1. What standard does this proposal seek to alter through the plans-in-lieu of compliance procedure?

The Spokane Municipal Code (SMC) Section 17C.110.200 Development Standard Table 17C.110-3 will be altered regarding lot width, frontage and minimum lot area. As proposed, approximately 317 lots intended for single-family detached residences will have a minimum frontage and width of 35 feet and a minimum lot size of approximately 2,972.54 sf. Additionally, approximately 142 single-family residences are proposed to have a minimum frontage of 40 sf and a minimum lot size of approximately 4,000 sf. The townhome lots will utilize alley-loaded townhomes with front access along a public Right of Way.

In addition to lot dimensions and lot size, the project proposes to alter the following standards:

- **Maximum building coverage:** The project proposes to increase the building footprint to 65% for townhomes and compact lots.
- **Floor Area Ratio:** this PUD is applying for a FAR of up to 1.0.
- **Townhomes:** this project is applying for townhome lots in the RSF Zone with a minimum lot size of 1,280 sf.

2. Does this proposal seek bonus density?

No, this proposal does not seek bonus density.

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

   A. Per the City of Spokane Zoning map, the subject parcel is in the RSF Zone.
   B. According to Spokane Municipal Code Section 17c.110.030- Characteristics of Residential Zones, the RSF zone is a low-density single-family residential zone. It allows a minimum of four and a maximum of ten dwelling units per acre. The RSF zone is applied to areas that are designated residential 4-10 on the land use plan map of the comprehensive plan.
   C. Section 17c.110.115 states the following uses are allowed: single family residence (attached and detached) traditional housing, zero lot line, accessory dwelling unit and manufactured homes.
   D. Section 17C.110.200 Development Standard Table 17C.110-3 will be met, including density, lot frontage and lot setbacks for all lots excepting the compact lots.
   E. Section 17C.110.205 (F) land within a critical area may be subtracted from the calculation of density. The project area includes slopes greater than 30%
   F. Section 17C.110.208 Lot Dimension standards will be met.
   G. The remaining portions of Section 17C.110.200 to 17C.110.270 are or will be met as appropriate.
   H. Chapter 17G.070 allows for Planned Unit Developments.

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

   **LU 3 – Efficient Land Use**
• We believe that the proposed PUD will continue to promote the efficient use of land by placing these lots adjacent to existing development and public services. This development as proposed will implement the following policies:
  • LU 3.1 Coordinated and efficient land use
    ○ This project is located along Thorpe Road, where existing services and facilities are in place or can be reasonably extended into the development.

LU 4 – Transportation
• We believe that the proposed PUD will provide public streets and lots that will utilize existing transportation infrastructure and thereby promote the efficient use of the proposed and built environment. This development as proposed will implement the following policy:
  • LU 4.1 Land use and transportation
    ○ This project includes a trip generation and distribution letter, which forecasts the future transportation needs of the project. This project as required will participate in the city’s impact fee ordinance to mitigate transportation impacts from this development.

LU 5 – Development Character
• We believe that the development of this PUD will continue to utilize geographic areas that will maintain both the existing and proposed built environments without placing undue burden on the area residents or services. This development as proposed will implement the following policy:
  • LU 5.5 Compatible development
    ○ As a single-family attached infill development, this project is compatible with the RSF zone to the east, south and west; and RMF zoning to the north. The PUD overlay assures compatibility with the adjacent RMF zoned land to the north by allowing for higher-intensity development while remaining within the RSF zone. It should be noted that the site has steep slopes that limit the density of the site, particularly along Victory Heights Drive.

LU 7 – Implementation
• We believe that the development of this PUD will ensure the implementation of the goals and policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan by promoting infill development, thereby limiting sprawl opportunities.

LU 8 – Urban Growth Area
• The development of this PUD within the UGA and within the City’s corporate limits meets the goals of this policy. This development as proposed will implement the following policy:
  • LU 8.1 Role of Urban Growth Areas
    ○ This project is located within the UGA and the City of Spokane, where public facilities exist adjacent to or in the nearby vicinity.

