council District 3

District 3 is located in northwest Spokane and is represented by Council Members Karen Stratton and Zack Zappone. Resident Forum meetings were held on April 4 and April 18, 2023 at the Shadle Library.

**Question 1 – Why did you choose to come tonight?**

- "People are struggling"
- It’s painful to see the housing issues
- "I feel helpless"
- Appreciate not having current housing insecurity, but know it’s not guaranteed in the future
Question 2 – What is your ideal neighborhood?

- Front porches to increase neighborliness
- Greenery, trees
- Walkable
- Small yards with nearby open space
- Mix of residential and commercial uses
- Community hub with shops
- Native plants and sustainable landscaping
- Natural swales and stormwater
- Accessible sidewalks
- Constructed like a village
- Safe

Question 3 – Recall a time when you struggled to find housing. What ultimately tipped the scales (or could have tipped the scales) towards finding your next place?

- Found an affordable option and got lucky enough to have seen it in time before it was rented out
- Bought a dilapidated house that was too expensive for investors to put money into, but in too bad of shape for most first-time home buyers
- Neighbors were renters who were having the duplex sold out from under them, purchased the property using a home occupied loan and traded units with one of the renters to help avoid displacement (resident tipped the scales for their neighbors)
- Got in early, able to get a foot in the door
- Support from state financing

Question 4 – What does safe and secure housing look like to you? How do we get there?

- A place you know you won’t get kicked out of
- “We’re at the bottom of the barrel now, people’s standards of safe and secure have dopped”
- Stability trumps livability
- Financial insecurity is scarier than physical insecurity when it comes to housing
- Security means there are no unknowns
- People stay in toxic relationships (friends, romantic) due to fear of not having housing; that is not safe or secure
- Being desperate for housing, people do not report substandard housing
- Baseline of housing is warm with a roof and lock
Question 5 – What role do existing residents play in housing new neighbors?

- “I can’t make a big difference to everyone, but I can impact my neighbors”
- Create community and sense of belonging and value, look out for one another
- Work on changing individuals’ minds, if you’re not currently struggling it’s easier to dismiss potential solutions for other people
- “Change is going to happen, so how do we shape that change together?”
- Build accessory dwelling units for long term rentals, not short-term rentals
- “Being neighborly is being safe”

Question 6 – When you heard about this project, what doubts or reservations came to mind? What would keep those doubts from coming true?

- Concerned about how and if change will occur
- Not sure what to expect, appreciated that it was a conversation
- Talk to real people who understand the housing struggle
- Be accessible to people and answer questions, even if they are broad
- Be out in the community constantly talking about the project

Below are identified barriers and opportunities for housing in Spokane that were in addition to the above questions:

- Finding housing with kids and pets is an added struggle
- Development regulations, such as setbacks and the cottage housing code, prevent it from being easy to build affordable housing
- “Density is the solution”
- Height transitions for infill will help increase neighborhood compatibility
- If the landlord is not invested in the property, why would the renter be invested?
- Rehabilitate existing housing stock
- Change can be scary, need to bring people along and demystify the process
- Investors flipping houses drives up costs and pushes out first-time home buyers
- “We are building for the past, not for the reality of today”
During the second Resident Forum, participants dug deeper into their vision for the future of Spokane.

**Question 1 – What have you continued to think about or something that has stuck with you from the first meeting?**

- How the built environment can support community connectivity (front porches, walkability, anything to increase random interactions)
- The importance of greenery and the natural environment to ideal neighborhoods
- Housing security, putting affordability before safety

**Question 2 – Whether you’ve lived here in Spokane for 20 days or 20 years, what is the biggest change you have seen in the community?**

- More sprawl (“sprawl is my fear for Spokane”), less open space and farmland
- Increased traffic, less bikeable, historic neighborhoods have kept their sense of place (because of the people)
- Developers are no longer building what the community needs or desires (bedroom count, location, affordability)

**Question 3 – What is one positive attribute of Spokane that should be maintained?**

- Unique neighborhoods
- Access to nature
- Neighborliness
- Areas with a mix of uses
- The people
- Diversity
Question 4 – Do you see the land use values advocating for the type of city you believe Spokane should be? What is missing?

- Affordability
- Diversity and equitability
- Access to public transportation
- Walkable/bikeable
- Sustainability, impacts of climate change
- How to integrate a mix of uses
- Language needs to be adaptable to change
- Supporting, allowing to thrive, and stewardship should be guiding principles

The following observations were made as the participants went line by line reviewing the Land Use, Chapter 3 values:

- “Acquiring and preserving the natural areas inside and outside the city”
  - Sustainability and improvements should be identified
- “Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods”
  - Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods only means more sprawl
  - Protect should mean upkeep of existing homes (rehabilitate), not to preserve in amber
  - Which neighborhoods are currently being protected and which ones have not been?
  - What does character mean? Character changes and develops with the people
  - There is no one “character” of a neighborhood
  - To protect means there is an adversary
- “Guaranteeing a variety of densities that support a mix of land uses”
  - Single-family neighborhoods appear privileged in the values, which prevents clarity on what this means
  - Emphasize increased density, not just variety
- “Utilizing current residential lots before development raw land”
  - Displacement needs to be addressed
Shared Values

All three districts were brought together for a final celebratory meeting to discuss shared values that arose out of the Resident Forums series and to review draft language influenced by their engagement. The meeting was held on April 28, 2023 at the Central (Downtown) Library.

A summary of key takeaways included:

- Conflicts between what “is” and “what will be” are foremost in everyone’s mind
- Everyone is having difficulty, not just the first-time homebuyer or the income constrained
- It isn’t just about housing availability, but security
- Luck is not a housing strategy
- It is not just about the building, it’s about the entire neighborhood
- It takes a home and a community

A word cloud created from the table and staff notes of all six Resident Forum meetings that was presented at the final meeting on April 28.
The draft language presented to participants was as follows:

- Acquiring, preserving, and enhancing the natural areas inside and outside the city;
- Managing urban growth to ensure development results in equitable, livable, community-oriented neighborhoods, contributes positively to the City’s financial resources, and protects outlying rural areas;
- Developing and maintaining sufficient access and opportunities for amenities, services, and employment in all neighborhoods;
- Celebrating the uniqueness of each neighborhood while allowing for growth and diversity everywhere;
- Ensuring equitable housing supply by encouraging diversity of housing choice, addressing displacement of existing residents, and ensuring attainable and accessible housing for all parts of the community;
- Encouraging redevelopment in already-built areas while promoting compatible changes in residential neighborhoods; and
- Balancing stability and flexibility by reviewing and amending standards in an orderly and thoughtful fashion as needs change in the city.

Discussion around the proposed draft language to Chapter 3, Land Use values included:

- Equity was appropriately added within the proposed language
- How is walkability and bikeability incorporated into the values? What about transit?
- Access to greenspace should be specifically mentioned
- Education and access to schools is missing
- Maintaining and increasing tree canopies should be included as a value
- The use of “sufficient” does not capture the complexity of access and opportunities, almost minimizes their needs with the adjective

The comments received have been incorporated into the final recommended language and will be sent to Plan Commission and City Council for review.

Parking Lot

During the conversations, concepts were brought up that were not within the purview of the Building Opportunity for Housing project. However, there is recognition that successful community planning relies on the interconnection and collaboration of services. As such, “parking lots” were established to capture these ideas so they could be sent to the appropriate project teams, City Department, or decision maker.
• Childcare costs are so high that for many people it is cheaper to be a single income household than to be a two-income household and pay for care
• It is important to maintain a culture of honesty and straightforwardness in local governance
• Getting people educated in the planning and government processes is key to getting more people involved
  o People need to know how it helps/serves them to be involved
• Condos could increase homeownership significantly
• Tiny homes can help increase housing diversity and provide more affordable, smaller housing options
• Incentives to encourage desired behavior (renters, affordable housing) are needed
• Permitting needs to work at the neighborhood impact level, not just the individual property level
• There is a lack of transparency on submitted projects under permit review; need to improve information sharing with citizens
• The potential impact of natural gas bans on housing (e.g., utility costs, replacing appliances)
• The interim ordinance (Building Opportunity and Housing for All) did not incorporate sustainability/environmental practices
• Many people make too much to qualify for housing vouchers or other assistance programs, but not enough to afford housing or basic needs
• Expensive permitting processes incentivize bad design
• Design standards should increase walkability and community connectivity (e.g., less garages and more front porches)
• Improve code enforcement to enforce maintenance of homes and prevent deterioration of buildings
• Ensure solar access is maintained (state incentivizes solar and it is a long-term investment on people’s homes)

Next Steps

The first part of the Building Opportunity for Housing project involves amendments to Shaping Spokane, the city’s comprehensive plan. These amendments will concentrate on the City’s land use
vision for how land use and housing interact. Related amendments to policies necessary to improve access to housing choice in Spokane will be crafted as well. Once the comprehensive plan is updated (tentatively by July), development regulations within the Spokane Municipal Code will be updated to modify housing requirements and allowances.

