

**STAFF REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATION
Proposed Transit-Supported Development Policy; File Z18-958COMP**

I. SUMMARY OF REQUEST AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

This application, sponsored by Council President Stuckart and initiated by the Spokane City Council, proposes a new policy, LU 4.6, Transit-Supported Development, in Chapter 3, Land Use, of the Comprehensive Plan. The new policy would call for the City to encourage transit-supported development within the vicinity of high-performance transit (HPT) stops in the City of Spokane.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION

Agent/Applicant:	Council President Ben Stuckart, on behalf of the Spokane City Council
Location of Proposal:	Various locations near high-performance transit lines within the city of Spokane
Zoning/Land Use Plan Designation:	Varies
SEPA Status:	A SEPA threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued on August 27, 2019. The appeal deadline is 5 p.m. on September 10, 2019.
Enabling Code Section:	SMC 17G.020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedure.
Plan Commission Hearing Date:	September 11, 2019
Staff Contact:	Kevin Freibott, Planner II, kfreibott@spokanecity.org
Recommendation:	Approve

III. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- A. Site Description:** The proposal would not directly affect any locations. However, future Land Use Plan Map and development regulation changes could be adopted by the City in the future as a result of this new policy. These changes would occur within the general vicinity of HPT lines in the City, depending on local conditions and opportunities. Specific land use amendments would be designed in the future and may or may not affect any properties along any individual HPT line.
- B. Proposal Description:** Pursuant to the procedures provided in [chapter 17G.060](#) Spokane Municipal Code, “Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedure,” the City Council has proposed a text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 3, Land Use. The proposal would add policy text and discussion text

outlining the need to encourage transit-supported development within the vicinity of HPT stops, likely to include increased density, public amenities, and changes in use. The proposal does not include any specific plans for development or improvement to any property. Future land use plan map and municipal code amendments would be subject to the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Spokane Municipal Code (SMC) regarding such actions at the time of their development and consideration.

C. Existing and Proposed Text: See Exhibit 1 for the full text of the proposed policy. Note that the original proposal has been modified by Plan Commission by unanimous motion on their meeting on July 24, 2019. Exhibit 2 indicates the changes made to the text by the Plan Commission motion.

D. Policy History: The Comprehensive Plan has included a number of policies related to transportation and transit as they relate to land use since the original adoption. However, the concept of HPT has been developed in recent years by transit providers. While transit availability has been an integral part of land use planning in the city, HPT provides for a unique set of opportunities when more frequent use and new ridership technologies like simultaneous boarding, real-time signage, and other typical HPT amenities are considered.

E. Application Process:

- City Council established the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program for 2019 by resolution ([RES 2019-0011](#)) on February 25, 2019;
- Notice of Application was posted and published on May 28, 2019, which began a 60-day public comment period, ending on July 29, 2019;
- A SEPA Determination of Non Significance was issued on August 27, 2019;
- Notice of Public Hearing was posted and emailed by August 28, 2019;
- Notice of Public Hearing to be published on August 28 and September 4, 2019;
- Hearing date is scheduled with the Plan Commission for September 11, 2019.

IV. AGENCY, INTERESTED DEPARTMENT, & PUBLIC COMMENT

Notice of this proposal was sent to City departments and outside agencies for their review. One agency/city department comment was received regarding this application (see Exhibit 6):

- City of Spokane, Development Services

Notice of this proposal was also sent to the City's neighborhood councils. Notice was posted in the Downtown library branch, and published in the Spokesman Review. One comment was received from members of the public at large prior to the comment deadline, included in this report as Exhibit 7.

V. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS GUIDING PRINCIPLES

SMC [17G.020.010](#) provides the following guiding principles for the annual comprehensive plan amendment process:

1. Keep the comprehensive plan alive and responsive to the community.
2. 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.
3. Make map adjustments based on a foundation in policy language, consistently applying those concepts citywide.
4. Honor the community's long-term investment in the comprehensive plan, through public participation and neighborhood planning processes, by not making changes lightly.
5. 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.
6. Amendments to the comprehensive plan must result in a net benefit to the general public.

VI. REVIEW CRITERIA

SMC Section [17G.020.030](#) establishes the approval criteria for Comprehensive Plan amendments, including Land Use Plan Map amendments. In order to approve a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan Map amendment request, the decision-making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant that demonstrates satisfaction of all the applicable criteria. The applicable criteria are shown below in ***bold italic*** print. Following each criterion is staff analysis relative to the amendment requested.

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 most 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. The proposal meets 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 policies and the goals and purposes of the GMA. As such, the proposal meets 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 comment request or require a traffic impact analysis for the proposal. The proposed policy does not include any direct changes to land use and development regulations in the City, though future such amendments may be proposed in later amendment cycles in order to implement this policy. Any subsequent development of sites modified by future land use/development regulations enacted as a result of this policy would be subject to a concurrency determination pursuant to SMC [17D.010.020](#). As such, staff finds that the proposal meets 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: As described in item “C” above, implementation of the concurrency requirement as well as applicable development regulations and transportation impact fees will ensure that development is consistent with adopted comprehensive plan and capital facilities standards, and that sufficient funding is available to mitigate any impacts to existing infrastructure networks. The proposal meets 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:

Development Regulations. As a non-project proposal, there are no specific plans for development of any site tied to this application. The proposal does not result in any non-conforming uses or development. Staff finds no reason to indicate that the proposed policy would conflict with applicable regulations.

