

**STAFF REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATION  
FILE NO. Z1000055-COMP**

**I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

This proposed amendment is a set of approximately 100 minor text amendments (typos, clarification, and corrections) proposed to be made to Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan. None of these proposed changes are categorized as substantial changes to the Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The Capital Facilities Program located in Chapter 5 is excluded.

This proposal is made by the City of Spokane Plan Commission. In 2010 the Plan Commission appointed a subcommittee to review the Comprehensive Plan for possible amendments on the topic of Healthy Communities. While undergoing this review, the subcommittee identified many minor text amendments classified as typos, clarifications, or corrections to the Comprehensive Plan which should be undertaken to keep the document current. While it is still the desire of the Plan Commission to move forward with Comprehensive Plan policy work under the topic of Healthy Communities, it was decided that these minor amendments could move forward first.

The subcommittee members were Plan Commissioners: Robert Mansfield, Gail Prosser, and Stan Stirling.

**II. GENERAL INFORMATION:**

- A. Applicant: City of Spokane Plan Commission
- B. Location of Proposal: No location.
- C. SEPA Status: A Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is anticipated on June 22, 2011.
- D. Enabling legislation: SMC 17G.020, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process
- E. Hearing Date: July 13, 2011
- F. Staff Contact: Tirrell Black, 625-6185  
tblack@spokanecity.org
- G. Procedural Requirements:
- Application was submitted on October 29, 2010;
  - Application routed to departments and agencies to determine need for additional information on November 17, 2010
  - Application determined complete on January 5, 2011

- Public comment period of 60-days began on January 19, 2011.
- A SEPA Determination of Non Significance was made on June 22, 2011;
- Notice of Public Hearing before Plan Commission was published in the Spokesman Review on June 22, 2011 and again on June 29, 2011.

#### **IV. DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

Notice of this proposal was sent to City departments and outside agencies for their review. No comments concerning the specific language of the proposed amendment were received. Comments indicating no objections were received from Solid Waste, Traffic Engineering, Engineering, and Spokane Regional Transportation Council.

#### **V. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Three people made comment on this proposal. Their comments were brought forward to the Plan Commission at a workshop on March 23, 2011. The Plan Commission asked staff to incorporate many of the comments into the draft language to be presented to the Plan Commission at time of Plan Commission Public Hearing. These public comments are part of the public record and are available for review in Planning Services.

#### **VI. CONCLUSIONS**

##### **Decision Criteria—SMC 17G.020.010(C)**

SMC 17G.020.010C specifies the decision criteria for Comprehensive Plan amendments. For amendments, it states the following:

##### **SMC 17G.020.010C. Amendments: Timing, Criteria**

*Starting in 2003, and thereafter no more often than once a year, the Plan Commission may recommend and the City Council may adopt amendments to the Land Use Plan Map, or the text of the Comprehensive Plan or land use code, upon finding that each proposal meets all of following conditions and requirements. However, proposals that are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan are addressed only within the context of the required comprehensive plan update cycle every seven years pursuant to RCW 36.70A.130(4)(c) and every other year starting in 2005.*

**Criterion 1. GMA: The change must be consistent with the goals and purposes of the state Growth Management Act.**

Relevant facts:

The “Legislative findings” included in the Revised Code of Washington pertaining to GMA is essentially a call for coordinated and planned growth that is done cooperatively between citizens, government, and the private sector. The complete text of the “Legislative findings” follows:

**RCW 36.70A.010, Legislative findings.**

*The legislature finds that uncoordinated and unplanned growth, together with a lack of common goals expressing the public's interest in the conservation and the wise use of our lands, pose a threat to the environment, sustainable economic development, and the health, safety, and high quality of life enjoyed by residents of this state. It is in the public interest that citizens, communities, local governments, and the private sector cooperate and coordinate with one another in comprehensive land use planning.*

This Comprehensive Plan text amendment proposal has no impact on existing land uses in Spokane.

