

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
DECEMBER 13, 2022
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Phil Ward
Peter Luttrupp
Sarah McCracken

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director
Tami Stroud, Associate Planner
Mike Behary, Associate Planner
Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
Randy Adams, City Attorney

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Brinnon Mandel

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Messina at 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Luttrupp, seconded by Ingalls , to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on November 8, 2022. Motion approved.

Motion by McCracken, seconded by Ward , to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on November 10, 2022. Motion approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Patterson provided the following Statements:

- Ms. Patterson thanked the commission members who attended the joint workshop with the other representatives of the other Planning Commissioners at the joint meeting with the county.
- She commented that we have a contract with Welch Comer to help get our Impact Fees updated with a scheduled staff kick off meeting in January.
- She announced that the City has a contract with Granicus for Short-Term Rental (STR) monitoring and enforcement assistance. They are working with staff on the GIS data to start to build how many short-term rentals are in the city with an estimate of eight weeks to get the data back to us. We will have a meeting with the ad hoc subcommittee in January to review the data.
- She reminded the commission of an ICRMP Webinar on Thursday, December 15th held in

the Community Room at 9:00 pm with the topic "How to conduct meetings".

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Luttrupp thanked Chairman Messina on conducting our monthly meetings and allowing the public the courtesy of being able to voice their opinion.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Pinetree Health Group
Location: 1114 W. Ironwood Drive
Request: A proposed Food/Beverage special use permit in the C-17L zoning district
QUASI-JUDICIAL,(SP-4-22)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner, provided the following statements:

- There are three (3) existing structures on the subject property that were constructed in 1982, known as the Pinetree Health property.
- In addition to the two (2) medical offices buildings, the property owner was granted a Special Use Permit in 1982 for Convenience Sales to allow for a pharmacy to be built and operate in association with the medical office use.
- Over the years, the structures were used for medical office uses along with the drive thru-pharmacy, known as Medicine Man Pharmacy. Medicine Man Pharmacy has since been closed as the pharmacists has retired.
- One of the office buildings is occupied by an insurance company, and the other a holistic medicine practice. Because the former pharmacy space has become available, the applicant is requesting a Food and Beverage Off-site Consumption SUP for a drive-through coffee shop which is allowed with the approval of a Special Use Permit in the C-17L (Commercial Limited) zoning district.
- She stated that the Comprehensive Plan Place Type designation is Employment Center.
- For a Commercial Use such as Primary beverage sales, such as espresso stands three (3) off street spaces per drive-up window are required. Based on the current parking code: 11 parking stalls are required for the professional/medical office use, with 3 stacking spaces for the proposed drive-thru coffee shop.
- The previous use was a Service Activity, Medical and healthcare practitioners. The Parking Code was amended in 2010. Based upon the previous code, 33 parking spaces were required and provided at that time for the Pinetree Health property.
- The applicant is proposing one drive-up window. There is adequate stacking space to meet the 60' requirement. The 33 parking spaces will also satisfy any off-street parking needs for the proposed use.
- She noted the findings and that all city departments stated that they didn't have any concerns with this request.
- She stated, if approved, there are three proposed conditions.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Fleming inquired if this is a request for just a drive through coffee shop. Ms. Stroud stated

that is correct and that the applicant is here to answer additional questions.

Commissioner Ward inquired if the drive way is in place going from Ironwood to Ironwood. Ms. Stroud answered that the driveway is existing. Commissioner Ward noted in the staff report it states 60 feet of stacking for cars and questioned if that was measured from the right of way line. Ms. Stroud explained that measurement was taken from the drive-up window based on three cars.

Public testimony open.

Travis White applicant stated that staff provided a great introduction for his project and that he would be able to answer any questions.

Commissioner McCracken inquired if there will be any walk-up traffic. Mr. White commented that he has plans to do that eventually when he is able to hire more staff. He added that he intends to be working by himself and in the next couple years be able to hire staff.