Capital Facilities Program. As described in the staff analysis of Criterion C above, no additional demand for infrastructure or capital expenditures by the City would be directly created by this non-project action. Future actions would be subject to additional review and analysis at the time they are proposed. As such, it is not expected that the City's integrated Capital Facilities Program would be affected by the proposal.

Neighborhood Planning Documents Adopted after 2001. The proposed policy would not directly result in any development projects or changes to infrastructure or other physical features typically addressed by Neighborhood Plans. Future changes to land use and/or development regulations enacted as a result of this policy would be subject to a review and consideration of neighborhood plans on a case-by-case basis as those changes are considered as part of the sub-area planning process described by the policy.

Miscellaneous Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies. Staff have compiled a group of Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies excerpted from the Comprehensive Plan and contained in Exhibit 8 of this report which relate to the proposed policy. In general, the proposal supports several comprehensive plan policies and is not in direct conflict with any.

- 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 expected to be consistent with current Comprehensive Plan policy as discussed in item E.1 above. The proposed policy may result in additional land use and development regulation changes in the future in order to implement the policy, though none are proposed at this time. Pursuant to [SMC 17G.025.010](#), the City must find that any future development regulation amendments are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan before approving them. Likewise, any future land use changes as a result of this policy must consider consistency with the existing Comprehensive Plan, per [SMC 17G.020.030.E](#).

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: The proposed amendment is consistent with the various requirements for land use planning in the CWPPs, including the need for establishing efficient land use, providing certainty to capital facilities, and allowing timely extension of services and utilities for new development. Furthermore, no comments have been received from any agency, City department, or neighboring jurisdiction which would indicate that this proposal is not regionally consistent. Therefore, the proposal meets 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: The City is concurrently reviewing this application and four other applications for Comprehensive Plan amendments, as part of an annual plan amendment cycle. The three map amendment proposals are spread throughout the city and concern properties distant from and unconnected to any of the others under consideration. Both proposed text amendments are citywide in nature and significantly larger in the amount of property potentially impacted than the subject application, though their impacts are less direct. However, the proposed text amendments could not affect the map amendments as they would only apply to future land use amendments, not those currently under consideration. As such, the applications would not affect each other in any cumulative fashion and the proposals meet 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. On the basis of 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 August 27, 2019. The proposal meets 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: While the proposal would not modify land use or density immediately, it's conceivable that future land use or development regulation modifications may result from this policy. Any development that occurs following those changes will be subject to a concurrency determination pursuant to [SMC 17D.010.020](#), which will establish whether sufficient services are available to serve that development. Therefore, staff finds that the proposal meets 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 application does not propose an amendment to the urban growth area boundary. 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. [...]

Staff Analysis: The proposal represents a new policy intended to address the opportunity created by a new transit methodology which was not available or fully developed during the original drafting of the Comprehensive Plan. While the Comprehensive Plan currently includes policies and guidance for HPT (see Exhibit 8), the land use opportunities presented by HPT were not yet included. The proposed policy language was included in the [Central City Line Strategic Overlay Plan](#) and was identified as additional recommended policy language to accommodate and take advantage of the land use opportunities raised by HPT in the City of Spokane. As such, staff finds that the proposal meets 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.);***

Staff Analysis: The proposal does not involve a change to the land use plan or zoning map. Consequently, this section does not apply.

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

Staff Analysis: As discussed above, the proposal does not include a map amendment and this section does not apply.

- c. The map amendment implements applicable comprehensive plan policies and subarea plans better than the current map designation.***

Staff Analysis: As discussed above, the proposal does not include a map amendment and this section does not apply.

3. Rezones, Land Use Plan Map Amendment.

Corresponding rezones will be adopted concurrently with land use plan map amendments as a legislative action of the city council. If policy language changes have map implications, changes to the land use plan map and zoning map will be made accordingly for all

affected sites upon adoption of the new policy language. This is done to ensure that the comprehensive plan remains internally consistent and to preserve consistency between the comprehensive plan and supporting development regulations.

Staff Analysis: As this proposal does not include a map amendment, this criterion does not apply. Future map amendments would be subject to this criterion at the time of their consideration by the City.

VII. CONCLUSION:

Based on the facts and findings presented herein, staff concludes that the requested amendment to the text of the City's Comprehensive Plan satisfies the applicable criteria for approval as set forth in SMC Section [17G.020.030](#).

VIII. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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 for approval or denial of the requested amendment to the text of Chapter 3, Land Use, of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Staff recommends that the Plan Commission adopt the facts and findings of the staff report and recommends approval of the requested amendment to the text of Chapter 3 of the City's Comprehensive Plan for the subject text amendment in Exhibit 1.

IX. LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. Proposed Policy Text
2. Originally Proposed Text, Showing Changes
3. Application Materials
4. SEPA Checklist
5. SEPA Determination of Non-Significance
6. Agency Comment
7. Public Comment
8. Applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies

Exhibit 1 – Final Proposed Policy Text

Following public input and Plan Commission discussion about the text, the Plan Commission voted unanimously to amend the proposed policy text to read as follows. The text shown here is the current text to be considered by the Plan Commission at their hearing on September 11, 2019.

