

## Comment Matrix for File Z100055-COMP, Minor text amendments to Chapters 5-10 excluding the Capital Facilities Plan

This is a summary document meant to keep track of changes made during the process. Complete file is available from Planning Services any time during business hours. For additional information, please contact Tirrell Black, City Planner, [tblack@spokanecity.org](mailto:tblack@spokanecity.org) or 509-625-6185

Type	Date	Commenter	Comment	Amendment as shown in Application/ Staff discussion	3/23/11 Plan Commission(PC) Workshop and 5/11/11 PC workshop notes
Agency Review	11/19/10	City of Spokane, Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
	12/13/10	City of Spokane, Traffic Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional comments or concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
	12/22/10	City of Spokane, Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts to City of Spokane Utilities (sewer and water); no impacts to Stormwater regulations or policies; Transportation and Capital Programs concur with changes; Engineering Services concurs with changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
End Agency Review	12/28/10	SRTC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments specific to this Comp Plan Amendment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Public Comment	3/7/11	Bob Mansfield, Plan Commissioner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 6, Policy H1.14: The original word was correct; leave “practices try”</li> </ul>	<p><b>H 1.14 Performance Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a process to review proposed development practices that <del>try</del> <u>tries</u> to achieve the same results as existing development standards but that are currently not allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>At 3/23/11 workshop, PC requests staff look at this policy wording and bring back at another workshop</p> <p>At 5/5/11 workshop, staff brought forward language change as described in public comment by Mr. Kropp. PC asked that change be brought forward.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 7, Introduction, “Spokane Profile” should also read “<u>an</u> interstate highway”</li> </ul>	An international airport, a major rail <del>line</del> hub, interstate highway, and proximity to the Columbia and Snake River systems reinforce Spokane’s position as a distribution center.	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9, Overview, last sentence: Consider adding “sustainability” to the list in this sentence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finally, this chapter concludes with policies that encourage energy conservation, environmental education, and quality of life indicators and benchmarks. <del>The latter appears throughout this comprehensive plan as part of many topic chapters.</del></li> </ul>	PC discussed; comment not incorporated into the text.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9, Goal NE5, Clean Air: should read: <i>the health of current residents, <del>children</del> and future generations.</i></li> </ul>	<p>NE 5 CLEAN AIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Goal: Work consistently for cleaner air that nurtures the health of <u>current residents</u>, children and future generations.</b></li> </ul>	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9, Policy NE 5.4: <i>Support <u>diesel bus</u> alternatives <del>to diesel-powered buses</del> that reduce noise and air pollution while conserving fuel.</i></li> </ul>	<p>NE 5.4 Alternative Powered Buses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Support alternatives to diesel powered buses that reduce noise and air pollution while conserving fuel.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Comment: no changes were proposed to this policy in comp plan amendment at time of application.</i></p>	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9, Policy NE 5.10: <i>Recruit industries that can make use of <del>and profit from</del> Spokane's solid waste...</i></li> </ul>	<p>NE 5.10 Profit From Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Recruit industries that can make use of and profit from Spokane's solid waste in a <del>non-environmentally impacting</del> manner <u>that minimizes or mitigates environmental impacts.</u></i></li> </ul> <p><i>Comment: Since the policy is called "Profit from Waste"; this change does not seem prudent.</i></p>	PC discussed; Comment not incorporated.
	End Bob Mansfield comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9, Policy NE 11.3: <i>Acquire nature space and connecting corridors using <del>any one or more combination of</del> available acquisition techniques <del>available</del> to create a nature space network.</i></li> </ul>	<p>NE 11.3 Acquisition Techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Acquire nature space and connecting corridors using <del>any one or more combination of</del> acquisition techniques available to create a nature space network.</i></li> </ul>	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
3/11/11	Paul Kropp (representing himself)	<p>CFU 2.2</p> <p>The proposal omits "either" without its accompanying "or" later in the sentence. <i>Both words should be omitted.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long discussion accompanies CFU 2.2 Concurrency Management System, see full text. Paragraph under discussion is:</li> </ul> <p>The City of Spokane must <del>either</del> ensure that adequate facilities are available to support development or else prohibit development approval when such development would cause service levels to decline below standards currently established in the Capital Facilities Program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</li> </ul>