Both the comprehensive plan and development code amendments will first go to Plan Commission for recommendation of approval, before going before City Council for the final decision. City Council decisions are then sent to the Mayor, to sign, veto, or leave unsigned. Resident Forum participants will be kept up to date throughout the process and notified when there are opportunities to speak/write to City Council as they consider the changes.

The Resident Forums were the last major part of a robust engagement effort around the Comprehensive Plan amendment process for the Building Opportunity for Housing project. The insight gained from the series will be combined with other public comments received throughout the process, the Community Roundtable, the Faith-Based Roundtable, and multilingual survey results to inform the final decision. Department staff will continue to be available to answer questions or receive addition feedback anytime at developmentcode@spokanecity.org.
Exhibit A – Currently Adopted Vision and Values

Shaping Spokane, a Comprehensive Plan for the future of Spokane

Comprehensive Plan is the name given to identify the community’s long-range plan for growth. It is comprehensive because it provides guidance for all aspects of the city's growth and development over a long period, typically twenty-years. The plan is a set of visions, goals, policies, and implementation strategies that state how the city should grow physically, socially, and economically. This comprehensive plan is the product of many, many people including hundreds of community members, the city Plan Commission, City Council and Mayor.

Chapter 3, Land Use

3.2 VISION AND VALUES
Spokane volunteers working to develop the 2001 Comprehensive Plan identified important themes in relation to Spokane’s current and future growth. A series of visions and values was crafted for each element of the Comprehensive Plan that describes specific performance objectives. From the Visions and Values document, adopted in 1996 by the City Council, the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies were generated.

Land use is defined as the general location of various uses of land, population density, and building intensities.

VISION
“Growth will be managed to allow a mix of land uses that fit, support, and enhance Spokane’s neighborhoods, protect the environment, and sustain the downtown area and broaden the economic base of the community.”

VALUES
“The things that are important to Spokane’s future include:

- Acquiring and preserving the natural areas inside and outside the city;
- Controlling urban sprawl in order to protect outlying rural areas;
- Developing and maintaining convenient access and opportunities for shopping, services, and employment;
- Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods;
- Guaranteeing a variety of densities that support a mix of land uses; and
- Utilizing current residential lots before developing raw land.”
Chapter 6, Housing

6.2 VISION AND VALUES

Spokane volunteers working on the Comprehensive Plan identified important themes in relation to Spokane’s current and future growth. A series of visions and values was crafted for each element of the Comprehensive Plan that describes specific performance objectives. From the Visions and Values document, adopted in 1996 by the City Council, the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies were generated. Housing refers to housing availability, affordability, and mix.

VISION

“Affordable housing of all types will be available to all community residents in an environment that is safe, clean, and healthy. Renewed emphasis will be placed on preserving existing houses and rehabilitating older neighborhoods.”

VALUES

“The things that are important to Spokane’s future include:

- Keeping housing affordable;
- Encouraging home ownership;
- Maintaining pride in ownership;
- Developing a good mix of housing types;
- Encouraging housing for the low-income and homeless throughout the entire city;
- Preserving existing houses; and
- Rehabilitating older neighborhoods.”
Staff Report - File Z23-112COMP

Exhibit F

Agency/Department Comments Received
From: Nilsson, Mike  
To: Freibott, Kevin  
Cc: Whitmarsh, Brandon; Brown, Eldon; Eliason, Joelie; Johnson, Erik D.  
Subject: RE: Request for Agency/Department Comment - Comp Plan Amendment File Z23-112COMP  
Date: Wednesday, April 26, 2023 8:35:34 AM  
Attachments: image002.png  
image003.png  
image004.png

Engineering has no comments at this time. Individual projects following the new comp plan amendments will be evaluated for their specific proposed improvements.

From: Freibott, Kevin <kfreibott@spokanecity.org>  
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 1:27 PM  
Cc: Whitmarsh, Brandon <bwhitmarsh@spokanecity.org>  
Subject: Request for Agency/Department Comment - Comp Plan Amendment File Z23-112COMP

Please see the attached request for agency/department comments relating to the Building Opportunity for Housing comprehensive plan amendments. We request you submit comments no later than May 2 at 5:00 PM by emailing this address or by mail at:

Attn: Kevin Freibott, Planning & Economic Development  
Spokane City Hall  
808 W Spokane Falls Blvd  
Spokane, WA 99201

Thank you and have a great day!

Sincerely,

Kevin Freibott

Please note that my work schedule is currently 6:30 AM – 5:30 PM, Monday through Thursday
May 22, 2023

To: Kevin Freibott, Senior Planner

RE: File No. Z23-112 COMP

Mr. Freibott,

Thank you for contacting the Tribe’s Historic Preservation Office, we appreciate the opportunity to provide a cultural consult for your project. The intent of this process is to preserve and protect all cultural resources whenever protection is feasible.

As you already know these areas are sacred, religious and cultural significance to the Spokane Tribe, these sites are very limited and irreplaceable.

While surface evidence or artifacts and human remains may be sparse after years of no-Indian occupation and development, evidence below the surface may still be in place and artifacts and human remains may be entering the site through hydrological processes and other means.

RE: Case by case review on each project and may require cultural surveys and monitoring on these projects

We are looking forward to working with you and your staff.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to comment and consider this a positive action that will assist in protecting our shared heritage.

If questions arise, please contact me at (509) 258 4222.

Sincerely,

Randy Abrahamson
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (T.H.P.O.)
June 5, 2023

Kevin Freibott  
Senior Planner  
City of Spokane  
Planning & Economic Development  
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.  
Spokane, WA 99201  

RE: City of Spokane Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z23-112COMP  

Mr. Freibott,  

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the City of Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan Amendment Z23-112COMP Building Opportunity for Housing Phase 1. SRTC staff has reviewed the notices and materials provided. As we previously discussed, SRTC’s requirements for reviewing and certifying comprehensive plans are outlined in SRTC’s Plan Review and Certification Process Instruction Manual.

We understand that the proposed text amendments to Chapter 3 of the City’s Comprehensive Plan essentially allow more housing types in low intensity residential areas. Based on our conversation in April, we also understand that this will not increase development beyond what is already planned for in the City of Spokane’s current comprehensive plan.

Based on the information provided for the proposed comprehensive plan changes, SRTC has determined that the proposed amendment is generally consistent with the relevant Guiding Principles and Policies of Horizon 2045, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SRTC has also determined that the proposed amendment is generally consistent with the relevant transportation planning requirements of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), including the Growth Management Act (GMA).

In the future, SRTC would like to be able to provide a more comprehensive analysis of regional impacts. For comprehensive plan updates and amendments, SRTC may conduct a regional level of service (LOS) analysis for the regional mobility corridors as outlined in the certification instruction manual. To that end, we look forward to working with the City of Spokane to discuss opportunities for SRTC to provide the analysis.

Please contact me if you need any additional information about our review of the amendment proposal.

Sincerely,

Ryan Stewart, AICP  
Principal Transportation Planner
Exhibit G

Public Comments Received
Department of Planning & Economic Development  
City of Spokane

I would like to submit for consideration the following comment on the proposed changes to the Spokane Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you,  
J. Carl Bruesch  
3003 S. Manito Blvd.

- The proposal would change one of the Values statements as follows:
  
  Protecting the character of single-family neighborhoods; Celebrating the uniqueness of each neighborhood while allowing for growth and diversity everywhere;

- Comment:
  
The character of these residential neighborhoods is important, and I think it is a mistake to eliminate neighborhood character as a value.

For example, I live in the Comstock neighborhood and walkability is a significant part of the neighborhood’s character. This is clearly described in the Comstock neighborhood profile posted on the Spokane City website, and was a significant factor in my house purchase. Daily I see children walking to and from school, dog walkers, as well as general strollers – and I count myself among them.

It is important to me that potential development in my neighborhood be evaluated for impact on this character (among others).

- Suggested alternative language for this bullet point:
  
  Protecting the character of single-family residential neighborhoods; Celebrating the uniqueness of each neighborhood while allowing for appropriate growth and diversity;
To the Plan Commission:

Regarding the proposed changes to Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan, allowing fourplexes nearly everywhere, please add language that prevents developers from pushing most of this dense development out to the city’s suburban fringes, far from bus lines and emergency services, in far-flung neighborhoods such as North Indian Trail, North Nevada and South Regal.