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.

Discussion: People are more likely to take transit to meet their everyday travel needs when transit service is frequent, at least every 15 minutes. Mixed-use development in these areas will enable less reliance on automobiles for travel, reduce parking needs, and support robust transit ridership. Land use regulations and incentives will encourage this type of development along high-performance transit corridors.

Transit-supported development should be encouraged through the application of development incentives, enhanced design measures, streetscape standards, parking standards, and potential changes in density and use. Each of these measures should be developed through a sub-area planning (or similar) process as each high-performance transit line is planned and developed. These sub-area planning processes should include neighborhood and stakeholder involvement and public participation processes to ensure that site-specific and neighborhood-context issues are addressed and benefits are maximized.

Exhibit 2 – Original Proposal with Modifications

The following text shows the original proposed text from the [Central City Line Strategic Overlay Plan](#) with changes made by the Plan Commission marked with omitted text in ~~strikethrough~~ and new text underlined.

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-corridors-and-other-transit corridors with service of at least every 15 minutes during weekdays.~~

Discussion: People are more likely to take transit to meet their everyday travel needs when transit service is frequent, at least every 15 minutes. Mixed-use development in these areas will enable less reliance on automobiles for travel, reduce parking needs, and support robust transit ridership. Land use regulations and incentives will encourage this type of development along high-performance transit corridors.

Transit-supported development should be encouraged through the application of development incentives, enhanced design measures, streetscape standards, parking standards, and potential changes in density and use. Each of these measures would be developed through a sub-area planning (or similar) process as each high-performance transit line is planned and developed. These sub-area planning processes should include neighborhood and stakeholder involvement and public participation processes to ensure that site-specific and neighborhood-context issues are addressed and benefits are maximized.

Changed to “stops” only, as some HPT routes would not stop outside the downtown and thus don’t require additional development in the City to support them.

New paragraph to outline how the City might encourage transit-supported development (summarizes the recommendations of the Central City Line Strategic Overlay Plan).

Because 15-minute service does not always include the increased amenities that HPT does, it may not be appropriate to encourage transit-supported development in these areas. By limiting it to HPT stops, the City can ensure that the transit service will remain long term and will attract necessary riders.



SPOKANE CITY COUNCIL
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, WA 99201-3335
(509) 625-6255

Ben Stuckart
Council President

December 17, 2018

Tirrell Black
Planning Department, City of Spokane
808 W Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, WA 99201

Dear Tirrell:

I am writing to submit an application for a text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. This amendment consists of a new policy in section 4 (Transportation) of the Land Use chapter (Chapter 3), and is intended to implement the recommendations of STA's Central City Line ("CCL") Strategic Overlay Plan. The text of each of this new policy is as follows:

[PROPOSED] Policy LU 4.6 Transit-Supported Development

Encourage transit-supported development, including a mix of employment, residential, and commercial uses, adjacent to high-performance transit corridors and other transit corridors with service of at least every 15 minutes during weekdays.

Discussion: People are more likely to take transit to meet their everyday travel needs when transit service is frequent, at least every 15 minutes. Mixed-use development in these areas will enable less reliance on automobiles for travel, reduce parking needs, and support robust transit ridership. Land use regulations and incentives will encourage this type of development along high-performance transit corridors.

In order to implement this strategy, consistent with the recommendations of the Central City Line Strategic Overlay Plan adopted by resolution in 2016, I am proposing a work plan item in order to develop and implement high-performance transit overlay zone(s) or district(s) within the Central City Line ("CCL") corridor area as called for in the Spokane Transit Authority's ("STA") Central City Line plans and route alignment.

Overlay zones/districts modify the underlying zoning or land use plan to achieve certain goals. A transit overlay zone or district can improve walkability, enhance neighborhood character, encourage a mix of different uses, and ensure urban-scale housing densities. In the CCL corridor, an overlay district or zone can also be used to apply development incentives that reduce the costs of development, making it more likely for a project to "pencil out" (*i.e.*, be financially feasible). Rental rates within the CCL corridor are relatively low, which means that new development is less likely to be financially feasible. Incentives can help close that feasibility gap and make projects happen.



Overlay zone(s) or district(s) could be developed for property within the entire CCL corridor or only within certain areas, such as within a certain distance from specified permanent CCL stations. Some or all of the characteristics and incentives applicable within CCL overlay zone(s) or district(s) could also be later made applicable to other high-performance transit network areas as the network expands throughout Spokane.

In general, new development within a high-performance transit overlay zone or district should be required to meet the stricter standard as between the overlay zone or district and the underlying base zone. For example, if the overlay zone or district requires 10-foot minimum sidewalk widths, and the underlying base zone requires 5-foot minimum sidewalk widths, the overlay zone or district's 10-foot minimum would prevail.

This proposed change to the text of the Comprehensive Plan and attendant work plan item request are being presented as a single Comprehensive Plan amendment application because they both concern a single topic (transit-supported development) and geographic area (the CCL route).