5. Please explain how the proposal meets the concurrency requirements of SMC 17D.010. Are the existing transportation systems, public facilities and services in the area adequate to support the proposed development? Are any of the improvements to transportation systems, public facilities and services necessary as a result of the proposed use funded in the City’s capital improvement programs?
A. As identified in this section, this project will meet concurrency as defined for all elements (A to I) listed under 17D.010.010 Applicability and will not affect overall levels of service.
   i. Transportation: the project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan and is agreeable to pay the City of Spokane Traffic Impact Fees associated with the region.
   ii. Public Water: the additional water services will be reviewed by the City of Spokane Public Works and is in the Retail Water Service Area. Comments from City of Spokane Water Department staff in the pre-development conference notes indicate that water is approximately 61 psi at surrounding hydrants, which will meet city requirements of 45 psi for fire flow and potable water.
   iii. Fire Protection: The City of Spokane Capital Facilities Plan (Appendix C of the comprehensive plan) references the Washington Survey and Rating Bureau and states that areas greater than five road miles from a fire station receive a 9A rating and typically an increase of insurance rates. The project site is located 3.3 road miles from Station 4 at 1515 W 1st Ave. The project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan.
   iv. Police Protection: The City of Spokane Capital Facilities Plan identifies that the city has funding to support an adequate level of service for police through 2023. The project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan.
   v. Parks and Recreation: This project will supply at minimum 10 percent publicly available open space as required by SMC 17G.070.030.E.1.a.
   vi. Library: the project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan.
   vii. Solid Waste disposal and recycling: the project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan. Comments from City of Spokane Solid Waste staff in the pre-development meeting notes indicate that the plans would be approved.
   viii. Schools: The project site is currently served by Wilson Elementary, Sacajawea Middle School, and Lewis and Clark High School. The capital facilities plan identifies that Sacajawea Middle School is slated to be replaced in the future. The capital facilities plan identifies that both Wilson Elementary and Lewis and Clark High School were in need of a classroom addition, which was set to be completed in 2020. The project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan.
   ix. Public wastewater (sewer and stormwater): Sewer and storm sewer for the vicinity of the project, with stormwater discharging to drywells for infiltration; however, the sewer from the project site passes by CSO 19, a combined sewer outfall that is considered controlled in the 2013 CSO plan amendment. The project will not add any additional densities not considered in the comprehensive plan.

B. As required, it is understood that further concurrency tests will be made by staff and other affected agencies. If a concurrency test were to be marginal, appropriate provisions would be implemented to bring this subdivision back into level of service conformance such as the payment of traffic impact fees or other modifications that may be required to meet the appropriate and identified levels of services for the noted facilities and services, these changes may affect existing water and sewer facilities.

6. If approval of a site plan is required, demonstrate how the property is suitable for the proposed use and site plan. Consider the following: physical characteristics of the property, including but not
limited to size, shape, location, topography, soils, slope, drainage characteristics, the existence of ground or surface water and existence of natural, historic or cultural features.

A. A copy of the preliminary plat and PUD plan is attached utilizing topography obtained in the field and supplemented by Washington State Lidar and the proposed lots are adequate for required density as proposed. Some grading should be expected to ensure the establishment of proper building pads, roads and utility extensions.

B. The lots proposed in the PUD are single-family detached residences, single family detached residences on compact lots, and single family attached (townhouse) residences, with multifamily to the north. As each residence will be a single-family unit, this project is proposed to be generally consistent with the single-family residences to the north and south.

C. Soils, slope and drainage features have been considered as a part of this project.

D. Public utilities including water and sewer are available to this project. This project will be required to provide extensive water and sewer extensions for service. Preliminary design reports for water and sewer have been prepared and are a part of this application.

E. A Geotechnical report has been or will be prepared for this proposal.

F. There is no apparent evidence of historic or cultural features on site and a cultural resource survey has been ordered to verify that no historic or cultural features are onsite.

G. As required by the SRSM, all storm water will be treated and disposed on site or as allowed.

7. 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.