Let’s learn from the city’s failed multifamily tax incremental financing policy of 20 years ago, which was intended to subsidize apartment development in inner neighborhoods. Instead, developers took the subsidies to the city limits, building subsidized apartments in outer fringes where they were least needed, locking in still more car dependency and carbon emissions, forcing taxpayers to fund more suburban streets and services.

Without stronger language in the plan amendment, developers will do this again.

Please stick to Spokane’s “centers and corridors” plan, giving preference to fourplex developments close to bus lines, schools and businesses, where existing police and fire resources can serve additional people, and where we won’t need to build as many additional streets, water and sewer lines.

The state Growth Management Act will soon require Spokane to reduce emissions and vehicle miles traveled, so please ensure that this plan amendment puts density close to transit.

I love density. I love more housing. However, let’s not let developers abandon Spokane’s inner neighborhoods again.

Please add language to the amendment that prioritizes density near bus lines and existing services.

Thank you,
David Camp
To the Planning Commission,
As an environmentally-motivated Spokane voter and property owner, I support the Spokane's Comprehensive Plan in its current form, which allows increasing housing density through permitting fourplexes near centers and corridors that provide public and active transportation connections and are near schools and businesses because that plan will help us reach our goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and creating livable 15-minute neighborhoods.
I strongly oppose the proposed extension of such density to outlying areas such as North Indian Trail, North Nevada, and South Regal because those areas are not well served by public transportation and have few nearby schools and businesses and therefore such an extension would trap our city in the destructive car culture that has produced so much pollution damaging to our health and environment and that causes endless crashes, reckless driving, and street racing.
Please retain the current Comprehensive Plan density around centers and corridors to promote a healthier life for our community and all of us who live in it.
Linda Carroll
Dear Plan Commission,

I understand that you are meeting today to discuss an amendment to Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan which would allow for development of fourplexes around the city. I commend this move, however, I have serious concerns regarding how this change is implemented. More housing is clearly needed and fourplexes, duplexes and the like are wins for improving the housing crisis in Spokane. But it is imperative that this is implemented in keeping with the current objectives to increase housing density in the centers and corridors, where bus lines, infrastructure (including fire and police resources) and shops and businesses already exist. This will reduce the need for expensive new roads, water and sewer lines and reduce dependence on cars, thereby helping to mitigate already clogged traffic arteries in the city and reduce pollution.

Please include stronger language in your amendment to the plan which emphasizes development of fourplexes in the centers and corridors of Spokane to keep developers from focusing on developing these high density housing structures in fringe neighborhoods in Spokane, which though costing them less, would cost the city and its residents more in terms of sprawl, infrastructure development, less green spaces, and more pollution.

Thank you kindly,

Kari Gaither
As a long time observer and participant (I was on the Boundary Review Board) I request that you stick to the centers and corridor plan.
Thank you,
Lila Shaw Girvin
Good Morning,

Attached are some comments on the Comp Plan.

Really great work – and a lot of goals that tie directly to our region’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (THRIVE Spokane). Great to see the City leading the way!

Joey Gunning  
Strategic Growth Manager  
Greater Spokane Inc.  
(509) 321-3617  

together we’re greater  

AdvantageSpokane.com  |  THRIVESpokane.org  

Register today
Public Comment on City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan: Chapter 7 – Economic Development

ED 1.2 Support of Economic Development Organizations

I would suggest calling out the support of organizations who support underrepresented communities, such as AHANA, Carl Maxey Center, HBPA, Latinos En Spokane, etc. This is critical to ensuring economic development activities and policies achieve equitable outcomes.

ED 2.2 Revitalization Opportunities

May want to include language around pursuing policies and processes to stabilize communities and mitigate gentrification.

ED 2.4 Mixed-Use

Could add language around supporting arts & culture here. Creative economy has emerged as a key industry both locally and state-wide.

ED 3.5 Locally-Owned Businesses

The region’s CEDS includes language around elevating the region’s buy local campaigns, such as Live Local INW, to support locally owned BIPOC and small businesses. Might include language here to align with the region’s equity goals.

ED 4.2 Benchmark Indicators

Might include language around equity here. How can we use benchmark indicators to achieve more equitable results going forward.

ED 5.2 Youth Programs

Might include language around supporting youth entrepreneurship programs to help Spokane’s young residents cultivate an entrepreneurial spirit, building a community culture of innovation.

ED 5.3 Post-Secondary Education and Job Training

Could include language around uplifting BIPOC workers by connecting them with clear career pathways that offer earn-and-learn initiatives, like stipends, paid work experience, internships, or on-the-job training.

ED 5.8 Library as Educational Resource

Absolutely! The Library provides tools to help businesses overcome their vulnerabilities and to ensure they have critical processes to continue operations in the event of an unplanned disruption or disaster. This is critical.
ED 7.1 Collaborative Nurturing of the Business Climate

This is also critical. Might include specific language around establishing a process for regular communication with businesses to understand their priority issues and needs.

ED 8.4 Recreation and Tourism Promotion

How can you partner with municipalities and organizations that are already doing this? We could think about a collaborative approach to promoting the region's identity and high quality of life to support tourism, business attraction, and talent attraction and retention.
Mr. Freibott,

I am excited that Spokane is FINALLY getting serious about the need for housing options for both homeless and other folks.

As we move toward more density it will be crucial that development be done in such a manner to "help" us live better at density. By that I mean as lots are developed or redeveloped that there would be requirements for the following; lighting that does not bleed onto adjacent properties; landscaping that does not bleed onto neighboring properties; sidewalks whether new or existing be installed, repaired and maintained (levers to use: business license renewals for apt. owners, building permits for lot improvements and development, sidewalks required to be in good condition at the time of property sale and the city could repair or replace the sidewalk and put a lien on the property which would be paid off at the time of sale of the property) Sidewalk condition is an equity and quality of life condition in all areas of the city and cannot be allowed to be ignored as it has been for DECADES.

Don't forget noise ordinances, traffic enforcement and traffic calming so pedestrians and bicycles can safely move through neighborhoods.

There should be clear paths identified so that if a condition needs to be addressed that citizens know who in the city to contact so the issue can be resolved. I suspect that more code enforcement folks will need to be hired to "help" citizens live better at density. Density needs to happen whether people want it or not and density can either be an inconvenience or a horror depending upon how it occurs. Thanks Debra Howard
Upon cursory review, many amendments to the comprehensive plan are as old as January 2020!!! This is pre-covid. Pre-urban exodus. Certainly, anything post-covid would be much more valuable to the city and it’s residents.
To whom it may concern,
I am excited to see that city council will allow to build multi-residential units and halt city sprawling.

I would like to address the concerns of clear cutting of mature trees within and on outskirts of our city.

The examples are a new apartment development at the intersection of Magnesium and Nevada (by the international school) and the one across the Sundown plaza at the end of the Indian trail rd.

There used to be beautiful, mature park, which was clear cut.

Could you please consider requiring a 30% or so retainment of original vegetation and incorporate new buildings into the existing nature?

It breaks my heart to see loss of mature trees our city is famous for. I am also concerned for environmental impact with high winds and dry, hot summers with no tall trees to break the wind speed or shade to provide.

Sincerely, Alena Izhokhina, homeowner in Spokane
425 419 9570 cell

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
Get Outlook for Android
To whom it may concern

I am reservations against the new BOCA zoning regulations. The new rules allow for up to 4 units on any parcel zoned single family. Many new 4 plexes will be built in historically single family neighborhoods which defeats the whole purpose of zoning. Many people decided to buy homes in established single family neighborhoods and planned on raising their families in a lower density area. I am seeing plans to break up larger parcels into many parcels and put 4 plexes on them to create apartment complexes. I don’t believe this was the intended purpose of the zoning changes. But, it is happening. The proposed 5 Mile Multi Family project at 7601 N 5 Mile Rd is an example of this.

This type of project goes against the language in the law and is wholly incompatible with the foundational goals and policies of the City of Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan as listed in section 3.3:

1. …Much of the future growth will occur within concentrated areas in Neighborhood Centers, District Centers, Employment Centers and Corridors designated on the Land Use Plan Map. While this growth occurs in Centers and Corridors, established single-family residential neighborhoods will remain largely unchanged. The Centers and Corridors contain a mix of uses, including higher density housing centered around or above retail and commercial establishments, office space and public and semi-public activities (parks, government and schools).

   …Other important directives of the land use goals and policies include:
   - limiting commercial and higher density development outside Centers and Corridors to support growth and development of Centers and Corridors;
   - directing new higher density housing to Centers and Corridors and restricting this type of development in single-family areas; and

2. Using design guidelines to ensure that commercial buildings and higher density housing are compatible with existing neighborhood character in and around Centers and Corridors.
   [Emphasis Added] Comprehensive Plan, Amended Jan. 17, 2020, 3-5 - 3-6

If new apartment developments are allowed to be built in single-family neighborhoods it will irreversibly degrade areas that have traditionally been areas many people want to live in. Those people will be forced to push further out of the city to find similar neighborhoods to live in. That would be unfair and detrimental to the city financially.