Please see the attached documents, namely: (1) pre-application answers, (2) threshold review application answers, (3) proposed amendment text, and (4) a completed SEPA checklist for your review. If you have any questions or need further information, please reach out to City Council Policy Advisor Brian McClatchey.

Sincerely,

Ben Stuckart
President, Spokane City Council

Encl. (4)



Transit-Supported Development

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TEXT

The following text would be added, verbatim, to Chapter 3, Land Use, Shaping Spokane—the 2017 Comprehensive Plan Update. New text is shown underlined. The existing goal LU 4 is shown for reference.

LU 4 TRANSPORTATION

Goal: Promote a network of safe and cost effective transportation alternatives, including transit, carpooling, bicycling, pedestrian-oriented environments, and more efficient use of the automobile, to recognize the relationship between land use and transportation.

...

LU 4.6 Transit-Supported Development

Encourage transit-supported development, including a mix of employment, residential, and commercial uses, adjacent to high-performance transit corridors and other transit corridors with service of at least every 15 minutes during weekdays.

Discussion: People are more likely to take transit to meet their everyday travel needs when transit service is frequent, at least every 15 minutes. Mixed-use development in these areas will enable less reliance on automobiles for travel, reduce parking needs, and support robust transit ridership. Land use regulations and incentives will encourage this type of development along high-performance transit corridors.



Comprehensive Plan or Land Use Code Amendment

Pre-Application

Rev.20180102

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

(Please check the appropriate box(es))

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Plan Text Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Designation Change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory Code Text Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Area-Wide Rezone |

Please respond to these questions on a separate piece of paper. Incomplete answers may jeopardize your application's chances of being reviewed during this amendment cycle.

1. General Questions *(for all proposals):*

- a. Summarize the general nature of the proposed amendment.
- b. Why do you feel this change is needed?
- c. In what way(s) is your proposal similar to or different from the fundamental concepts contained in the comprehensive plan?
- d. For text amendments: What goals, policies, regulations or other documents might be changed by your proposal?
- e. For map amendments:
 1. What is the current Land Use designation and zoning for each affected parcel?
 2. What is the requested Land Use designation and zoning for each affected parcel?
 3. Describe the land uses surrounding the proposed amendment site(s); e.g. land use type, vacant/occupied, etc.
- f. Do you know of any existing studies, plans or other documents that specifically relate to or support your proposal?
- g. Why did you decide to pursue a comprehensive plan amendment rather than address your concern through some other aspect of the Development Services department's work program (e.g. neighborhood planning, public input on new regulations, etc.)?
- h. Has there been a previous attempt to address this concern through a comprehensive plan amendment?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------
- i. If yes, please answer the following questions:
 1. When was the amendment proposal submitted?
 2. Was it submitted as a consistent amendment or an inconsistent amendment?
 3. What were the Plan Commission recommendation and City Council decision at that time?
 4. Describe any ways that this amendment proposal varies from the previously considered version.



Transit-Supported Development

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

PRE-APPLICATION FORM ANSWERS

- 1.a. The proposed amendment would insert a new policy into Chapter 4, Transportation of Shaping Spokane, the 2017 update to the Comprehensive Plan. This proposed policy and its attendant discussion text call for the City to encourage transit-supported development adjacent to high-performance transit routes.
- 1.b. This proposed amendment was identified in the Central City Line Strategic Overlay Plan (“the Overlay Plan”), adopted by City Council resolution in September 2016. The Overlay Plan identified certain implementation steps for accommodation of the Central City Line, including a new Comprehensive Plan policy such as this one.
- 1.c. The proposed amendment supports and augments several existing policies in the Comprehensive Plan, including policy LU 4.1 (Land Use and Transportation), Goal TR-C (accommodate access to daily needs and priority destinations), goal TR-G (maximize public benefits of transportation), and policy TR-19 (plan collaboratively). An efficient and comprehensive transit system is envisioned and supported by the existing Comprehensive Plan. This proposed policy would augment those goals and policies with specific language related to the soon-to-be-implemented Central City Line and the remaining high-performance transit routes STA proposes to install in the city in the near future.
- 1.d. The only change envisioned by this application is a new policy in Chapter 3, Land Use. Proposed as policy LU 4.6, the following language is proposed:

Policy LU 4.6 Transit-Supported Development

Encourage transit-supported development, including a mix of employment, residential, and commercial uses, adjacent to high-performance transit corridors and other transit corridors with service of at least every 15 minutes during weekdays.

Discussion: People are more likely to take transit to meet their everyday travel needs when transit service is frequent, at least every 15 minutes. Mixed-use development in these areas will enable less reliance on automobiles for travel, reduce parking needs, and support robust transit ridership. Land use regulations and incentives will encourage this type of development along high-performance transit corridors.

- 1.e. This question does not apply to text amendments.
- 1.f. This proposal relates directly to the Overlay Plan described above as well as the Spokane Transit Authority (“STA”) Moving Forward Plan. Furthermore, the inclusion of a specialized transit service through downtown Spokane, connecting to adjacent neighborhoods, is described in Fast Forward Spokane, the 2018 Update to the Downtown Plan.