		<p>CFU 3.2</p> <p>The proposal adds the continuation idea. But that notion of ongoing property development and its accompanying urban services is embedded in the CFU3 goal: <b>“Promote contiguous, orderly development and provision of urban services through the regional coordination of land use and public services related to capital facilities and utilities.”</b></p> <p><i>This text revision is unnecessary and need not be adopted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>CFU 3.2 Utility Installations</b></p> <p><del>Facilitate</del> <i>Continue to facilitate coordination of public and private utility trenching activities by giving interested utilities timely and effective notification of road projects that would afford them an opportunity for utility installation and maintenance.</i></p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
		<p>CFU 5.3</p> <p>Again, the continuation idea, but with a phrase that splits a verb.</p> <p><i>A better phrase should be used: “. . . the City of Spokane should work on a continuing basis toward . . .”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>CFU 5.3 Stormwater</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Implement a Stormwater Management Plan to reduce impacts from urban runoff.</i></li> <li>• <i>Discussion relates to one paragraph in discussion for policy CFU 5.3, it reads:</i></li> </ul> <p>Disposal of stormwater to either sanitary or combined sewers is not allowed in new developments. In addition, the City of Spokane should <u>continue to</u> work toward the reduction of existing combined sewer overflows wherever technically, economically, and environmentally appropriate.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text, but in a slightly altered format.</p>

			<p>CFU 5.4</p> <p>The continuation idea is not needed in this place.  <i>Changing “consider” to “acquire” is sufficient here, it implies ongoing activity.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<p><b>CFU 5.4 Ground Water</b>  <i>Protect, preserve, and enhance ground water resources through proactive, aggressive measures.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> Ground water can be protected through watershed and wellhead protection programs, as appropriate, and comprehensive monitoring, which is coordinated with other regional efforts. In addition, permit processes should be designed to avoid or mitigate land uses and activities that reduce ground water quality or increase the quantity of ground water above normal levels. Management and monitoring strategies should acknowledge the physical link between surface water and ground water and emphasize prevention and control of pollutants at the source. Sewer lines should be maintained or repaired to prevent leakage into ground water and surface waters, as well as to prevent excessive infiltration into the system. <b>When necessary, the City of Spokane should consider continue to buying acquire land or development rights if there is property that must be kept undeveloped to protect a vulnerable ground or surface water resource.</b> Comment: Mr. Cruz also commented on this policy.</li> </ul>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
			<p>H 1.8</p> <p>Does the phrase after the suggested revision (“... or small (four unit/two story) townhouse structures...” potentially conflict with the coming Infill Housing Task Force development regulation change proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<p><b>H 1.8 Affordable Housing Requirement</b>  <i>Include a percentage of affordable housing within all new developments that include housing.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Requiring that lower-income housing be incorporated in every new housing development helps reverse the economic segregation trends within the city. This has the positive effect of integrating households of varying incomes. A greater variety of housing styles and density should be allowed to accommodate the housing units required. <b>Housing types such as smaller homes on lots smaller lots than 5,000 square feet or small (four unit/two-story) townhouse structures should be allowed to accommodate this requirement.</b> This housing should be priced so that it is available to households that earn around eighty percent of the countywide median household income.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment: This is an illustrative statement, it can be amended either way and still not substantively affect the policy statement.</li> </ul>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>