A. We believe that the SEPA checklist that was prepared for this project as well as the existing zoning and inclusion within the city limits would have contemplated the addition of these lots on this property and therefore, this project is not anticipated to have any substantial impact to the neighboring property or the surrounding area as whole; however, traffic impacts will be mitigated to maintain levels of service as necessary.

8. Demonstrate how each of the objectives in SMC 11.19.361 are satisfied in the proposal:

   Please note that SMC 11.19.361 was repealed and is no longer in effect.

   a. Encourage a more creative approach for land development, achieving a more efficient, aesthetic and desirable use of the land in harmony with and not adversely affecting the surrounding area, but remaining within desired population density ranges and land area coverage standards. Such land development must be consistent with the available land, transportation, utilities, public health and safety standards of the City and the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan.

This Planned Unit Development utilizes compact detached single-family residences on 35’ lots to make best use of the existing steep slopes and reduction in developable land, and to create a variety of single-family residences within the Spokane region. The development is consistent with available land, transportation, utilities, public health and safety standards of the City of Spokane as mentioned in other sections of this application. Please see the response to question 5 for more information regarding concurrency.
b. Best utilize and protect the potential of sites characterized by special features such as size, shape, geography, topography, or some environmentally sensitive feature.

The proposed PUD best utilizes the potential of the site’s size, shape, geography and topography using compact lots, particularly those close to Thorpe Road. As noted on the site plan, the site is encumbered with steep slopes, particularly on and near parcel number 25351.0001. Due to the steep slopes onsite and in order to meet density standards, the project proposes approximately 317 compact lots with a lot width of 35’. The compact residences are proposed to be single-family detached lots with alley access and rear-facing garages. We anticipate that the 35’ compact lots will be similar to townhomes in form and function aside from being detached.

c. Best preserve historical and cultural features.

This item is not applicable as there are no historical or cultural features onsite. A cultural resource survey was conducted onsite under DAHP project number 2022-09-06426. While artifacts were found onsite in the form of a dumping ground and cistern, the survey recommends that they be determined not eligible for historic preservation.

Prior to the advent of motorized transportation and the suburban culture in the United States, more dense housing types (apartments, mixed-use buildings, etc.) were common throughout the region; therefore, the addition of compact lots to the City of Spokane could be considered a revival of historic features or traditions.

d. Make possible a variety of living, working and/or recreational environments.

This PUD allows for the creation of rear-loaded compact lots which are underutilized in the City of Spokane. These compact lots would be priced somewhere between the detached single-family lots and the townhouse lots with the privacy benefits that come from detached residences.

e. Maximize opportunities to conserve energy or utilize alternative energy sources.

This project will follow all applicable energy codes. Additionally, townhouses require less energy than detached single-family residences.

f. Encourage economy and efficiency in the provision and maintenance of utilities and transportation routes and in the provision of quality housing at a reasonable price.

This development as designed will provide quality housing in the RSF zone at a more affordable price than detached single-family residences. The site is located approximately 1.5 miles from the nearest bus stop for Routes 60 and 61 at Sunset Boulevard and Lindeke Street/Government Way.

g. Permit a flexibility in design such as, for example, placement of buildings, common wall construction, use of open spaces, bicycle and pedestrian circulation facilities, off-street parking areas, street alignment, or other methods to achieve these objectives.

This project proposes common wall construction and open spaces. Buildings are placed with frontage along public roads for easy access to sidewalks.

9. For CBD-1 through CBD-6 zones, the additional criteria of SMC 11.19.198(c)(1) through (c)(8) must be met. Please demonstrate how the proposal, if located in a CBD zone, meets these criteria. The property is not located in a CBD zone, so this item is not applicable.
10. Is design review required? If not, describe the design features of the proposed development that result in a need for flexibility in the application of zoning or subdivision standards and why are they necessary?

Design review is no longer required for PUD applications, per the Shaping Spokane Housing. This project proposes the use of alley-loaded detached residential lots, which are necessary due to topographic limitations.