- 1.g. This proposal, as described in the Overlay Plan, is one of a series of proposals that will accommodate and encourage the use of high-performance transit in the City of Spokane. This proposal is most appropriate at the Comprehensive Plan level as it is necessary to provide policy direction and intent for the later steps. Furthermore, the proposal concerns the City as a whole rather than a single project or property. As such, the most appropriate venue for this change is at the Comprehensive Plan level.
- 1.h. No. This is the first time this proposal has been made.
- 1.i. This question does not apply to this proposal.



Unified Development Code Amendments

Threshold Review

Pre-application:

The first step in applying for an amendment to the Unified Development Code which is initiated by persons or entities other than the city, is to submit a threshold review application. Prior to submitting this application, a private applicant is required to schedule a no-fee pre-application conference with staff. Applications are accepted through October 31 each year, during business hours. Applicants are strongly encouraged to make an appointment with Planning Department staff prior to submitting an application.

Description of the Proposed Amendment:

- In the case of a proposed text amendment, please describe the proposed amendment and provide suggested amendment language.

In addition to describing the proposal, please describe how your applications satisfies the threshold review criteria in SMC 17G.025.010, which are restated below. You may need to use a separate piece of paper.

1. Describe how the proposed amendment is appropriately addressed as a Unified Development Code Amendment.
2. The proposed amendment does not raise policy or land use issues that are more appropriately addressed by an ongoing work program approved by the City council or by a neighborhood or subarea planning process.
3. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the resources and time frame of the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program.
4. Describe how the proposed amendment is consistent with current general policies in the comprehensive plan for site-specific amendment proposals. The proposed amendment must be consistent with policy implementation in the Countywide Planning policies, the GMA, or other state or federal law, and the WAC.
5. The proposed amendment is not the same as or substantially similar to a proposal that was considered in the previous year's threshold review process, but was not included in the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program, unless additional supporting information has been generated.
6. If this change is directed by state law or a decision of a court or administrative agency, please describe.



Transit-Supported Development

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

THRESHOLD REVIEW APPLICATION ANSWERS

1. This proposal, as described in the Overlay Plan, is one of a series of proposals that will accommodate and encourage the use of high-performance transit in the City of Spokane. This proposal is most appropriate at the Comprehensive Plan level as it is necessary to provide policy direction and intent for the later steps. Furthermore, the proposal concerns the City as a whole rather than a single project or property. As such, the most appropriate venue for this change is at the Comprehensive Plan level.
2. The proposed amendment would provide policy direction and support for later work program items such as the eventual adoption of a high-performance transit overlay and development regulations as envisioned by the Central City Line Strategic Overlay Plan (the "Overlay Plan").
3. The proposed amendment is a single text amendment, previously discussed and vetted during the preparation and eventual adoption by resolution of the Overlay Plan.
4. This threshold criteria does not apply to text amendments.
5. The proposal would add language that augments and enhances language already in the Comprehensive Plan as well as the Countywide Planning Policies, as follows:
 - **Supporting Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies:**
 - Goal LU 4 – Transportation
 - Policy LU 4.1 – Land Use and Transportation
 - Goal TR-C – Access to Daily Needs and Destinations
 - Goal TR-G – Maximize Public Benefits
 - Policy TR-19 – Plan Collaboratively
 - **Supporting Countywide Planning Policies:**
 - Policy Topic 1 – Urban Growth Areas
 - Urban Policy 9 – High-Capacity Transportation Corridors
 - Policy Topic 5 – Transportation
 - Transportation Policy 11 – Support for Public Transportation
6. The proposed amendment has not been presented to the threshold review process previously.
7. The proposed amendment is not related to a change in state law, nor is it the result of a court or administrative agency decision.

**State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**File No. Z18-958COMP**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: Transit-supported development text amendment
2. Applicant: Council President, Ben Stuckart
3. Address: Spokane City Council, 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd.
City/State/Zip: Spokane, WA 99201 Phone: 509-625-6258
Agent or Primary Contact: Same
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____ Phone: _____
Location of Project: Citywide (Text Amendment)
Address: _____
Section: _____ Quarter: _____ Township: _____ Range: _____
Tax Parcel Number(s) All parcels within City Limits
4. Date checklist prepared: October 31, 2018
5. Agency requesting checklist: Neighborhood and Planning Services Department
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): To be considered in the 2018-2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle.

7. a. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. STA Central City Line

b. Do you own or have options on land nearby or adjacent to this proposal? If yes, explain. _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal. None.

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. Unknown.
-
-
-
10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. Comprehensive Plan amendment docketing process approval; Plan Commission recommendation; City Council adoption.
-
-
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 proposal would amend the Comprehensive Plan to include one new land use policy to encourage and support transit-supported development. This proposal is intended to amend the City's land use policies in advance of the construction of the Central City Line and to give sufficient time for developers and neighbors to understand the impacts of the Central City Line and the new development options along the route.
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. This proposal would have effects city-wide, as high-performance transit routes are established and implemented. For further information, see the STA website at <http://stamovingforward.com/plan/projects/hpt-service-central-city-line>
-
-
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.) Yes.
-
-
-

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). None.

- (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? None.

- (3) What protective measures will be taken to insure 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 text amendment.