Please reconsider the BOCA plan and ensure established single family neighborhoods are protected.

David
What's my home worth?
Thanks for your response.
What I didn't see in the survey was a space about current housing options. The sale price of my condo has tripled since I bought it 11 years ago. While that would be good news if I wanted to sell it, the fact is that if I did sell, it would be difficult to find affordable housing in Spokane. I checked condos on the internet and the price went quickly from $65k for a "blank canvas" that would require a tremendous amount of work to $150k with nothing in between. And no parking. So if I sold, I would have no place to go.

I am a promoter of condos as a good way of increasing the number of people that can live in an area. Rents increase constantly (my own experience) and a 10% limit on increases can still move an apartment from reasonable $800/month to unaffordable in just a few years. But you own your condo unit. If public spaces are easily accessible (parks, etc) then children can also thrive in a condo. And a condo is a good first time homebuyer investment. (The other issue is I don't WANT to take care of a yard)

Transportation is also an issue. I chose to live near Gonzaga because I knew I would have reasonably good bus service (and wonderful bus service with the Central City line), but for activities after dark, one still needs a car because busses don't come that often and may not coincide with the end of a movie or a worship service.

Wish I had some answers, but I think rules that encourage condos could be part of the mix.

Thank you.
Hello,
keeping new development of housing to corridors near schools and bus routes will be better for the community in a variety of ways. If people can ride the bus to school and work and appointments, there is less wear and tear on our roads, less pollution. In addition, poorer people many times can afford older cars more likely to break down and lack of transportation can mean losing a job, which can start a cycle of homelessness or other hardship. Let’s do what is most effective.
Thanks,
Cynthia Manycolors
Spokane, WA
To Whom It May Concern,

Building Opportunity and Choices for All is meant to encourage better housing on many levels. It’s meant to create generational wealth, make housing available at different price levels, and create housing for more to enjoy.

Unfortunately, there are no safeguards to prevent unscrupulous developers from taking advantage of BOCA to line their already well lined pockets. All over the city these developers are snapping up any piece of land they can get their hands on and stacking as many houses as they can on them. They add moderate to high density housing in traditionally single family residence areas.

With the increase in density created by BOCA for all zoning areas, this puts more people in areas without public transit. And since the parking requirements listed in Table 17C.230-2 were not updated to take into account the increased density, the developers are only required to provide one parking space per house. You would be hard pressed to find families with only one vehicle. And with Spokane lacking a sufficient public transit system, how are families supposed to traverse the area? The original framework of BOCA included a requirement for nearby public transportation, however, for some reason, it was removed. The definition of public transit, however, was left in the interim ordinance. The city of Spokane has a number of places that are not serviced by public transportation and building multi-unit dwellings without requiring a sufficient number of parking spaces is contrary to providing housing choices for all. Not everyone has a personal vehicle and therefore requires housing with easy access to public transportation. No one wants to have to hunt for on-street parking when they get home after working or going to school, nor not have any guest parking for people who might visit.

As you work on making the Building Opportunity and Choices for All interim ordinance permanent, I request that you revisit the access to public transportation, on-site parking requirements and not allowing moderate to high density housing in areas traditionally and historically meant for single family homes.

Sincerely,

Ben Maplethorpe
Five Mile Prairie Resident
City of Spokane Planning,

This current amendment to the Comp Plan appears benign but still does not address critical requirements that should be considered prior to authorizing development which are lacking or remain unenforced in the Comp Plan - namely adequate infrastructure in place or enforced concurrency. Largely in outer districts such as Latah Valley, 5 mile, Indian Trail, West Hills the checks and balances which should be present prior to permitting have not been adhered to. This has and will continue to result in inefficient and in some cases reckless growth patterns creating public safety concerns (fire, water quality) or access issues to critical roadways. Not including specifics on required infrastructure and functioning levels of service, whether imposed by low-density zoning changes should be remedied. Direction to the Planning Department to potentially deny permits when infrastructure is not adequate. The Comp Plan should incorporate more appropriate and comprehensive infrastructure requirements, such as availability of public transportation, parks, fire & police support, K-12 schools and bussing, libraries, and active-transportation corridors. Recognizing the Comp Plan only directs water and sewer levels of service,

Adam Marshall
Hello;
I have a few comments & suggestions on the new housing plans.
First off I think it’s unfair to neighborhoods to allow investors to have ADU’s in the backyards of homes they do not live in. We have an 8 year old home across the street from us that was built by an investor for a rental house. At only 8 yrs. old it looks older, junky and unkept. The sidewalks (& it’s a corner lot) have never been shoveled no matter how much snow falls. The weeds grow up out of the fence & grow as tall as the fence. The trees that were planted in the back died within the first year of neglect. And we’re talking about the comstock neighborhood. Now, the new rules have allowed him to build an ADU behind the parent house. The whole neighborhood knows what this means. 2 unkept homes & yards with more than enough cars & trucks for 2 homes. Since this law is not going to change, why do you not apply some rules to these investors who you have just gifted with 2 rental incomes off of one property? Such has an ADU can only be added (in the case of the owner not being onsite) when the investor provides full lawn care (including regular weed killing), full snow shoveling & requirements that their tenants have no more vehicles than the required “off” street parking that you allowed to be built for the size of the homes. They get double income & further lower the quality of the neighborhood & neighbors frustration for zero effort. It seems like this requirement would give something back to the neighborhoods you indicate you’re trying to preserve.
Another concern is the daily commercials about the importance of trees. Spokane has an Urban Forestry department that is supposed to be insuring that trees are being planted and our dwindling canopy being restored. But in another conflict the city is allowing homes to be built 15 ft. from the curb & allowing porches to extend 6 ft. into that setback effectively allowing homes to sit 9 ft. from the curb. Where do the trees go? We have a home being built in a 2 lot pocket lot next door where the neighborhood was promised “more” landscaping because it was a pocket development than a single family home required. We notice on the application for permit that Urban forestry has stated there is no room for a tree because of right of way. A fine will have to be paid instead. Won’t this be the case with all homes built so close to the curbs? What happened to the concern for trees & the tree lined streets you envision? The ADU across the street has room for a street tree but Urban Forestry states on their permit that they “can” plant a tree in there’s an appropriate place or pay a fine. Hmmm. It seems like fines are what they’re after not trees.
And finally, I think you should come clean with the public about what constitutes “off” street parking. The bunny story in one of your community outreach updates indicated that all bunnies would have a bedroom & therefore their home would require 5 off street parking spaces. Everyone is relieved. Except you never mention that if the bunnies lot was 100ft. wide, all 5 “off” street parking spots could be met “on” the street. And your vision of narrower neighborhood streets, tree lined forgot to mention those narrow streets would be filled with cars that have no where else to park. If you think people will get rid of their cars, ride the bus or a bike if you just eliminate most of the parking,you need look no further than Seattle with their superior bus & rail system, not to mention their milder winters and see their neighborhoods are busting with cars on top of cars. If you’re so sure each home & rental will come with no more than the parking spaces you require, then that should be another rule for
the investors. They must allow no more vehicles to be at their rentals than the city required them to provide. I think since you are so sure of vehicle count per bedroom, it should be a requirement at least in rentals.
Thank you for your time. I know you only want to hear positive input but you asked for peoples opinions. I’m not sure you really listen or care to anything that is said that goes against your agenda but I thought I would try.
Regards,
Rick & Roxanne Messenger
May 24, 2023

TO:  Spokane City Plan Commission

RE:  Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendments
      Proposed Text Amendments Chapter 3

Page 1: Vision

I would suggest leaving the word “neighborhoods” in the paragraph. Since we are
talking about adding more diverse housing to neighborhoods.

Page 1: Values

I am all for enhancing natural areas inside and outside the city, would be good to
explore here how you plan to do that.

If you are truly committed to the uniqueness of each neighborhood then you must
realize that “All Land Is Not Created Equal”. You can only build what the land
will allow while following all the regulations for stormwater, erodible soils, ground
water saturation and contamination and the harm that blasting has on a basalt
mesa like Five Mile Prairie.

I think it is also fair to say that even though these amendments are meant for every
city neighborhood, development will come to the neighborhoods that have the
land. And by looking at a map you can see where those neighborhoods are.

The last bullet point I don’t understand. It would help to know what your thinking
is with regards to being flexible in amending standards.

Also I do not see anything about the Capital Facilities Plan, and how we are going
to pay for services knowing that they are more expensive on the fringe of the city.
Providing services outside of centers and corridors is more expensive for the city,
right? And concurrency will still be an important part of adding density to every
part of the city?