Brian Jorgenson stated would answer questions about this development and that he was the owner of the pharmacy that opened in 1978 and he is the lead of Pinetree Hills Group. He added that the applicant took two months off to go to Poland to help feed the Ukraine people before taking out a lease with him and that he will be a great asset to the community.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Motion by Fleming, seconded by McCracken, to approve Item SP-4-22. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

2. Applicant: Rivers Edge Apartments, LLC
Location: 3528 W. Seltice
Request: .

- A. A modification to the Rivers Edge PUD QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-2-04m.2)
- B. A proposed R-34 Density Increase special use permit QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-5-22)
- C. A proposed zone changes from R-12PUD, C-17PUD to R-17 QUASI-JUDICIAL, (ZC-3-22)

Mike Behary, Associate Planner, provided the following statements:

- The subject site has had three requests that were held before the Planning Commission since 2018.
- The first request was heard in December 2018 by the Planning Commission. The development proposal was for an 850-unit apartment facility with a public trail located along the river. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the request for a zone change. The other two items, a special use permit (SP-11-18) and a Limited Design PUD (LDPUD-1-18), were denied without prejudice by the Planning Commission and the applicant appealed to the City Council. The zone change request was heard by the City Council on March 5, 2019, which denied the request. A motion was then passed dismissing the appeal of denial of the requests for a SUP and LPUD as those requests were deemed moot based on the denial of the zone change.
- The applicant's second development proposal request at this site was heard in July of 2019. This PUD and subdivision consisted of a 250-unit apartment facility, a mini-storage facility, and a private gated residential community along the river. This PUD and subdivision are known as "River's Edge". The City's 3.6-acre property that bisects the applicant's property was not part of this request. The Planning Commission approved the applicants request for this PUD and subdivision in items PUD-2-19 and S-2-19.
- The applicant's third development proposal request was heard in August of 2020. This allowed the applicant to incorporate the City's 3.6-acre property that bisects the applicant's property into the overall project. The City's 3.6-acre property was part of land swap with applicant and the city. This proposal allowed for 384-unit apartment facility, 431 mini storage units, and 28 single family residential lots along the river. The Planning Commission approved the applicants request for this PUD, Special Use Permit (Density increase to R-34 on the City's 3.6 acres tract), and Subdivision in items PUD-2-19m, SP-5-20, and S-2-19m.
- The applicant's current proposal will remove the 431 unit mini-storage facility and the 28 single-family residential lots along the river from the project and replace it with 296 multi-family units, public open space, and a 16-foot-wide trail adjacent to the river that allows the public access to the river.
- The applicant has indicated that he is proposing some workforce housing units be available as part of this proposal. See applicant's proposed workforce housing statement below.
 - *"I am willing to make 5% of any additionally approved units available to people making Coeur d'Alene's AMI for a 4-person household. I offer this for a period of 5 years commencing when the first buildings Certificate of Occupancy is issued".*

- He stated that the City Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property to be in the Planned Unit Development Place Type.
- He noted the various findings and that all departments reviewed the application with two departments two department Parks and Wastewater who had some additional requests.

PARKS:

- The 2017 Trails and Bikeways Master Plan requires a shared use path located along the north side of the Spokane River. The Parks Department has reviewed the PUD and has one change. The proposed trail has a sharp 90-degree turn planned near the western end of the trail where it turns west and goes off the property. According to MUTCD standards the turn in the trail must have a gentler curve upwards than the planned 90-degree turn. The distance in the curve cannot be less than 60 feet long. It is possible to begin the curve closer to the south property line of the adjacent parcel and then end the trail in the middle of the curve at the property line. The curve can be finished when the City extends the trail in the adjacent property to the west. The other 90-degree curve to the south looks to have a larger turn radius and is (likely) acceptable.

The property owner will have to maintain all the landscaping, beaches, amphitheater and docks in the proposal. The city will plow snow and sweep/blow the surface of the trail on a regular basis.

The asphalt mix used in the trail should have 3/8-inch rock instead of the typical ¾-. This is referred to as driveway mix and provides a smoother surface for bicycles, wheelchairs, skateboards, rollerblades and strollers. Our standards require 4 inches of compacted gravel and 2 inches of asphalt.

It is also helpful to sterilize the surface under where the trail will go to prevent weeds from growing through and damaging the trail. The Parks Department has no objection to the zone change as proposed.