		<p>H 1.14</p> <p>Don't keep the "try" idea. It is a weak notion for a positive plan. <i>Simply omit "try."</i></p>	<p><b>H 1.14 Performance Standards</b> <i>Create a process to review proposed development practices that <del>try</del> tries to achieve the same results as existing development standards but that are currently not allowed.</i> Comment: This policy was also a comment subject by Mr. Mansfield.</p>	<p>PC requests staff look at this policy wording and bring back at another workshop (note: second citation for this policy in public comment)</p>
		<p>ED Economic Development / 7.1 Introduction / Spokane Profile / p. 7</p> <p>The final sentence addition could contain a bit more detail. Example: <i>"A University District has evolved on the Riverpoint Campus with SIRTI, Washington State University, and Eastern Washington University planning continued expansion there in conjunction with private development."</i></p>	<p>Chapter 7, from Introduction: Spokane's convention and tourism industry continues to develop as a major component of the Spokane regional economy. Downtown is home to Spokane's major convention facilities, the majority of hotel rooms, several restaurants, shopping, and Riverfront Park. <u>In 2007 the Spokane Convention Center completed a major expansion and renovation. The Riverpoint Campus has continued to evolve into the University District with Sirti, Washington State University and Eastern Washington Campus's continuing to expand there.</u> Comment: Nicer prose. SIRTI has changed name to "Sirti"</p>	<p>PC requests staff look at this policy wording and bring back at another workshop</p>

		<p>ED Economic Development / 7.1 Shaping Our Economic Future / Development Organizations / p. 8</p> <p>About the final sentence addition:  <i>If the 2008 update of the downtown plan was officially incorporated in the city's comprehensive plan at some point then this addition should note that fact.</i></p>	<p><i>Paragraph reads:</i>  The Horizons process also paralleled the planning process for the <u>Plan for a New Downtown</u>, prepared by the City of Spokane and the Downtown Spokane Partnership, a non-profit coalition of business, government, and community leaders. The policies and actions set forth in the 1999 document, <u>Charting the Future The Plan for a New Downtown</u> are consistent with the direction of the Comprehensive Plan. <u>Charting the Future was updated in 2008 with the publication of Fast Forward Spokane: Downtown Spokane Plan.</u></p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
		<p>ED 2.4</p> <p>Although this addition verges on being a substantial amendment to an existing policy, the preservation idea could be worked in otherwise, For example:  <i>“Support mixed-use development by identifying areas for economic growth that bring employment, shopping and residential activities into shared locations, and that through preservation or redevelopment stimulate opportunities for economic activity.”</i></p>	<p><b>Chapter 7,</b>  <b>ED 2.4 Mixed-Use</b>  <i>Support and preserve mixed-use development by identifying areas for economic growth that bring employment, shopping, and residential activities into shared locations and that, through redevelopment, create new areas for economic activity.</i></p> <p>Comment: Subcommittee’s intent with this addition was to acknowledge that historic mixed-use structures and development continue to exist and function in the city.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>

			<p>ED 3.7</p> <p>The addition of “family” appears arbitrary but cogent. Adding “individual” would make it a more complete notion:  <i>. . . many community, family, and individual benefits . . .</i>”</p>	<p><b>ED 3.7 Home Businesses</b>  <i>Encourage opportunities for teleworking and home businesses that are compatible with residential neighborhoods.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> More people are working from their homes, a trend that results from shifts in the economy toward services, corporate down-sizing, and improved telecommunications. <b>Teleworking and appropriate home businesses can produce many community and family benefits including new business opportunities, such as information technology development, reduced traffic congestion, and reduced air pollution.</b></p> <p>Development regulations should minimize the potential for negative impacts from home businesses by limiting signs, maintaining the residential appearance of neighborhoods, requiring adequate parking while ensuring that parking and traffic generation fits into the neighborhood and is not excessive, limiting truck deliveries, and appropriately managing other potential adverse impacts.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
			<p>DP Urban Design &amp; Historic Preservation / 8.1 Introduction / p. 7</p> <p>Before the addition “... now known as (etc.) ...”Design Review” should be omitted and “committee should not be capitalized, because just above the text only refers to a citizen committee, as follows:  <i>“The members of the committee (now known as the Design Review Committee) accepted . . . .”</i></p> <p>The replacement text for “Instill . . .” should omit “action” and “permit” which are unnecessary detail for a description of a generalized process, as follows:  <i>“Recommendations as to whether a proposal is consistent with the applicable design criteria are forwarded to the responsible approving authority of the City. In most cases, the Board’s recommendations are adopted or made a condition of approval.”</i></p> <p>In the final sentence on this page, “may” should be replaced by “should.”</p>	<p>This refers to an entire page of text. This is attached at the end of this table.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>