Page 3: LU1.3

This is where again, please be reminded that not “Not All Land Is Equal”. Because
we sit on 4 perched aquifers, we are a CARA,(critical aquifer recharge area), we
have underground springs and huge evaporation ponds with complimentary frogs!
We find that we need less impervious surface not more. We are more than a mile from a transit stop and we share our roads with our rural neighbors who still farm. More walking and biking facilities would be great we have a bike/ped plan already adopted.

Page 6:

Top of Page 6 under Residential Low. This seems to be out of context with residential low. Grocery stores, small format retail, medical facilities? These should be in neighborhood centers, centers and corridors, but you would need land that is environmentally safe and could take more impervious surfaces, I am sure there are several neighborhoods that this would not work well and is one reason why our Neighborhood Plan does not call for “commercial development”. I hope you will rethink this section and out it under high intensity uses where commercial should go. I don’t believe it belongs here.

Thank you for listening. I’ll have more comments before the deadline.

Respectfully,

Kathy Miotke

53 year resident of Five Mile Prairie

prairiepyrs@fastmail.com
Greetings,

What good is any spending on planning or its manifested implementations if those achievements are drowned out by rampant crime and drugs?

Numerous businesses have already high-tailed out of downtown and many locals no longer have any desire to go there.

How long will it be ignored?

Only when this blatant issue is addressed will me and others consider it "comprehensive."

Thank you,

Scott Moore
(406) 926-9583
Good afternoon,

BOCA is designed to encourage creating a variety of housing at various price points, but lacks any requirements for access to public transportation or adequate on-site parking. This is shortsighted and ultimately is contrary to promoting a quality of life for people regardless of the type of housing they live in. To make multi-dwelling units liveable you either need to provide adequate on-site parking for residents and their guests and/or you need to have easy access to public transportation. The interim BOCA ordinance does not address this.

I have lived in apartments, townhomes and single family homes at various times in my adult life. When looking and choosing housing, adequate parking or access to public transportation for myself and my co-habitants is a deciding factor in where I chose to live. The city of Spokane has a number of places that are not serviced by public transportation and building multi-unit dwellings without requiring a sufficient number of parking spaces is contrary to providing housing choices for all.

Parking:
The interim ordinance only requires builders to adhere to existing requirements found in Table17C.230-2 Parking Spaces by Use which only calls for one parking space per unit for less than three bedrooms. In this day and age, it is rare to see one car per household. Even a one bedroom unit is likely to have two car-owners living in it (ie couples, roommates). It would be shortsighted to overlook these lack of sufficient parking requirements which ultimately impedes the quality of life for all. No one wants to have to hunt for on-street parking when they get home after working or going to school, nor have any guest parking for people who might visit.

Public Transportation:
Not everyone has a personal vehicle and therefore requires housing with easy access to public transportation. Access to publication transportation is even mentioned the PIES committee report summary indicates there was discussion to “Allow duplexes in all zoning districts, and triplexes and fourplexes in all areas within ¼ mile of frequent transit and ½ mile of all Center and Corridor zones.” “Major transit stop” is even defined in the interim ordinance (Chapter 17C.400.010B), yet the term is mentioned nowhere else in the ordinance.

As you work on making the Building Opportunity and Choices for All interim ordinance permanent, I request that you revisit the access to public transportation and on-site parking requirements.
And also in the Proposed Text Amendments - Chapter 3 Comprehensive Plan page 3, complementary types of development should allow residents to walk to “churches,” I suggest you use “places of worship” or another more inclusive term.

Sincerely,
Heather Morgan
Kevin,

Here are my comments for the PC today.

I have a funeral and will get there as soon as I can.

Candace Mumm
MIDDLE HOUSING DEFINITION SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE

Please modify the definition of Middle Housing being added to the Glossary section on Page 10.

State law will likely change again does not prescribe that five and six plexes are outright allowed on any residential lot. Only in the case of being within ¼ mile of a major transit stop or if at least two units are affordable housing.

Optional language is below following the proposed language of May 24, 202

- **Middle Housing**
  - In accordance with state law, Middle housing includes buildings that are compatible in scale, form, and character with single-family houses and contain two or more attached, stacked, or clustered homes such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, sixplexes, townhouses, stacked-flats, courtyard apartments, and cottage housing.

- **Middle Housing** is a range of house-scale buildings with multiple units—compatible in scale and form with detached single-family homes—located in a walkable neighborhood. (source: missingmiddlehousing.com)

- **Middle Housing** is a term for homes that are at a middle scale between detached single-family houses and large multifamily complexes. Examples include: duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, sixplexes, courtyard apartments, cottage clusters, and townhomes. These types are typically “house-scale”; that is, the buildings are about the same size and height as detached houses. (source: Commerc.WA.gov)

- **Middle Housing** is diverse, fits seamlessly into existing residential neighborhoods and supports walkability. It can include duplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, multiplexes and other small-footprint homes. (source: housingnext.com)
3.2 Vision and Values

Values

1. Keep in language about controlling urban sprawl - this keeps costs down for using capacity of existing investment in infrastructure and expands it only when the city has the means to do so, otherwise this language is permissive and may be used against you when planning for expansion. Remember we serve outside our jurisdiction for water and sometimes sewer.

2. Controlling urban sprawl in order to Managing urban growth to ensure development results in equitable, livable, community-oriented neighborhoods, contributes positively to the City’s financial resources, and to protects outlying rural areas;

3. Keep the word “convenient” because it affects climate change — makes it walkable —

4. I like adding education to this section

   Developing and maintaining convenient access and opportunities for shopping to amenities, services, education, and employment for people of all ages and abilities in all parts of the city;

5. This sentence is word salad and unnecessary.

   Balancing stability and flexibility by reviewing and amending standards in an orderly and thoughtful fashion as needs change in the city.
6. Keep these in. They are important to the function and health of Centers and Corridors and focused growth. Must keep this in there—efficient land use for utilities—investment of the city—Not all parts of the city are geographically built to handle the same amount of intensity due to the lack of infrastructure or the fact that they have 400 foot cliffs. New Centers and limiting commercial and higher density development outside Centers and Corridors to support growth and development of Centers and Corridors;

directing new higher density housing to Centers and Corridors and restricting this type of development in single-family areas; and

using design guidelines to ensure that commercial buildings and higher density housing are compatible with existing neighborhood character in and around Centers and Corridors.

7. **LU 1.4 Higher Density Intensity Residential Uses Areas**

Suggest you substitute this section: “and to areas where existing development intensity is already consistent with development of this type.” Use language here to “and adopt new centers through the neighborhood planning process where “existing development intensity is already consistent with development of this type.”

*Direct new higher density intensity residential uses to areas in and around Centers and Corridors designated on the Land Use Plan Map and to areas where existing development intensity is already consistent with development of this type.*
Hello – I am a homeowner and business owner in the city of Spokane and creating urban density is critically important to our city. Creating density will help address our homeless problem, better support the local population growth, aligns with the sustainability action plan that was passed by the Spokane City Council in October of 2021, and is critical to addressing the climate crisis.

Allowing growth to expand outwards into the suburbs will create more traffic congestion, increase costs related to maintaining transportation infrastructure, and significantly increase the greenhouse gases that threaten our local and global community.

I urge the Plan Commission to reject the amendment and leave the plan in its current form.

Mark

Mark Odegard
MEASURE MEANT
Operations | Senior Strategist
509.904.5692
mark@measurepnw.com
www.measurepnw.com
I am a 74 y.o. white male who has lived in the same residential one level 2100 sq ft rancher in the south hill for 28 years. My spouse and I have raised 4 children, 3 of whom now live outside of Spokane. The youngest child lives with us after he was injured in a major accident 5 years ago. We love our home but worried going forward about our capacity to continue to manage the upkeep and pay the property taxes. We have thought about downsizing but upon investigation have found few options that are financially feasible. When we compare the costs of remaining in our current home vs purchasing a new home, remaining in our current is more cost-effective. We would like to see options of moving into a multi-age, diverse family make-ups and diverse racial, ethnic and cultural settings. We are supportive if Spokane developing more housing options for everyone in the community. Thank you.

James O’HARE  
Jolmhc@gmail.com  
509-251-4474.  
1414 E. Woodcliff Rd  
99203

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

Please find the attached letter we are submitting during your public comment period.

Thank you,

Drew Peterson
Land Stewardship Guide
Presbytery of the Inland Northwest
(509) 496-2916
Dear Spokane City Plan Commission,

Thank you for your hard work in updating our city’s comprehensive plan amendment in ways that support increasing opportunities for housing. As you know from the city planning department’s roundtable discussion with faith-based leaders, many churches in our city are both geographically and missionally oriented to provide needed housing for the community. We support changes that allow for church sites to create moderate intensity development. Therefore, we appreciate specific mention of “churches” in section 3.4 under “residential moderate”, as well as “residential low”. We wish to eliminate any possibility for interpretation of the comprehensive plan that excludes churches.