WASTEWATER :

- Based on the 2013 Sewer Master Plan (SMP) Appendix J, this subject property falls under the Mill River Sewer Lift Station Basin which was modeled for 17 units per acre. The SMP requires this property to connect to the public sewer that was extended east from Shoreview Lane and was extended “to and through” the subject property to their easterly property line. Since sewer capacity falls under a “1st come 1st served basis”, and while the City presently has the capacity to serve.
- The Special Use’s proposed density increase to R-34 will require hydraulic modeling of the added PUD sewer flows into the Mill River Pump Station. City sewer is already on this site from the east end of Shoreview Lane and through this parcel to the east at Atlas Waterfront.
- Sewer Policy #719 requires a 20’ wide utility easements (30’ if shared with Public Water) or R/W dedicated to the city for all city sewers. Sewer Policy #719 requires an “All-Weather” surface permitting O&M access to the city sewer. City Resolution 14-025 requires all EDUs within the Mill River Lift Station Sewer Service Area to pay into the capacity system upgrades to the Mill River Lift Station. Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to be assigned with a single (1) public sewer connection. The Applicant shall be responsible for all O&M of the private sewer. The City of CDA will not be financially obligated for any O&M costs associated with a private sewerage system. Idaho Code §39-118 requires IDEQ or QLPE to review and approve public infrastructure plans for construction.

- He stated if approved there are 28 conditions for consideration.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls stated that we have to make a finding regarding utilities and asked for staff to confirm that there were no issues with water or sewer. Mr. Behary stated that is correct. Commissioner Ingalls noted a statement in the staff report and a proposed condition based on the approval of an R-34 zone that would require hydraulic modeling. Mr. Behary stated that's correct. Commissioner Ingalls stated that we aren't doing the modeling to determine adequacy and questioned why do we need the modeling when we know there won't be a problem with capacity. Mr. Behary explained that language came from Larry Parsons, Wastewater, who wrote that condition.

Commissioner Ingalls stated recently that there has been a lot of discussion on workforce housing and inquired how the applicant came up with 5% of units to go for workforce housing. Mr. Behary explained that the applicant discussed this with staff and this is what he would be willing to do. Commissioner Ingalls inquired if this was to pass would a Development Agreement be designed for tracking to ensure the 15 units made available. Ms. Patterson confirmed that there would be a Development Agreement with this project.

Chairman Messina inquired how the applicant came up with the formula for workforce housing. Mr. Behary explained that the applicant is here that can answer that question.

Commissioner Luttrupp congratulated staff and the applicant for bringing forward a proposal to dedicate a percentage of housing towards workforce housing and the first time an applicant has brought forward this type of proposal.

Chairman Messina noted an email from staff to the applicant regarding the promise to provide workforce housing and depending on which way this goes can this comment be tied into a Development Agreement. Mr. Behary explained that staff has worked with the applicant on that language and what was before was a brief email before the hearing they will commit to these and later work out the details and will be in the Development Agreement.

Commissioner Ward explained that he wasn't here for the previous hearing and inquired if the western portion of the site that was intended for a mini storage replaced with a 5-story apartment. Mr. Behary stated it will be four-story apartments. Commissioner Ward added that the single-family homes along the river will now be apartments. Mr. Behary explained that the residential homes will be replaced with a trail and the 4-story units will be placed behind the trail. He noted on the site plan the shaded portion that is the east/north thirds of the site. Mr. Behary explained that area will not be modified.

Commissioner Ward noted on the east side of the sight shows a connection into the Atlas Mill property which is now gone. Mr. Behary explained there was no access to the east/west. Ms. Patterson explained there was previous discussion but staff worked with Mr. Douglass and the Atlas team and determined made no sense to have that connection.

Commissioner Ward concurs that the email talking about workforce housing from the applicant needs more defining.

Commissioner McCracken inquired about the west end of the property where the trails ends and

past that is single family homes and will the trail meet at Seltice. Mr. Behary explained that the city has some additional railroad right of way which will be connected at Mill River to extend the trail.

Commissioner Fleming noted the comment on the pedestrian crossing on that tight turn and if the applicant will address that issue.