- (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? None.

b. Stormwater

(1) What are the depths on the site to groundwater and to bedrock (if known)? _____

N/A. Non-project text amendment.

(2) Will stormwater be discharged into the ground? If so, describe any potential impacts. _____

N/A. Non-project text amendment.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**1. Earth**

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

☐ Flat ☐ Rolling ☐ Hilly ☐ Steep slopes ☐ Mountainous

Other: All types. Proposal concerns all parts of the City.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? _____

Unknown.

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. _____

Unknown.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. _____

Unknown.

- 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: _____
Various. Proposal concerns entire city.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

- 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 text amendment.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth, if any: _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

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 text amendment.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. N/A, non-project text amendment.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

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 text amendment.

- (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. _____ None--the proposal amends the text of the
Comprehensive Plan only.

- (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 text amendment.

- (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 text amendment.

(5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. _____

N/A, non-project text amendment.

(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. _____

N/A, non-project text amendment.

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. N/A, non-project text amendment.

(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. None.

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 text amendment.

- (2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. N/A, non-project text amendment.

- (3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe. N/A, non-project text amendment.

d. PROPOSED MEASURES to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage patter impacts, if any. None.

4. Plants

- a. Check the type of vegetation found on the site: All types. Proposal concerns all parts of the City.

Deciduous tree: ☐ alder ☐ maple ☐ aspen

Other: _____

Evergreen tree: ☐ fir ☐ cedar ☐ pine

Other: _____

☐ Shrubs ☐ 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: _____

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? _____

None.

- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. _____

None/Unknown.

- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: N/A, non-project text amendment.

- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site. _____
Unknown. _____

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: Unknown. Proposal concerns all parts of 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): _____

- b. List any threatened or endangered animal species known to be on or near the site.

Unknown. _____

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

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: _____

N/A, non-project text amendment. _____

- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site. _____
Unknown. _____

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 text amendment. _____

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. _____
N/A, non-project text amendment. _____

- 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: _____
N/A, non-project text amendment. _____

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 text amendment. _____

- (1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses. _____

N/A, non-project text amendment.

- (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. _____

None known.

- (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 text amendment.

- (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 text amendment.

- (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 text amendment.

- (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. _____

As this proposal would be implemented city-wide, the proposal concerns all possible land uses.

- 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? _____

Portions of the City have been used or are used for agriculture. The proposed amendment would not change any existing protections for those uses.

- 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: No.

- c. Describe any structures on the site. The proposal has no "site" as it concerns a text amendment.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, which? No.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? _____

As this proposal would be impelmented city-wide, the proposal concerns all possible zoning classifications.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? _____

As this proposal would be impelmented city-wide, the proposal concerns all possible designations.

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? _____

As this proposal would be impelmented city-wide, the proposal concerns all possibl shoreline designations.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or the county? If so, specify. ____
As this proposal would be impelmented city-wide, the proposal concerns all critical areas within the city. However,
the proposal would not modify any existing protections for such areas

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? _____
Unknown.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? _____
None.

- 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: None.

- 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. None.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high-, middle- or low-income housing. None.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

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 text amendment.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed? N/A, non-project text amendment.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: N/A, non-project text amendment.

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 text amendment.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? ____
No.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? ____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: ____
N/A, non-project text amendment.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? ____
Various. Proposal concerns entire city.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. ____
No.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: N/A, non-project text amendment.

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. Unknown/various.

- 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. Unknown.

- 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. N/A, non-project text amendment.

- 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. _____

The proposed amendment would concern any City street designated as a high-performance transit route.

- 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 _____

Yes. Spokane Transit Authority serves the entire City.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? _____

None.

- 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). No.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail or air transportation? If so, generally describe. No.

- 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 text amendment.
-
-
-

(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. _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.
-
-
-

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any: _____
N/A, non-project text amendment.
-
-
-

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.

Evaluation for
Agency Use Only**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: 1/7/19 Signature: Ben Stuckart

Please Print or Type:

Proponent: Ben Stuckart Address: 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd

Phone: 509-625-6258 Spokane, WA 99201

Person completing form (if different from proponent): Brian McClatchey

Phone: 509-625-6210 Address: 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd
Spokane, WA 99201

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: _____

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? The proposed amendment could result in more dense development along high-performance transit routes. This increased density could have the potential to increase these types of emissions/etc. as would any new development.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: Any such increases would be analyzed on a project-by-project basis as individual building permit applications are submitted to the City for approval.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life? As densification and redevelopment as a result of this proposal occurs in established, developed parts of the City, the impact to plants, animals, fish, or marine life would be minimal.

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? See the answer to question 1 above.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: See the answer to question 1 above.

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? The proposal would not directly affect these locations as it concerns a text amendment. However, if development occurs as a result of the proposed policy, each development project could have incremental effects on these areas.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: _____
Any potential effects will be analyzed by the City on a project-by-project basis as building permit applications are submitted.

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? Similar to answer 4 above, incremental effects on shorelines might occur as a result of development following adoption of the proposed policy.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: _____
Any such development would be subject to the City's existing protections and limitations on land uses in the shoreline areas.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities? The proposed policy concerns development in the vicinity of transit, specifically designed to foster greater use and demand for those transit uses and the attendant benefits resulting from it, such as less vehicle travel, pollution, etc.