At the bottom of page six, the proposed language amendments to chapter 3 says, “Residential Moderate uses should be generally limited to within moderate walking distance of a Center, Corridor, or major employment/commercial area.” Thank you for this language, as it seems to define more clearly what the comp plan means by “in and around centers and corridors.” We understand the value of using flexible language in the language amendments and we also understand defining “moderate walking distance” may need to be done on a case-by-case basis. Our hope is that these proposed language amendments will support inclusive and expansive interpretations by future city staff to ensure churches are regarded as good partners and preferred locations that fit the vision, values, and goals of the plan commission for building options for housing in our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft language and for including us in this important process.

Sincerely,

Dirk Vastrick, Clerk of Session, Bethany Presbyterian Church
Brian Grow, President of the Board, Proclaim Liberty
Sarah Brede, Associate, ZBA Architecture
Dave Roberts, Development Consultant, Kiemle and Hagood
Shannon Meagher, Development Consultant, Kiemle and Hagood
I'm writing to thank the Plan Commission for their proposal to build fourplexes in the city to increase housing availability and density but also to strongly encourage them to stick to the “centers and corridors” plan, giving preference to fourplex developments close to bus lines, schools and businesses, where existing police and fire resources can serve additional people, and where we won’t need to build as many additional streets, water and sewer lines. As Spokane is growing, new housing is incredibly important, and I would love to see this new housing be constructed in ways that are going to be the most cost-efficient and climate-friendly. I think you can accomplish both of those by prioritizing and incentivizing denser housing options closer to existing resources and infrastructure.

Thank you so much,

Amy Pistone

Amy Pistone
Assistant Professor, Department of Classical Civilizations
She/her/hers
@apistone
College Hall 416L
Spring 2023 Office Hours: Mon 11-12, Wed 11-12, Thu 10:30-11:30, or by appointment
Hello:

I'm writing to encourage you, when considering changes to Spokane's Comprehensive Plan, that you remain steadfast in sticking to the existing Centers and Corridors strategy, giving preference to developing multifamily projects, including fourplexes, close to existing infrastructure — streets, water, sewer, gas, and electricity — where access to existing services, schools, transit, businesses, shopping, hospitality, and entertainment are easy to access and don't require additional burdens on taxpayers to create new infrastructure in less dense or undeveloped areas where land may be cheaper but civil and societal costs are much higher.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Ed. Renouard
I live on E Illinois consequently, I have a vested interest in any forms of development between Market St & Perry St. The southside of Illinois has railroad tracks & a dynamic panoramic view of the City from Sunset hill to the Idaho Mountains. There is thinking of landscaping with viewpoints on the southside of Illinois between the curb & railroad tracks. A year ago a large apartment complex was built on N Regal which has blocked the view of the river & obviously destroyed any plan of adding a viewpoint in that area. Before that apt complex I used to enjoy the view of the river watching Osprey skim the water catching fish. That’s gone now forever. Further development west of Regal should never be considered to avoid destroying one of Spokane’s most valuable scenic drives. E Illinois was recently resurfaced with the addition of a jogging/bicycle path against the southern curb, specifically to take advantage of the view. Spokane housing is of great concern & every area of development should be considered but, at what expense to our valuable livable environment needs equal consideration.

Richard Schubach
pa.schubach@gmail.com
509 255 3874
2809 E. Illinois
Spokane WA 992207

--
Richard
[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL - Verify Sender]

Please develop the empty parking lots downtown, before carving into historical neighborhoods, basalt rock formations and green spaces in the city of Spokane, these are our assets… bus lines, infrastructure and retail are already in place downtown. We could add 50,000 residents to downtown, thank you for taking my comment.
Take Care,
Toni Sharkey

Sent from my iPhone
Please stick to the “centers and corridors” plan, giving preference to fourplex developments close to bus lines, schools and businesses, where existing police and fire resources can serve additional people, and where we won’t need to build as many additional streets, water and sewer lines. Spokane is already very car-dependent; please don’t let this continue into the future.

Thank you,

Hannah TeGrotenhuis
I disagree with a proposed change to 3.2 Visions and Values. Neighborhoods should not be omitted and replaced with livability.

Shaping Spokane Housing "aims to address housing needs while preserving character and livability". Our neighborhoods provide the city's character and livability. The city has 29 neighborhoods that are recognized by City Charter.

I tell everyone I live in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood. We identify ourselves by our neighborhood. Our city supports our neighborhoods with the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program and the Neighborhood Clean-up Program.

The Land Use chapter should not omit our neighborhoods in its Visions and Values.

And, it was noticeable that 'downtown' was not omitted and given preference, since it is a neighborhood by City Charter.

And, a priority in the Housing Action Plan is to preserve housing affordability and quality to help people thrive where they live and support residents in every 'neighborhood'.

Please leave neighborhoods in the text.

I greatly appreciate the wording in the proposed changes that preserve and enhance the existing character of housing in our neighborhoods, especially LU 5.5 Complementary Development.

Carol Tomsic
Lincoln Heights
Hello,

I live in a single family home on a lot next to a low-income, rent assisted apartment building and value my neighbors and what they bring to the neighborhood. I think other neighborhoods will benefit as well by having a more diverse selection of housing available to different income levels.

So just giving a comment of support - I appreciate the attention given to the missing middle. Thank you for your work, I think this is a good step in addressing access to affordable housing.

Thanks!

Katie Upton
623 W Spofford Ave, Spokane, WA 99205
Hello!

Today at 2 PM, Spokane’s Plan Commission will discuss a new proposal to amend Spokane’s Comprehensive Plan, allowing for development of fourplexes all over the city.

While this is in keeping with the Middle Housing Bill just passed by the state legislature developers want to push this dense development out to the city’s suburban fringes, far from bus lines and emergency services, in far-flung neighborhoods such as North Indian Trail, North Nevada and South Regal. They do this because in these fringe neighborhoods, land is cheaper, parcels are larger and deals are easier.

The result will be an even more car-dependent Spokane, with higher tax bills to support more streets, sewers, police and fire services along sprawling suburban edges.

This echoes the city’s failed tax incremental financing policy of 20 years ago, which was intended to subsidize apartment development in inner neighborhoods. Instead, developers took the subsidies to the city limits, building subsidized apartments in outer fringes where they were least needed, locking in still more car dependency.

Let’s not repeat that mistake. Please stick to the “centers and corridors” plan, giving preference to fourplex developments close to bus lines, schools and businesses, where existing police and fire resources can serve additional people, and where we won’t need to build as many additional streets, water and sewer lines.

Thanks,

Jim Young

Spokane WA
Exhibit H

Comprehensive Plan Policy Environment Around Diversity and Choice
The following goals and policies of the comprehensive plan relate to file Z23-112COMP. The full text of the Comprehensive Plan can be found at www.shapingspokane.org.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY ENVIRONMENT: DIVERSITY AND CHOICE**

- **Policies Calling for Increased Diversity and Choice Throughout the City**
  - Policy H 1.9
  - Policy H 1.15
  - Policy H 1.18
  - Policy H 1.19
  - Policy N 2.1
  - Policy LU 3.6
  - Policy LU 4.6
  - Policy LU 3.7

- **Policies Calling for Design Requirements to Seek Compatibility Between Diverse Land Uses**
  - Policy LU 5.5
  - Policy LU 5.2
  - Policy LU 5.3
  - Policy LU 7.1
  - Policy LU 5.1
  - Goal LU 7.1
  - Goal LU 5
  - Goal LU 2
  - Goal LU 3.2
  - Goal LU 3.1
  - Goal LU 3

- **Policies Limiting Diversity and Choice**
  - Policy H 2.1
  - Policy H 2.2
  - Policy H 2.4
  - Policy H 2.3
  - Policy H 1.11

**Chapter 3 – Land Use**

**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 2 PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENT

Goal: Encourage the enhancement of the public realm.

LU 2.1 Public Realm Features

Encourage features that improve the appearance of development, paying attention to how projects function to encourage social interaction and relate to and enhance the surrounding urban and natural environment.

LU 2.2 Performance Standards

Employ performance and design standards with sufficient flexibility and appropriate incentives to ensure that development is compatible with surrounding land uses.

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.

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 3.3 Designating Centers and Corridors ¹

Designate new Centers or Corridors in appropriate locations on the Land Use Plan Map through a city-approved planning process.

LU 3.6 Compact Residential Patterns

Allow more compact and affordable housing in all neighborhoods, in accordance with design guidelines.

LU 3.7 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.