		<p>DP 3.5</p> <p>The continuation idea is unnecessary. This is sufficient:  <i>“The City of Spokane should work with . . . .”</i> and  <i>”Cooperation avails the city of greater funding . . . .”</i></p>	<p><b>DP 3.5 Urban Forestry Program</b></p> <p><i>Develop and support a comprehensive urban forestry program.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> An urban forestry program includes an inventory of existing trees and all available tree locations and establishes goals for new and replacement tree planting and total canopy cover. Needed are citywide regulations and street standards that require establishing and maintaining plantings in traffic islands and planting strips and that allow large canopy street trees. Landscape standards for parking lots and neighborhood entranceways, along with regulations designed to save large trees in newly developed areas and subdivisions, are a necessary part of the program. The program could establish incentives, such as reduced parking requirements or building setback deviations for tree planting and replacement and could serve as a means to educate the public regarding the benefits of trees and their necessary maintenance. The City of Spokane should <del>consider joining</del> <u>continue to work with</u> the Spokane County Conservation District, which is a state-chartered agency established to promote education and preservation of natural resources. <del>Joining</del> <u>This continued cooperation</u> could avail the city <del>to</del> <u>of</u> greater funding opportunities, encourage the sharing of staff expertise, and promote tree planting programs on a countywide basis.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
		<p>DP 3.14</p> <p>Continuation again. Prefer:  <i>“Identify and implement on an ongoing basis ways to provide . . . .”</i></p>	<p><b>DP 3.15 Bus Benches</b></p> <p><del>Continue to <i>Identify</i></del> <i>identify and implement ways to provide bus benches and control bus bench advertising.</i></p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>

			<p>DP 6.7</p> <p>There would need to be some adjustments to the full text of the second paragraph of the discussion if the “design review process” mission statement is omitted.  <i>“Thus” in the subsequent sentence should be omitted too, and “policy” in that sentence changed to “process.”</i></p>	<p><b>DP 6.7 Design Standards for Public Projects and Structures</b></p> <p>One of the discussion paragraphs for DP 6.7:</p> <p>The process for developing city projects and structures to achieve this aim will utilize the City of Spokane’s Design Review Process. <del>The mission of the city design review process states, “Instill the values of the public into a project’s design, keeping in mind the developmental standards established by the governing body, while at the same time, not substantially increasing the development cost or permit issuance time for the proponent.”</del> Thus, the design review process is both an appropriate and useful tool to use, particularly since the intent of this policy is for city projects and structures to serve as models of design quality and community values for the entire community. The process to achieve desirable projects that adds to the functional and aesthetic aspects of the project’s merits includes coordination between the funding sources, urban forestry program, urban design and engineering, utilities, police, fire, transportation, school districts, neighborhoods and adjacent property owners, among others.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
			<p>NE Natural Environment / 9.1 Introduction / Current Trends / p. 1</p> <p><i>Omit “recent” in the modified text. “Growth trends continue . . . .” is enough here.</i></p>	<p>From Chapter 9, Introduction, p. 7:</p> <p><b>Current Trends</b></p> <p><del>Recent growth trends continue</del> <del>More recently, growth has started again</del> to impact the natural environment in and around Spokane. More water is being drawn out of the aquifer, more sewage must be treated and released into the river, more vehicles contribute to the poor air quality, more garbage must be incinerated, <del>sprawling</del> development replaces <del>farmland and</del> open space, and more wildlife habitat is altered or lost. At the same time, citizens increasingly ask for improved natural areas, trails, clean air and water, and protection for wildlife and their habitat.</p> <p>Comment: Kelly Cruz also commented on this passage.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>