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 proposal would not conflict with any local, state, or federal law or policy.

Evaluation for
Agency Use Only

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: 1/7/19 Signature: Ben Stuckart

Please Print or Type:

Proponent: Ben Stuckart Address: 808 W Spokane Falls Blvd
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: 509-625-6258
Person completing form (if different from proponent): Brian McClatchey
Phone: 509-625-6210 Address: Same

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Staff member(s) reviewing checklist: _____

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.

NONPROJECT DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE**FILE NO(S):** Z18-958COMP**PROPONENT:** City of Spokane

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: This application, sponsored by Council President Stuckart and initiated by the Spokane City Council, proposes a new policy, LU 4.6, Transit-Supported Development, in Chapter 3, Land Use, of the Comprehensive Plan. The new policy would call for the City to encourage transit-supported development within the vicinity of high-performance transit (HPT) stops in the City of Spokane.

LOCATION OF PROPOSAL, INCLUDING STREET ADDRESS, IF ANY:

The proposed policy would be enforced city-wide within the general vicinity of high-performance transit stops in the City of Spokane.

Legal Description: n/a

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 197-11-355 WAC. There is no further comment period on the DNS.
- ☒ 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 September 10, 2019 if they are intended to alter the DNS.

Responsible Official: Heather Trautman**Position/Title:** Director, Planning Services **Phone:** (509) 625-6300**Address:** 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, WA 99201**Date Issued:** August 27, 2019 **Signat** 

APPEAL OF THIS DETERMINATION, after it has become final, may be made to the City of Spokane Hearing Examiner, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane WA 99201. The appeal deadline is Noon on September 18, 2019 (21 days from the date of the signing of this DNS). This appeal must be on forms provided by the Responsible Official, make specific factual objections, and be accompanied by the appeal fee. Contact the Responsible Official for assistance with the specifics of a SEPA appeal.

MEMORANDUM



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES CENTER

DATE: April 30, 2019

TO: Kevin Freibott, Assistant Planner

FROM: *Eub*
Eldon Brown, P.E., Principal Engineer – Development Services Center

File No: Z18-958COMP

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment – Policy LU 4.6 Transit-Supported Development

APPLICANT: Ben Stuckart, President, Spokane City Council

Comp Plan Amendment Comments

1. Conflicts with city utilities (sewer, water, stormwater) cannot be foreseen at this time by the proposed Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment for Transit-Supported Development. Future development will require a review of existing public utilities and infrastructure before concurrency for new development is reached.
2. New driveway and business delivery/loading locations may be affected by the overlay zone.
3. Existing ADA accessibility must be protected and new ADA accessibility should be encouraged in the overlay zone.
4. Existing planting strips between the sidewalk and curb, outside of the loading zones, should be maintained and improved to reduce stormwater runoff from sidewalks to the street and to provide a better streetscape.
5. Minimum clear pedestrian paths must be maintained.

cc: Development Services File
Kris Becker, P.E., Manager, Development Services
Mike Nilsson, P.E., Senior Engineer, Development Services
Patty Kells, Traffic Engineering Assistant, Development Services

From: [Carol Tomsic](#)
To: [Black, Tirrell](#); [Gwinn, Nathan](#); [Freibott, Kevin](#)
Cc: [DOUGLAS & MARILYN LLOYD](#); [Sally Phillips](#); [Wittstruck, Melissa](#); [Beggs, Breean](#); [Kinnear, Lori](#); [Stuckart, Ben](#); [Greg Francis](#)
Subject: Comment on 2018/2019 Comprehensive Plan Updates
Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 10:02:50 PM

[CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL - Verify Sender]

Transit Supported Development - Text Amendment

The Lincoln Heights Neighborhood will be affected by the text amendment. The Monroe/Regal High Performance Transit will connect the South Hill with North Spokane. Our neighborhood will benefit from the proposed mixed-use, transit supported development. The Lincoln Heights Neighborhood District plan supports a pedestrian friendly and walkable economically vibrant neighborhood. Encouraging transit ridership will positively affect pedestrian safety on the traffic-congested 29th Ave.

I support the text amendment and discussion; "mixed use development in these areas will enable less reliance on automobiles for travel, reduce parking needs, and support robust transit ridership. Land use regulations and incentives will encourage this type of development along high-performance transit corridors." However, the benefits of the proposed text amendment is contrary to the existing Corridor and District Center Type 2 zoning which sadly allows auto-oriented businesses such as drive thru-coffee shops, tire shops and retail auto parts stores on the auto-congested intersection of Regal/29th. I would like an additional text added stating any inappropriate "transit-supported development" adversely affecting a neighborhood and not supported by neighborhood councils be addressed and favorably rectified.

General Commercial Uses Comprehensive Plan Update

I agree that it's necessary to add clarification against establishing new General Commercial areas outside of centers and establish limited exceptions. I'd like to see a text addition that supports a neighborhood council's objection to any development that is contrary their district plans.

Thank you

Carol Tomsic
resident

Exhibit 8 – Related Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies

GOAL LU 3 EFFICIENT LAND USE

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.

