

DRAFT SOUTH LOGAN TOD PLAN PUBLIC WORKSHOP SUMMARY

THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2023, 6:00 PM – 7:30 PM
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY @ HEMMINGSON CENTER

AGENDA

- Welcome
- Subarea Plan and DEIS overview
- Q & A
- Small group discussion
- Share out and next steps



AREAS OF AGREEMENT

- Limit impacts to historic buildings in the neighborhood
- Good quality design for new buildings is important
- The southeast is the best opportunity for new development

AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT

- Future study of Sharp Ave pedestrian bridge
- Development north of Gonzaga (protecting character, scale and form of new development)
- Role of detached housing/internal conversations for student housing vs. apartment buildings

INDIVIDUAL GROUP COMMENTS

GROUP 1

- Participants agreed that if there's upzones and growth that the SE area is the best place for it – based on reduced impact on current neighborhoods, current uses and ownership there.
- Two didn't like the Sharp St pedestrian bridge, feeling that it will attract more unhoused individuals into the neighborhood
- Participants noted that public safety is lacking; some students are terrified to walk through the neighborhood
- Some participants didn't like the high growth options, particularly for areas north of Desmet
- Two participants own multiple rental units in the neighborhood. Findings:
 - They are making a profit now renting units from existing detached "single-family" dwellings. Any of the upzones probably won't move them to redevelop.
 - Nearly all of the students own cars.
 - Both work hard to ensure that students minimize impacts to surrounding neighbors
- It's tough for businesses to serve both students and non-students. With students gone in summer, it's more challenging obviously when class isn't in session
- Gonzaga comments
 - Increasing density south of Sharp/Sinto – closer to campus
 - Don't see enrollment increasing much in near term – goal to maintain what we have
- Concern shared about neighborhood impacts of rentals that have tenants with criminal records

GROUP 2

- Likes:
 - Access to riverfront – should include benches, trees, nature trails, walking areas
 - Access to downtown via trails (riverfront connection)
 - Like access to pedestrian infrastructure and crossings along Hamilton, and Mission Park connectivity
 - Centers and Corridors – market driven, focused development towards Hamilton
 - Alt 3 housing increase is more moderate, focused
- Dislikes
 - Feeling that everything is market driven so there's no guarantee plan will be successful
 - Development in the neighborhoods – impacts to historic homes/character
 - Many rental properties are not well maintained
 - Non-student renters are getting priced out
 - Concern about tear down of historic and old properties
 - Concern about employment center emphasis ignoring other uses in the area
- Goals/hopes
 - Design guidelines/standards are huge for the preferred alternative
 - Would like to increase owner-occupied housing
 - Desire more community investment by residents
 - Need policies to avoid people being priced out
- Alternative comments
 - Alt 3 has more neighborhood protections for historic homes/character
 - Historic preservation conflicts with Alt 4
 - Advocate for Alt 1 – already a place in place for higher density – and Alt 1 protects historic homes. Planning for density around transit stops is a negative when city already has Centers and Corridor designations/zones.
 - Certain housing types are acceptable if they can preserve the existing character (internal ADU, boarding houses) + design standards

GROUP 3

- General concerns
 - Please don't encourage "box houses"
 - Large structures that exploited a code loophole for ADUs/student housing in recent years and led to a court case regarding development in the Missing Ave Historic District. Code loophole was addressed in recent years.

- Haphazard development in and around Gonzaga campus as well as exploitation of code loopholes created community pressure which led to the creation of the Hamilton Form-based Code. It's important to understand that.
- Please don't displace The Warehouse (indoor youth sports facility)
- How does HB 1110 affected these?
 - Not too much. HB 1110 doesn't go too much further than what Spokane already allows under BOCA/BOH
- Questions about balancing FBC and CC zoning on Hamilton
- Alternatives
 - Overall preference for Alt 3 with residential low around Mission Ave and Mission Park, with the addition of high-density housing and mixed-use should be allowed on Sharp Ave.
 - More intense development makes sense in the SE area, but CC1-EC does not have great design standards. Rezones should go to CC-DC or something else with better design.
 - Traffic calming on Hamilton St should be a part of all alternatives.
 - Agreement that smaller upzones may not encourage development because property owners are renting existing homes to college students with little incentive for redevelopment.
- Investments
 - No problem with the Sharp Ave bridge study. It would help activate Mission Park and Sharp Ave, which is good. Should not be the priority in the immediate future though.
- What's missing from the alternatives?
 - "Community Design" is the most important set of goals. Pay close attention to aesthetics and rights of way. Folks need comfortable routes to walk in the neighborhood and to get to the City Line bus stops.
 - Find ways to retain the unique sports facilities and historic homes
 - Think about the study area gateways – how do people know they're in South Logan? There should be a big sign "WELCOME TO SOUTH LOGAN" along Hamilton as people get off the freeway so that they know they're in a neighborhood now.