¹ This policy is included here because it pertains to a public comment discussed in the Staff Report.
LU 4.6 Transit-Supported Development

Encourage transit-supported development, including a mix of employment, residential, and commercial uses, adjacent to high-performance transit stops.

LU 5 DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

Goal: Promote development in a manner that is attractive, complementary, and compatible with other land uses.

LU 5.2 Environmental Quality Enhancement

Encourage site locations and design features that enhance environmental quality and compatibility with surrounding land uses.

LU 5.3 Off-Site Impacts

Ensure that off-street parking, access, and loading facilities do not adversely impact the surrounding area.

LU 5.5 Compatible Development

Ensure that infill and redevelopment projects are well-designed and compatible with surrounding uses and building types.

LU 7.1 Regulatory Structure

Develop a land use regulatory structure that utilizes a variety of mechanisms to promote development that provides a public benefit.

Chapter 6 – Housing

H 1 HOUSING CHOICE AND DIVERSITY

Goal: Provide opportunities for a variety of housing types that is safe and affordable for all income levels to meet the diverse housing needs of current and future residents.

H 1.7 Socioeconomic Integration

Promote socioeconomic integration throughout the city.

H 1.8 Affordable Housing Requirement

Include a percentage of affordable housing within all new developments that include housing.

H 1.9 Mixed-Income Housing

Encourage mixed-income developments throughout the city.
H 1.11 Access to Transportation

Encourage housing that provides easy access to public transit and other efficient modes of transportation.

H 1.13 Siting of Subsidized Low-Income Housing

Set clear site selection criteria for publicly subsidized housing to minimize geographic concentrations of publicly subsidized housing projects in neighborhoods with a high percent of minority or low-income households.

H 1.18 Distribution of Housing Options

Promote a wide range of housing types and housing diversity to meet the needs of the diverse population and ensure that this housing is available throughout the community for people of all income levels and special needs.

H 1.19 Senior Housing

Encourage and support accessible design and housing strategies that provide seniors the opportunity to remain within their neighborhoods as their housing needs change.

H 1.20 Accessory Dwelling Units

Allow one accessory dwelling unit as an ancillary use to single-family homes in all designated residential areas as an affordable housing option.

H 2.3 Housing Preservation

Encourage preservation of viable housing.

H 2.4 Linking Housing With Other Uses

Ensure that plans provide increased physical connection between housing, employment, transportation, recreation, daily-needs services, and educational uses.

Chapter 11 – Neighborhoods

N 2.1 Neighborhood Quality of Life

Ensure that neighborhoods continue to offer residents transportation and living options, safe streets, quality schools, public services, and cultural, social, and recreational opportunities in order to sustain and enhance the vitality, diversity, and quality of life within neighborhoods.
Staff Report - File Z23-112COMP

Exhibit I

SEPA Determination and Environmental Checklist
NONPROJECT DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

FILE NO(S): Z23-112COMP

PROPOSER: City of Spokane

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The City of Spokane is proposing various amendments to Chapter 3, Land Use, and the Glossary of the City's Comprehensive Plan with the intent of encouraging and easing development of middle housing in Spokane. Pursuant to the findings of the City's Housing Action Plan, and as called for in Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.600, the City intends to amend the Comprehensive Plan to increase the types of housing that may be accommodated and expected in residential land use plan areas throughout the City while accounting for and minimizing impacts to adjacent uses.

LOCATION OF PROPOSAL, INCLUDING STREET ADDRESS, IF ANY: The proposal would potentially affect any future development or redevelopment of residential properties in the city.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Spokane

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

[ ] There is no comment period for this DNS.

[ ] This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in section 197-11-35S WAC. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

[ X ] This DNS is issued under 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for at least 14 days from the date of issuance (below). Comments regarding this DNS must be submitted no later than 5 p.m. on June 27, 2023 if they are intended to alter the DNS.

********************************************************************************

Responsible Official: Spencer Gardner

Position/Title: Director, Planning Services  Phone: (509) 625-6500

Address: 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, WA 99201

Date Issued: June 12, 2023  Signature: [Signature]

********************************************************************************
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
File No. Z23-112COMP

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY BEFORE COMPLETING THE CHECKLIST!

Purpose of Checklist:
The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:
This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:
Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply."

IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (Part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.
A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project: **Building Opportunity for Housing – Phase I (Comp Plan), Amendments to the City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan**

2. Applicant: **City of Spokane (Contact: Kevin Freibott)**

3. Address: **808 W Spokane Falls Blvd**  
   City/State/Zip: **Spokane, WA 99201**  
   Phone: **509-625-6500**  
   Agent or Primary Contact: **Kevin Freibott, Senior Planner (kfreibott@spokanecity.org)**  
   Address: **(same)**  
   City/State/Zip: **(same)**  
   Phone:  
   Location of Project: **Citywide (text/map amendment to Comprehensive Plan)**

4. Date checklist prepared: **April 15, 2023**

5. Agency requesting checklist: **City of Spokane**

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): **Comprehensive plan amendments are expected to be completed by third quarter of 2023.**

7. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. **Following adoption of the proposed amendments to the City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan, a series of Municipal Code amendments will be developed for consideration. These code changes are not reviewed in this SEPA process.**

   b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain. **N/A**

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal. **No specific studies or analyses have been prepared.**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. **The City is not currently processing any other Comprehensive Plan amendments during 2023.**

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. **City Council approval of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.**
11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.

The City of Spokane is proposing various amendments to Chapter 3, Land Use of the City’s Comprehensive Plan with the intent of encouraging and easing development of middle housing in Spokane. Pursuant to the findings of the City’s Housing Action Plan, and as called for in Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.600, the City intends to amend the Comprehensive Plan to increase the types of housing that may be accommodated and expected in residential land use plan areas throughout the City while accounting for and minimizing impacts to adjacent uses.

The City of Spokane proposes to amend the text of Chapter 3, Land Use, as follows:

1) Text amendments to the vision and values section in Chapter 3, clarifying the intended relationship between low-intensity residential areas and a mix of housing types;

2) Text amendments to Policies LU 1.3 and LU 1.4, clarifying that middle housing types (up to 6 units per lot) are appropriate within low-intensity residential areas in the City and outlining topics which should be considered during any future land use or zoning changes that might increase the intensity of a given residential area in the City;

3) Text amendments to the land use plan map designations described in the chapter, changing the descriptors from density (units per acre) to low-, medium-, and high-intensity residential uses; and

4) Updates to land use labels on the Land Use Plan Map (map LU-1) to match the updated land uses described in item 3 above.

No change to the Spokane municipal code is proposed as part of this proposal.

12. Location of the proposal: Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you
should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist. Various locations throughout the City. Land Use Plan Map (LU1) residential land use descriptions will change; no changes to the boundaries of these residential land uses are proposed by this action. To view the Land Use Plan Map designations, visit the City’s public mapping website at my.spokanecity.org/opendata/gis/

13. Does the proposed action lie within the Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)? The General Sewer Service Area? The Priority Sewer Service Area? The City of Spokane? (See: Spokane County’s ASA Overlay Zone Atlas for boundaries.) This is a non-project action that is citywide. Portions of the City are located within the ASA, and most is within a sewer service area.

14. The following questions supplement Part A.

a. Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA) / Aquifer Sensitive Area (ASA)

   (1) Describe any systems, other than those designed for the disposal of sanitary waste installed for the purpose of discharging fluids below the ground surface (includes systems such as those for the disposal of stormwater or drainage from floor drains). Describe the type of system, the amount of material to be disposed of through the system and the types of material likely to be disposed of (including materials which may enter the system inadvertently through spills or as a result of firefighting activities). As a non-project action, this proposal is not expected to directly result or impel any physical development or alteration of the physical environment.

   (2) Will any chemicals (especially organic solvents or petroleum fuels) be stored in aboveground or underground storage tanks? If so, what types and quantities of material will be stored? N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer 1 above).

   (3) What protective measures will be taken to ensure that leaks or spills of any chemicals stored or used on site will not be allowed to percolate to groundwater. This includes measures to keep chemicals out of disposal systems. N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer 1 above).

   (4) Will any chemicals be stored, handled or used on the site in a location where a spill or leak will drain to surface or groundwater or to a stormwater disposal system discharging to surface or groundwater? N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer 1 above).

b. Stormwater
(1) What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)? **Varies throughout the City.**

(2) Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (check one):

☑️ Flat  ✗ Rolling  ☒️ Hilly  ☒️ Steep slopes  ☐ Mountainous

Other: **Varies throughout the City. Any future development in accordance with this proposal would be subject to a site-by-site determination as to the slope impacts to that development at the time of building permit application.**

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? **Varies throughout the City.**

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils. **Varies throughout the City.**

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer A.14.a.1 above for more detail).**

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill: **N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer A.14.a.1 above for more detail).**

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. **No, as this is a Non-Project Action. Any future development in accordance with this proposal would be subject to a site-by-site determination as to the erosion impacts and measures to prevent those impacts at the time of building permit application.**
g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt, or buildings)? N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer A.14.a.1 above for more detail).