Policy LU 3.1 Coordinated and Efficient Land Use

Encourage coordinated and efficient growth and development through infrastructure financing and construction programs, tax and regulatory incentives, and by focusing growth in areas where adequate services and facilities exist or can be economically extended.

Discussion: Future growth should be directed to locations where adequate services and facilities are available. Otherwise, services and facilities should be extended or upgraded only when it is economically feasible to do so.

The Centers and Corridors designated on the Land Use Plan Map are the areas of the city where incentives and other tools should be used to encourage infill development, redevelopment and new development. Examples of incentives the city could use include assuring public participation, using public facilities and lower development fees to attract investment, assisting with project financing, zoning for mixed-use and higher density development, encouraging rehabilitation, providing in-kind assistance, streamlining the permit process, providing public services, and addressing toxic contamination, among other things.

GOAL LU 4 TRANSPORTATION

Promote a network of safe and cost effective transportation alternatives, including transit, carpooling, bicycling, pedestrian-oriented environments, and more efficient use of the automobile, to recognize the relationship between land use and transportation.

Policy LU 4.1 Land Use and Transportation

Coordinate land use and transportation planning to result in an efficient pattern of development that supports alternative transportation modes consistent with the Transportation Chapter and makes significant progress toward reducing sprawl, traffic congestion, and air pollution.

Discussion: The GMA recognizes the relationship between land use and transportation. It requires a transportation element that implements, and is consistent with, the land use element. The transportation element must forecast future traffic and provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth. It must also identify funding to meet the identified needs. If probable funding falls short of needs, the GMA requires the land use element to be reassessed to ensure that needs are met.

TR GOAL C: ACCOMMODATE ACCESS TO DAILY NEEDS AND PRIORITY DESTINATIONS

Promote land use patterns and construct transportation facilities and other urban features that advance Spokane's quality of life.

INTENT

Land use type, mix, intensity, and distribution - as a result of on-going development of the city - greatly influences travel choices and decisions on connectivity, placement and investments of transportation facilities. Harmonize the key relationship between the places where people live, work, learn, access essential services, play, and shop and their need to have access to these places. Transportation investments should help drive economic development, energize activity centers, provide greater food security for residents, and produce quality places/neighborhoods/communities that retain value through time. Creating prosperous and walkable neighborhoods that offer opportunities for people to meet and connect means thinking of streets as people places as much as vehicle spaces.

Spokane recognizes that transportation needs and travel choices may change over time as new alternatives become available. Other modes become viable when land uses are planned in a way that connects to multiple travel options and the distance between daily needs are closer. Coordinating appropriate transportation options and land uses is important. Transportation facilities should be maintained and improved in a manner that equitably serves Spokane.

TR GOAL G: MAXIMIZE PUBLIC BENEFITS AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY WITH INTEGRATION

Design and maintain a fiscally efficient, environmentally responsible, and socially equitable transportation system that serves its users through coordinated planning and budgeting with other partners and utilities.

INTENT

The City of Spokane recognizes that transportation has a major effect on the environment and that environmental and fiscal stewardship must be a central focus in establishing and maintaining a transportation system that serves both today's users and future generations.

The 2014 Street Levy identified several key elements:

- Street repair needs are perpetual and ongoing investment is critical to maintain our system.
- The City will prioritize projects using an integrated approach that considers all needs in the right of way.
- The City will use a pay-as-you-go approach in maintaining streets.

"The City will focus these dollars on improvements on arterials, including both complete rehabilitation of streets and maintenance work, and will use an integrated approach that incorporates all uses of the right of way to leverage dollars and gain greater community benefits."

The intent is to upgrade the arterial roadway system to an average of "good" condition and maintain them there throughout the 20 years. Work would include everything from major reconstruction to sealing cracks. Other dollars, including those generated through

the vehicle license tab fee, would be dedicated to repairs on residential and other non-arterial streets, and pedestrian improvements.

Spokane will emphasize investments for context-sensitive roadway projects – maintenance, preservation, right-sizing - equitably across the city by seeking funding from a variety of sources and pursuing opportunities for system maintenance revenue for arterials, residential streets, and sidewalks. In addition, the city will remain good stewards of the transportation system by seeking out ways to use cost saving strategies and efficiencies for the best use of the available funds.

Policy TR 19 Plan Collaboratively

Work with partner agencies to achieve a regional transportation plan that meets the goals and requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA) but also reflects the visions and values of the City of Spokane.

Key Actions

- a. Coordinate with SRTC and neighboring jurisdictions on transportation planning, projects and policies to ensure efficient, multi-modal transportation of people and goods between communities regionally.
- b. Coordinate the setting and maintaining of transportation level of service standards with other agencies and private providers of transportation to ensure coordination and consistency when possible.
- c. Coordinate with WSDOT in areas where Highways of Statewide Significance (HSS) intersect/impact the local roadway network.
- d. Use the adopted Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP) as additional guidance for transportation planning.
- e. Protect the operations of Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane International Airport and Felts Field with compatible land use regulations and ensure planning is coordinated and consistent with the airfields' respective Master Plans.
- f. Share information between transportation entities on a regular basis and during appropriate phases of projects and comprehensive plan updates and amendments.
- g. Coordinate with Spokane Transit Authority to ensure and support an efficient transit system.