

SHORELINE PERMIT APPLICATION

Attach an additional sheet if needed

The proposed action requires approval of:

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

All Shoreline Permits must provide the following information:

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

Spokane River

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

Remove concrete & old unused water feature from site. Grade, seed and landscape, including a small concrete plaza and paths. Add seating and prepare area for representative sculptures from each of Spokane's Sister Cities. This will become a passive recreation site – for sitting and enjoying, for education about Spokane Sister Cities, and for an area for Spokane's mayor to bring visitors.

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

Currently, this area is used for park activities, but the area is uninviting, so there is little park activity there. To the east, Avista uses a portion of the site for access to its intake structure.

4. What is the estimated total Fair Market project cost within the Shoreline Jurisdiction? Approximately, \$203,000.

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

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

7. Explain how the proposed use will not unreasonably interfere with the normal public use of public shorelines.

Currently, the shoreline is a steep bank that backs into an uninviting rock garden. There is little public use of the public shoreline here. The proposed use will not alter the current topography or interfere with current use.

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

This is consistent with the Shoreline Master Program because there will be little change to the current shoreline. There will not be any structures added within 50' of the shoreline, and there will be minimal disturbance or grading within 200' of the Spokane River. This area is Urban Intensive, and the current Sister Cities garden plan does not change the nature of the shoreline nor the ability of the public to use it in the same manner in which it is currently used.

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

The shoreline ecological function will not change; the shoreline banks will not be developed or changed, and the site will still function as a public park.

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

General Permit, other building and grading permits. Because of the minimal changes to the shoreline or the site, Sister Cities does not believe that additional permits will be required.

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

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

SMC 17C.124.100, SMC 17C.124.240, SMC 17C.200, SMC 17C.190.460,

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

The Sister Cities *Connections* garden site proposal has been approved by the Riverfront Park Committee, and the Park Board and has been part of the Riverfront Park Master Plan presentation since 2011. Spokane Parks & Rec Director Leroy Eadie supports the project, and the Spokane Arts Commission approved the garden design in 2012. The garden design and project has been a subject within several public meetings regarding the Riverfront Park Master Plan in 2012 and 2014. Finally, the Spokane Arts Commission approved the design of the garden in 2012.

13. Please explain how the proposal meets the concurrency requirements of SMC Chapter 17D.010.

Because this is an aesthetic change to a small site within Riverfront Park, there will be little, if any, impact on public services, including Riverfront Park, public safety, drainage and transportation. Sister Cities plans to seed fund a maintenance fund with a Spokane Community Foundation for site maintenance, as well as encourage members to volunteer to clean within the site.

14. Please explain any significant adverse impact on the environment or the surrounding properties the proposal will have and any necessary conditions that can be placed on the proposal to avoid significant effects or interference with the use of neighboring property or the surrounding area, considering the design and intensity of the proposed use.

The Sister Cities Association has met with Avista, which has its intake house to the east of the project in Riverfront Park. Avista that there would be no adverse impact on its site. The Park Board and the Riverfront Park Committee, as well as the Master Plan group, has supported the project within Riverfront Park as a way to highlight Sister Cities and improve an underutilized portion of Riverfront Park.

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

The cumulative effect of conditional use permits within Riverfront Park along the Spokane River

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

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

	<i>REQUIRED</i>	<i>PROPOSED</i>
Front yard setback	N/A	N/A
Rear yard setback	N/A	N/A
Side yard setback	N/A	N/A
Lot coverage percentage	12% (current)	9%
Lot size	31,791 sq. ft.	31,791 sq.ft.
Lot width	EW-207ft; NS 216ft.	EW-207ft; NS 216ft
Height	N/A	N/A
Other (specify):	N/A	N/A

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

None

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

There is no physical difference. The subject property will be developed to the same extent or to a lesser extent than surrounding property within Riverfront Park.

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

No variance has been requested.

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

Compliance will not eliminate or substantially impair any natural, historic or cultural feature of area-wide significance. If anything, improvements to the site will improve a cultural feature of Riverfront Park.

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

No, there will little, if any, work done within 50' of the river, and the surrounding properties will be improved. There will be no structures built within 50' of the river.

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

The property appearance upon completion will be consistent with Riverfront Park's Master Plan.

23. Variance permits for development that will be located **landward** of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), and/or landward of any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant can demonstrate all of the following: **Not applicable**

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

- d. That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area;

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

- f. That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect. **This underused site will be improved for public use.**

24. Variance permits for development that will be located **waterward** of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(b), or within any wetland as defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)(h), may be authorized; provided, the applicant can demonstrate all of the following: **Not applicable**

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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