Commissioner McCracken inquired about the setbacks from the river and is the applicant proposing for those to be modified. Mr. Behary stated that those won't be modified with the setbacks to be 80 feet which is 40 feet more than the city requirement. He explained that there will be a sea wall and trail within the first 40 feet and they are not proposing to reduce the setback.

Commissioner McCracken inquired about the multi-family along the river and when addressing the viewpoints inquired what is the height difference of the single family versus the multifamily. She asked how much higher it would be than single family. Mr. Behary noted the view corridors on the map which the applicant is providing a total of four and in earlier testimony presented a diagram showing a cross section of the apartments and clarified the height would be 55 feet versus 32 feet. but the multifamily will be set back 80 feet versus a house that is 40 feet back,

Public testimony open.

Mike Gridley, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- Mr. Gridley complimented staff on providing great communication skills going through this process and that he has been working with Mr. Douglass over the years. He stated if this project is approved, it will be a benefit to the community.
- He provided a Power Point explaining the project. He added that he is a trail user and member of the Centennial Trail Foundation Board that helps with the preservation of access of the water. When working on this project, he found that the city is in need of more housing. If approved, this project will provide more housing and a trail that will fill those needs.

Lanzce Douglass, applicant, provided the following comments:

- He explained a brief history of the project and noted a few years ago the city passed Ordinance Resolution 1409 because access to the waterfront was important to preserve.
- He explained this request is about preserving access to the water for all the citizens and will be providing housing, including workforce housing.
- He showed a rendering of the area that is currently approved and noted the shaded area is for 384 apartment units in 12 different buildings with storage to the back which is approved and being constructed now. He explained that that they have been approved for a self-storage facility located west of the permitted apartments and east of the US Bank Call Center. He added that currently the trail is adjacent to the apartment buildings under construction with the trail located off the water behind the proposed single-family homes on the water and noted two spots where the public will have access to the water.
- He noted that the area for self-storage isn't the best use for that area and that multifamily would be a better fit.
- He explained the trail we are approved for is behind the single-family homes and noted the view corridors from a rendering which there won't be a lot of views to the river because of the houses that won't provide any connectivity.
- He showed a rendering of the proposed buildings that will have a modern design. If approved, the apartments will replace the storage buildings. He showed a picture of the

site looking east with the river on the right and showed how much a view would be to the river not providing any connectivity. He provided a video showing what a pedestrian would see with the trail in its current location.

- He explained why we are here tonight is for the approval of a zone change from R-12 to R-18 to allow the apartments on the water, a Special Use Permit to allow 34 units/acre which we don't intend to go that many with proposed 26 units per/acre and heights to allow 63 feet for the entire site but heights of the apartments will be more like 55 feet. He added that the PUD modification is needed to remove the self-storage buildings and replace with the apartment buildings, to remove the single-family homes along the water and replace them with the multifamily buildings, double the set back from the river to 80 feet, and have the trail along the water. He added by moving the trail will allow them to move the access road to the north being able to double the setback from the water to 80 feet which will provide a visual impact to the river less than what it would be for 40 feet.
- He noted, if approved, this project will have greater setbacks than what is required with the typical request to shorten the set back to the water to 25 feet. With this project he said they want to provide more of a buffer, landscape area and soften the project to be more appealing from the water and trail users. He added with an 80-foot setback from the water will allow them to plant in the 40-foot easement area with more vegetation. When reaching maturity, the apartment buildings will be hidden with only the roofs that would be noticeable.
- He explained from Seltice only about 25 feet of the buildings will be visible because of the 30-foot grade change from Seltice to the river.
- He added another benefit of additional height is to provide additional insulation in the attic and will have minimal impact to what was currently approved.
- He explained the biggest focal point is to get the trail on the water and where it should be and noted on a rendering on how this will look in order to provide ADA access ramps so everyone can have access to the water. He then provided a video showing how this would look compared to the current approved project with the trail away from the river.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that the applicant gave a great presentation. He referenced the new proposed trail on the water and noted in the staff report that the City Parks Department will remove snow and plow even though it will be considered private property and questioned if the city will be on the trail for maintenance how will this happen for the next 20 years. Mr. Douglass explained his intent would be to maintain the trail and keep it under the owner's "umbrella" since they have an investment in the apartment complex adjacent to the trail and will maintain it similar how they maintain their other properties. He added by maintaining the property themselves they are able to do things the city can't. For example, they can restrict camping and overnight stays. Commissioner Ingalls stated the trail is private property but for perpetuity it will be public access and asked how does it get recorded. Mr. Douglas explained will be done with an easement and that most are done in perpetuity.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if the property is sold, will the easement remain. Mr. Douglass explained that is correct and to get rid of the easement both parties have to agree to release the easement.