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth, if any: None.

2. Air

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known. N/A, Non-project action.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: None, Non-Project Action.

3. Water

a. SURFACE WATER:

(1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. N/A, Non-Project Action (see answer 14.a.1 above). Any development within Shoreline Jurisdictional Boundaries is subject to additional scrutiny, approval, and mitigation under existing requirements of the Spokane Municipal Code.

(2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans. N/A, Non-Project Action.

(3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from the surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material. N/A, Non-Project Action.

(4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? If yes, give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. N/A Non-project action.
(5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. **Varies throughout the City. Future development proposals would be subject to analysis at the time of application to determine any potential impacts from the floodplain.**

(6) Does the proposal involve any discharge of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge. **No, Non-Project Action.**

b. **GROUNDWATER:**

(1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. **Non-project action. Future developments will be subject to concurrency determinations per the Spokane Municipal Code.**

(2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals…; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve. **NA Non-project action.**

c. **WATER RUNOFF (INCLUDING STORMWATER):**

(1) Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) and method of collection and disposal if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

(2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

(3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

d. **PROPOSED MEASURES** to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any. **None.**
4. Plants

a. Check the type of vegetation found on the site: **Non-project action. All of the following are found in various locations throughout the City.**

   Deciduous tree: ☐ alder ☐ maple ☐ aspen

   Other: **Various street trees.**

   Evergreen tree: ☐ fir ☐ cedar ☐ pine

   Other: **Various street trees.**

   ☐ Shrub ☐ Grass ☐ Pasture ☐ Crop or grain

   ☐ Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops

   Wet soil plants: ☐ cattail ☐ buttercup ☐ bullrush ☐ skunk cabbage

   Other: ____________________________________________________________

   Water plants: ☐ water lily ☐ eelgrass ☐ milfoil

   Other: ____________________________________________________________

   Other types of vegetation: __________________________________________

a. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

b. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

c. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: **None.**

d. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

5. Animals

a. Check and List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site: **N/A Non-project action. Many of the following may be found in various locations throughout the City.**

   Birds: ☐ hawk ☐ heron ☐ eagle ☐ songbirds
Other:________________________________________________________________________
Mammals: ☐ deer  ☐ bear  ☐ elk  ☐ beaver
Other:________________________________________________________________________
Fish:  ☐ bass  ☐ salmon  ☐ trout  ☐ herring  ☐ shellfish
Other:________________________________________________________________________
Other (*not* listed in above categories): **Typical urban wildlife may exist on various sites within landscaping and street trees.**

b. List any threatened or endangered animal species known to be on or near the site.  **None.**

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.  **Unknown.**

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:  **None.**

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.  **None.**

6. **Energy and natural resources**

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:  **None.**

7. **Environmental health**

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

(1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.  **None.**
(2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity. N/A, Non-Project Action.

(3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals/conditions that might be stored, used, or produced during the project’s development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project. N/A, Non-Project Action.

(4) Describe special emergency services that might be required. None.

(5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: None.

b. NOISE:

(1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)? N/A Non-Project action.

(2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site. N/A Non-Project action.

(3) Proposed measure to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: None.

8. Land and shoreline use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe. N/A Non-Project action.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use? N/A.
1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how: **N/A, Non-Project Action**

c. Describe any structures on the site. **N/A Non-project action.**

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, which? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? **This is a non-project action that potentially changes the descriptions of Land Use classifications. It will not change zoning classifications.**

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? **This non-project action will not change the parcel level designations of the Land Use Plan Map but may change the descriptions of Land Use Plan Map classifications.**

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or the county? If so, specify. **N/A, Non-Project Action. Development within critical areas is guided by Spokane Municipal Code requirements.**

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: **None.**

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: **The proposal would amend land uses and land use plan map designations and policies, actions allowed under RCW 36.70A.130 and SMC 17G.020.**
m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:  **None.**

9. **Housing**
   
a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.  **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

   b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high-, middle- or low-income housing.  **This non-project action does not require the demolition or removal of any existing units.**

   c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:  **None.**

10. **Aesthetics**
   
a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?  **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

   b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?  **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

   c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:  **None.**

11. **Light and Glare**
   
a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?  **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

   b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?  **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

   c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?  **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

   d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:  **None.**

12. **Recreation**
   
a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?  **Varies throughout City.**
b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. **Non-project action.**

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: **None.**

13. **Historic and cultural preservation**

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the sited that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archaeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc. **None.**

d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required. **None.**

14. **Transportation**

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any. **N/A this is a non-project action.**

b. Is site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop **The City is currently served by a comprehensive regional and local transit system, as managed by the Spokane Transit Authority. This is a non-project action which does not address public transit.**

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**
d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private). **N/A Non-project action.**

e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail or air transportation? If so, generally describe. **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates? **N/A, Non-Project Action.**

(Note: to assist in review and if known, indicate vehicle trips during PM peak, AM Peak, and Weekday (24 hours).)

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, general describe. **No.**

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: **None.**

15. Public services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe. **This is a non-project action. Any future project actions must meet the concurrency requirements in SMC 17D.075.030.**

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any: **None.**

16. Utilities

a. Check utilities currently available at the site:

- ☒ electricity
- ☒ natural gas
- ☒ water
☒ refuse service
☒ telephone
☒ sanitary sewer
☐ septic system

Other: ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed: **None.**
C. SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency must withdraw any determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: April 17, 2023 Signature: ____________________________________________

Please Print or Type:

Proponent: City of Spokane
Staff Contact: Kevin Freibott, Department of Planning & Economic Development

Address: 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd

Phone: 509-625-6184

Person completing form (if different from proponent):

Phone: ____________________________ Address: ________________________________

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: Spencer Gardner, Planning Director

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

☐ A. there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.

☐ B. probable significant adverse environmental impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.

☐ C. there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.
D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS  
(Do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise? **This proposal is not expected to increase the overall density of development beyond levels already planned in the City. The overall impacts from development are expected to be substantially similar to those that could occur under the existing Comprehensive Plan language.**

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: **None.**

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life? **As discussed in the previous answer, the proposed amendments concern future residential development in portions of the City already designated for residential and/or urban development. Impacts to plants, animals, fish, or marine life would be substantially similar between current Comprehensive Plan language and the proposal. Likewise, any direct impacts to these resources resulting from any future private residential development that may or may not occur following adoption of the proposal would be subject to additional SEPA review and potential mitigation, as required by SMC 17E.050.**

   Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish or marine life are: **None.**

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources? **As the proposal concerns portions of the City already designated for urban development, and because the proposal would authorize/permit similar urban development in those areas, the impacts to energy or natural resources are expected to be substantially similar to those already expected under existing conditions.**

   Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: **None.**
4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, flood plains or prime farmlands? **This is a non-project action that does not change any designations of environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, flood plains or prime farmlands**

   Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: **None.**

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans? **This is a non-project action.**

**Land Use Plan Map and policy descriptions are proposed to be amended to allow for more types of housing. This will ensure compatible development patterns. No changes to the Shoreline Master Program are proposed.**

   Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: **None.**

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities? **This is a non-project action.**

   **The proposal envisions a similar intensity of urban residential development as is current called for by the Comprehensive Plan. These urban-scale uses were previously anticipated by the Comprehensive Plan and thus are accounted for in existing infrastructure and service plans for the City. While the proposal would potentially allow for future modification of the housing types allowed within residential areas of the City, the overall density of these areas is not anticipated to increase beyond the maximum currently planned for. Thus, demand for services or infrastructure is not expected to rise beyond that already assumed by the Comprehensive Plan.**

   Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: **None.**

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. **The proposed amendment is both consistent with and supported by RCW 36.70A.600.**
C. SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, swear under penalty of perjury that the above responses are made truthfully and to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that, should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part, the agency may withdraw any Determination of Nonsignificance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist.

Date: April 17, 2023  Signature: 

Please Print or Type:

Proponent: City of Spokane
Primary Staff Contact: Kevin Freibott, Department of Planning & Economic Development

Address: 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd
Phone: 509-625-6184

Person completing form (if different from proponent):

Phone: Address:

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: Spencer Gardner, Planning Director

Based on this staff review of the environmental checklist and other pertinent information, the staff concludes that:

A. ☑ there are no probable significant adverse impacts and recommends a Determination of Nonsignificance.

B. ☐ probable significant adverse impacts do exist for the current proposal and recommends a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with conditions.

C. ☐ there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts and recommends a Determination of Significance.