		NE 5.2 Continuation again! Prefer: "Pursue a land development and design pattern . . . ." which indicates simply and clearly an ongoing activity.	<b>NE 5.2 Alternative Transportation Modes</b> <del>Pursue</del> <u>Continue to encourage</u> a land use development and design pattern that allows people to walk, bicycle, or use mass transit to improve air quality through reduced use of single-occupant combustion vehicles.	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
		NE 5.3 Use "does not" instead of "doesn't".	<b>NE 5.3 Downtown Improvement</b> Design a downtown area that meets people's living, shopping, working, spiritual, and residential needs <del>that</del> <u>and</u> doesn't require the daily use of automobiles for transportation purposes.	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
		NE 12.2 Continuation!! Start the sentence with "Participate," which indicates simply and clearly an ongoing activity.	<b>NE 12.2 Urban Forestry Programs</b> <u>Continue to participate in</u> <del>Consider joining</del> the Spokane County Conservation District for urban forestry programs, protection, and maintenance. <del>Until joining, have a program that accomplishes the equivalent of the Conservation District program.</del>	PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.
	End Paul Kropp comments	NE 13 This is a goal statement, not merely a policy statement. Is this suggested change even kosher as shown? It would be more reasonable for a statement at this level only to replace "LINKS" with "CONNECTIVITY."	<b>Goal 13 <del>PARK AND PLAZA LINKS</del> <u>CONNECTIVITY</u></b> <b>Goal: Create a citywide network of paved trails, designated sidewalks, and soft pathways that link regional trails, natural areas, parks, sacred and historical sites, schools, and urban centers.</b>  Comment: Withdrawal of this correction may be warranted. Policy changes were not in the scope of this project. Subcommittee viewed this as updating language, not a policy change but if that is unclear; restoration of original language should be considered.	PC discussed; Comment not incorporated into the text.

3/15/11	Kelly Cruz	In chapter 5.3 Visions and Values (CFU 1.8Funding) I am curious as to why we are deleting the reference to RCW 39.89, unless this RCW is being repealed or changed I feel we should identify these types of funding sources in our comp plan so people know that it exist	<p><b>CFU 1.8 Funding</b>  <i>Identify and pursue all practical and equitable ways to fund the capital improvement projects necessary to serve existing and future development.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> It is necessary to leverage and supplement city funds to the fullest extent possible in order to maximize limited city resources. In addition to the grants and loans available to cities, certain other funding mechanisms are available locally. In addition, Tax Increment Financing (TIF) has been codified as RCW 39.89, which represents another very important tool for financing infrastructure and focusing those improvements in targeted areas of the inner city that are most in need of revitalization.</p>	PC discussed; Comment not incorporated into the text.
		Also I have a concern regarding the striking of language in chapter 5.3 Visions and Values (CFU 5.1 On-Site Wastewater Disposal). I feel that this language should remain so that we are constantly updating our SMC and the six year plan to reflect this.	<p>Comment: No changes were undertaken in “Visions and Values” sections of the chapters since this is an expression of the Horizons process.</p> <p><b>CFU 5.1 On-Site Wastewater Disposal</b>  <i>Prohibit on-site septic wastewater disposal within the City of Spokane’s Urban Growth Area.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Activities above the aquifer and in the aquifer recharge area must be regulated in order to protect the area’s water supply. Potential pollution can be reduced by requiring new development to be sewerred. Existing on-site disposal should be eliminated and appropriate treatment of wastewater provided. <del>All water and sewer facilities must be adequately maintained in order to provide required service levels and minimize impacts to public health and the environment.</del></p> <p>Comment: Subcommittee found this to be repetitive discussion already covered in previous chapter policies.</p>	PC discussed; Comment not incorporated into the text.