Commissioner Ward commented the picture of the walkway is nice and accessible. He questioned if there is a timeline for build out. Mr. Douglass explained that we currently have 12 buildings under construction now with the first building to be completed in 2023. He added the first

buildings they would start to construct, if approved, would be where the storage units are currently approved. The apartments on the water would have to have a seawall built which can only be done in the winter and done before spring when the high water hits. He added that we have to go through the building permit process and won't be done this year. He estimated that the work would be done in the 23/24 winter pending. That will dictate when the rest of the water front will be built out. If they are able to do the walls next year, it would be 25/26 when the project is completed.

Commissioner McCracken commented that she is excited the trail will be on the water and the setbacks to the river are generous.

Chairman Messina inquired if all buildings will be 55 feet and questioned how the formula for a four-person affordable housing compared to two-person household and what is the process. Mr. Douglass explained that this process was started with a conversation with staff with no standards so this is a starting point. He explained that AMI has a single family, 2-person household, 3-person household, etc. with different levels of AMI of how many people are in the household. For management that would be a "nightmare" for them to determine each household number, so we picked one based on two adults/two kids for the 4-person household. He explained that we are designating 5% for workforce housing and explained the email he sent to staff. They are required by law to have 5% of units accessible for handicap but not required to rent those units to a handicap person, but can rent them out based on need. He explained if we are 100% full, we could have 20% handicapped individuals living on site and not necessarily living in a handicap unit, but they can live anywhere on the property they want to live. He added we don't want to steer people to units based on race, color, creed or disability. That is a big "no." They are simplifying the housing proposal to prevent lawsuits. Chairman Messina asked does it have to be 4 people in a unit. Ms. Patterson clarified the four person AMI is what Panhandle Affordable Housing Alliance (PAHA) has been using. That is common and easy to calculate.

Chairman Messina inquired about docks and how will people access them. Mr. Douglass said docks will be private with gates on the seawall and for our tenants only.

Chairman Messina inquired about traffic mitigation and when will that be done. Mr. Douglass clarified they aren't doing a traffic mitigation study, but they will be funding a study that will determine what the fixes are for future failures that happen. Ms. Patterson explained that the study and traffic mitigation it's not just for this project but based on growth which will help with our impact fees. We will need to know issues for fixes.

Commissioner Fleming inquired if anything has been discussed on the trail on the west where the curb is too tight. Mr. Douglass explained that there is a "hard easement" on the western side located 7 to 10 feet off our line so we have to transition to get back to the Shoreview trail.

Mr. Gridley stated that he has learned a lot about this process involving PAHA and regional growth. If you have more housing supply, what naturally happens to prices is they go down. Residents in existing older apartments who can afford to move into a new apartment by the river opens up vacancies at a lower price, which creates a domino effect.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if you think workforce housing isn't necessary, are you saying it will take care of itself by increasing the supply. Mr. Gridley stated that he applauds Mr. Douglass for taking the first step and this process is complicated and explained that the apartments won't be filled with new people that some will move from existing apartments that creates vacancies.

Commissioner McCracken explained that we do have a lot of projects where build out varies and

inquired is there a way to get a progress report and a list of completed units added to the building permit process. Ms. Patterson explained that we can do that and share with the commission to see how things are progressing and noted condition number 24 in the staff report where it states "5 years commencing when the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) is issued and that the applicant can determine where those will be located and in which building. Mr. Douglass explained that 5% of units will be available for 5 years when the first CO is issued and located anywhere onsite.