The Growth Management Act also contains 13 goals (RCW 36.70A.020, “Planning Goals”). The proposed change is consistent with these goals.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

***Criterion 2. Consistency: Unless the proposal is consistent with and implements the current version of the comprehensive plan and its supporting documents, adoption of the proposal must also include any other changes needed to regain overall compliance with GMA’s requirement for internal and regional consistency.***

Relevant facts:

Staff concludes that this application is consistent with and implements the Comprehensive Plan and its supporting documents.

***Criterion 3. Cumulative Effect: All amendments must be considered concurrently in order to evaluate their cumulative effects.***

Relevant facts:

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

***Criterion 4. SEPA: SEPA review must be completed on all amendment proposals.***

Relevant facts:

The application has been reviewed in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) that requires that the potential for adverse environmental impacts resulting from a proposal be evaluated during the decision-making process. On the basis of information contained with the environmental checklist, the 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 Nonsignificance (DNS) was made on June 22, 2011.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

***Criterion 5. Adequate Public Facilities: The amendment must not adversely affect the City's ability to provide the full range of urban public facilities and services.***

Relevant facts:

This proposed text amendment will have no impact on the City's ability to provide public facilities and services.

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

***Criterion 6. Public Benefit: The proposed changes will result in a net benefit to the general public.***

Relevant facts:

Staff concludes that this criterion is met.

***Criterion 7. No Adverse Effect: The proposed changes will not have a significant adverse effect on the public.***

Relevant facts:

The proposal will not have a significant negative impact on the public. This application was reviewed in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was made on June 22, 2011.

**Review Criteria**

**SMC 17G.020.010 D. Amendments: Review Guidelines**

The following is a list of considerations that shall be used, as appropriate, by the applicant in developing an amendment proposal, by planning staff in analyzing a proposal, and by the Plan Commission and City Council in determining whether a criterion for approval has been met.

1. 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, or new environmental regulations.

Relevant facts:

The proposal is consistent with recent changes in state and federal regulations.

2. 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.

Relevant facts:

This criterion has been met. The proposal is has no impact on the City's Capital Improvement Plans.

3. 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.

Relevant facts:

The proposal is consistent with this criterion. It will not cause a funding short fall.

4. Internal Consistency: 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.

Relevant facts:

The proposal is consistent with all internal plans.

5. 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.

Relevant facts:

The proposal is consistent with regional plans and policies.

6. Consistent Amendments:

a. 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. The need for this type of adjustment might be supported by findings from feedback instruments related to monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. Examples of such findings could include:

- i. Growth and development as envisioned in the plan is occurring faster, slower or is failing to materialize;
- ii. The capacity to provide adequate services is diminished or increased;
- iii. Land availability to meet demand is reduced;
- iv. Population or employment growth is significantly different than the plan's assumptions;
- v. Plan objectives are not being met as specified;
- vi. The effect of the plan on land values and affordable housing is contrary to plan goals;
- vii. Transportation and/or other capital improvements are not being made as expected;
- viii. A question of consistency exists between the comprehensive plan and its elements and Chapter 36.70A RCW, the Countywide Planning Policies, or development regulations.

Relevant facts:

This proposal is an amendment to Comprehensive Plan policy text and is consistent with the overall policy of the Comprehensive Plan. No policy changes are proposed to change policy intent.

b. 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:

- i. 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.);

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. This is not a request for a map change.

- ii. The Map Amendment or site is suitable for the proposed designation;

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. This is not a request for a map change.

- iii. The Map Amendment implements applicable Comprehensive Plan policies better than the current map designation.

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. This is not a request for a map change.

7. Inconsistent Amendments.

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. The proposed amendments are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

8. 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.

a. 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.

Relevant facts:

This application was reviewed in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was made on June 22, 2011.

b. 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.

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. This is not a request for a change to the land use plan map.

9. SEPA.

SEPA review must be completed on all amendment proposals.

Relevant facts:

This application was reviewed in accordance with the State Environmental

Policy Act (SEPA) and a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was made on June 22, 2011.

10. 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.

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. This amendment does not affect the City's ability to provide services.

11. Changes to the UGA.

Relevant facts:

Not applicable. No changes to the UGA are proposed.

**VII. RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that this Comprehensive Plan text change be approved as proposed.

Prepared by: Tirrell Black, AICP, City Planner, Planning Services, City of Spokane

Date: June 22, 2011