			<p>I further have a concern with the language change to CFU 5.4 Ground Water; I feel that this change should read- Consider Acquiring and not Continue to acquiring. My reason for this is that while I believe it is important that we protect vulnerable ground or surface water resources, I don't believe it is the duty of the City to acquire land to do so. I think that this can best be achieved thru careful and comprehensive land use regulations.</p>	<p><b>CFU 5.4 Ground Water</b>  <i>Protect, preserve, and enhance ground water resources through proactive, aggressive measures.</i></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Ground water can be protected through watershed and wellhead protection programs, as appropriate, and comprehensive monitoring, which is coordinated with other regional efforts. In addition, permit processes should be designed to avoid or mitigate land uses and activities that reduce ground water quality or increase the quantity of ground water above normal levels. Management and monitoring strategies should acknowledge the physical link between surface water and ground water and emphasize prevention and control of pollutants at the source. Sewer lines should be maintained or repaired to prevent leakage into ground water and surface waters, as well as to prevent excessive infiltration into the system. <b>When necessary, the City of Spokane should consider continue to buying acquire land or development rights if there is property that must be kept undeveloped to protect a vulnerable ground or surface water resource.</b></p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment not incorporated into the text.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>I also wanted to address a couple of concerns that I have with chapter 7 regarding the Spokane profile section. Where the change of have been to was, it should be kept <i>have been or were</i> as <i>was</i> is not grammatically accurate.</p>	<p>Chapter 7, page 5, from Introduction:  The late 1990s brought major investments in renovation and new construction of downtown office buildings. In addition, millions of dollars <del>have been</del> <u>was</u> invested in fiber optic infrastructure within the downtown street system to create the “Terabyte Triangle,” a concentration of real estate designed to attract tenants with more sophisticated technology requirements.</p> <p>Comment: Agree, change, should read: “millions of dollars <u>were</u> invested”</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>
		<p>Secondly under Shaping Our Economic Future the first word in the paragraph should be the city not a city if we are intending to identify the City Of Spokane specifically.</p>	<p>Chapter 7, page 5, Introduction:  <b>Shaping Our Economic Future</b>  <b>The City of Spokane’s Role in Economic Development</b>  A city can foster economic development through actions that include activities primarily directed toward economic development and those undertaken for other reasons that also produce economic benefits.</p> <p>Comment: no changes were proposed at time of comp plan amendment application to this section. This context of “a city” does refer to generalized city so lower case is correct.</p>	<p>PC discussed; Comment incorporated into the text.</p>

End public comment		End Kelly Cruz comments	Finally in chapter 9.1 Introduction I believe that under current trends sprawling, farmland should remain as it is accurate in what has occurred and continues to occur. I hope you will consider these concerns and recommendations as you evaluate the proposed comp plan text amendments.	<p>From Chapter 9, Introduction, p. 7:</p> <p><b>Current Trends</b></p> <p><del>Recent growth trends continue</del> <del>More recently, growth has started again</del> to impact the natural environment in and around Spokane. More water is being drawn out of the aquifer, more sewage must be treated and released into the river, more vehicles contribute to the poor air quality, more garbage must be incinerated, sprawling development replaces farmland and open space, and more wildlife habitat is altered or lost. At the same time, citizens increasingly ask for improved natural areas, trails, clean air and water, and protection for wildlife and their habitat.</p>	Same sentence referenced earlier in this matrix. See above.
--------------------	--	-------------------------	--	--	---

In 1994, the City Council, recognizing the public demand for quality projects, established a design review program and appointed a citizen committee of design professionals and organization representatives to conduct individual project reviews and oversee the development of the program. The members of the Design Review Committee ([now known as the Design Review Board](#)) accepted the challenge to act in an advisory role, developing guidelines, reviewing projects, and making recommendations to the city approving authority for the assigned specific classes of projects. ~~The guiding principles of the committee are reiterated in their mission statement:~~

~~“Instill the values of the public into a project’s design, keeping in mind the developmental standards established by the governing body, while at the same time, not substantially increasing the development cost or permit issuance time for the proponent.”~~



~~The Design Review Board is advisory. Recommendations as to whether a proposal is consistent with the applicable design criteria are forwarded to the responsible action approving authority. In most cases, the Board’s recommendations are adopted or made a condition of permit approval. As an advisory body, the Design Review Committee lacks the authority to cause adherence to their recommendations. This, along with the limitation on the types of projects to be reviewed, has led to some frustration for the committee and has resulted in some buildings that do not fully reflect community values. A few of the Neighborhood Specific Plans, which require design review, and the Spokane Horizons process have given the public the opportunity to bring these inadequacies to light. It The Design Review Board may prove to be the vehicle through which community values are reinstilled into design parameters, the result being better projects, greater pride in the city, and Spokane once again being recognized as “The City Beautiful.”~~

The joint City/County Historic Landmarks Commission is responsible for the stewardship of historically and architecturally significant properties within the City and unincorporated areas of Spokane County. The Landmarks Commission sets historic preservation policies, including providing advice to the City Council as well as the Board of County Commissioners on matters of history, historic planning and preservation.