Commissioner Luttrupp commented if we look back three years from today, we will see how many things we have done differently and confident will improve through the years.

Mason Douglass stated the City of Coeur d'Alene does well with making all amenities available to the public. She explained with all the parks, beaches, walking path etc. that's what makes this community so special. She added by having the trail on the water will tie into what the city is doing well.

Susan Knutson commented she was here 4 years ago with the original request and was one of 61 people opposing the density of R-34 and feels this is a "bait/switch" and not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. She read a statement from the Coeur d'Alene Tribe in the Comprehensive Plan and feels that this project lacks the stewardship and guardianship, and she is opposed to this project.

Rob Knutson stated he is opposed and was also here 4 years ago. The proposed changes to the trail are a mistake. The City shouldn't go forward without more understanding of the give/take associated with the private/public easement on the trail and problems with traffic.

Karen Hansen stated she was here 4 years ago with the biggest issue is traffic and with no proposed studies going to be done. She feels that there is too much "grey area" in the details to ensure the workforce housing and this should be tabled.

Rebuttal:

Todd Whipple stated we did traffic studies and from that study this project doesn't have any impacts to existing traffic. He added when talking with staff and there are other things going on in the city where traffic is a concern and will help the city with any future impacts.

Mr. Douglass clarified that the easement is not a bait/switch but giving to the city for public use of the trail where we will maintain, landscape and will monitor issues that come up and explained easements are done every day with two partners. He added the issue with high density with 34 units per acre we won't be near that number with the units not visible from the water and will provide more housing for the community

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ingalls explained this project came forward 4 years ago. This wasn't bait/switch. We have seen this go "full circle." Four years ago, 19 buildings were proposed with 850 apartments, which was denied. He added the project did come back with the proposal for 28 residential homes on the water that are imposing on the river, lake, community etc. He noted a Coeur d'Alene Press article where he was quoted which stated, "there are huge positives here for public access and if there was any opportunity for middle ground. How about 650 units?" and now

the proposal is for 680. He added that the last proposal met all the findings with 28 units on the river that I didn't like including a trail and mini storage. I see this plan as a big improvement with the waterfront amenities that we should applaud to leave a small legacy. As an example, I don't feel welcome at the boardwalk in Bellerive, but with this proposal I feel welcome and will support this project. The water access should be applauded.

Commissioner Ward stated that the waterfront is important and was one of the things that was impressive when he moved here – to have a waterfront that was exposed and available to the public. He added the trail makes a difference that helps protect the river by moving houses back away from the narrow walkway. He concurs with Commissioner Ingalls that the proposed single-family homes weren't impressive. He is not crazy about 3 story apartment buildings creating a wall along the river, but there is an elevation change to the property of 30 feet with views to the river. He added the most important issue is providing some affordable housing and if 680 units gets us there, it's important. There would be more design issues he will overlook that but the affordable aspect is important. He added that the affordable housing concept needs to be more solidified and more of commitment.

Commissioner Mcracken concurs and the connection on the river is great and the density 4 years ago we didn't have the same needs for affordable housing and by adding these units is a start with affordable housing. She is confident through of a Development Agreement that it can be more defined.

Commissioner Fleming explained that she had concerns about massing and the number of buildings which felt like a military compound. She would like to see the buildings not all be the same. The goal with rentals is 50% turnover. Because this project has great amenities, she would like to see more individuality. She stated that we will have to deal with traffic in the future and with this walking trail to get across the road safely. That will be staff's challenge. She is happy to get the trail on the water. She suggests adding roof top decks to make these units special for this project. She added that she approves this project.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated this was before us 4 years ago and the room was packed and since then we have approved a new Comprehensive Plan with a couple things such as access along the river and the other is workforce housing. He congratulated the applicant on a great project.

Chairman Messina stated he had reservations. This has come a long way. We want access along the river and to work with workforce housing and set an example for future developments.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Luttrupp, to approve Item ZC-3-22. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

Motion by Fleming , seconded by McCracken, to approve Item SP-5-22 Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

Motion by McCracken , seconded by Ward, to approve Item PUD-2-19m2 Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:

Motion by Luttrupp, seconded by Fleming to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant