

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
DECEMBER 10, 2019
LOWER LEVEL – COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Michael Ward
Peter Luttrupp
Brinnon Mandel

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Lewis Rumpler

CALL TO ORDER:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 6, 2019
November 12, 2019
November 18, 2019

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Fleming, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on November 6, 2019. Motion approved.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Ward, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on November 12, 2019. Motion approved.

Motion by Luttrupp, seconded by Mandel, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on November 18, 2019. Motion approved.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Ingalls stated that Councilmember Ron Edinger is retiring at the end of the month, and wanted to say “thank you” for his many years of service.

Commissioner Fleming noted that TDS Fiber Optic recently sent out a notice to residents stating that they will be “trenching into your house” and she suggested that residents take a photo of their present landscaping and sprinklers in case they are moved or removed.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director provided the following comments:

- In regard to the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for January 14, they didn't receive any development applications, so they will be bringing forward some code amendments that include amending some sections of the zoning code such as Home Occupation, Storage of Heavy Equipment/Yard and Design Review Procedure amendments.
- The first meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission meeting was held on Monday, December 9, which included the nine members appointed to the commission, and they also invited the State Historian, Pete L'Orange, to join them via phone to talk about the roles of a Historic Preservation Commission and a Certified Local Government (CLG). Ms. Anderson explained that later there might be some interaction with the Planning Commission because the Commission may be working on a citywide Historic Preservation Plan if they get a grant. That document can be included in the Comprehensive Plan.
- We have recently added a new agenda item to the Planning Commission agenda located below staff comments titled “The Envision CDA Committee Updates” and Sean Holm, Senior Planner will be giving an update this evening on the Envision CDA Project, which is the Comprehensive Plan, with a partnership with CDA 2030. She explained the intent of the agenda item for this meeting and future meetings is for the Planning Commission members to report to each other and the community regarding the work being done in their specific focus groups which they were assigned to when the process started.

Chairman Messina asked if the Historic Preservation Commission meetings will be televised, and what days/times they are meeting. Ms. Anderson explained that the meetings will not be televised and they are in the process of trying to figure out what day is best to meet. She noted that the commission will be meeting quarterly, and after the meeting the commission felt it would be best to meet every month since it is a new commission and processes need to be established. If the commission decides to meet every month, the day will be on the fourth Thursday at City Hall, in Conference Room #6, starting at either 4:00 or 4:30 p.m., and the public is welcome to attend.

Chairman Messina questioned how the Historic Preservation Commission comments will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Anderson explained that staff can figure out how to get input to them and, if they get a grant for a City-wide preservation plan, they would be able to hire a Historic Planner that would help staff and commissioners create a plan looking at city-wide resources. Ms. Anderson added that once the document is done, it could be included in the Comprehensive Plan like the other plans they have incorporated into the plan by reference.

ENVISION CDA COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Sean Holm, Senior Planner provided the following statements:

- He explained that Envision CDA is a partnership between CDA 2030 and the City to take a look at the City's current Comprehensive Plan to create a master document that would better enhance what both groups are trying to do. He noted that three of the Planning Commissioners previously worked on the Comprehensive Plan in 2007 and felt the plan has been getting “long in the tooth” and missing a big piece that was the implementation portion of CDA 2030 that was missing from the City's previous Comprehensive Plan.
- He noted that the City of Coeur d'Alene has influence inside of the city limits as well as the Area of City Impact, but CDA 2030 will provide more of the regional things like transportation elements.
- He discussed the past, the present, and future and how they have been working to put together the background information of where they are right now including their existing conditions reports which include the economy, transportation and the review of the existing plan.
- He explained that at recent meetings, they have gathered information including the community partner meetings which included high tech, education and business leaders, etc., which created

information that MIG and the sub consultants have been using to create the existing condition reports.

- They recently had a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting that went well and, also, economic development meetings with the same groups mentioned before.
- They had a public kick-off, which was a success and attended by approximately 80 people. It was held at the Innovation Den on September 26, which included playing the game, "Making Better Places," which is fun and educational.
- They have had a few "pop-up" game nights where they went to North Idaho College and the high school to play the game. They had a total of 22 games that have been played and from those games MIG took all the information from the games which will help to identify where the public thinks growth should happen based on the input.
- Mr. Holm stated on December 4 and 5 they had the second CAC meeting and Focus Group meetings which were spread out over two days, with a discussion on the vision statement for each individual group. During those meetings, they looked at goal statements, policies and action items to go with the goals.
- He added that they will schedule a meeting in January or February with MIG and Bridge Economics for the next round of meetings with CAC and the Focus Groups. Bridge Economics will be in town providing an update to information they have found concerning the City's economic base.
- He said that, later, staff will be looking for public engagement opportunities to go out and attend events and meetings to generate more public input that will include their website, quadrant meetings and pop-up events.

Commissioner Ward said that he was part of the Identity and Community Focus group and felt that the best moment was towards the end of the meeting when one person said, "I see why we are here to help staff with the design of the Comprehensive Plan." It was a great statement about why we were doing these meetings.

Commissioner Mandel apologized that she had to miss her group meeting because of work commitments.

Commissioner Ingalls said that staff is doing a great job and commented that he is part of the Growth and Development Focus Group and was impressed with the representation from various parts of the community within his group. They stated that one thing they need is to get the school district represented and was encouraged with the school district representative who will be a good voice.

Commissioner Luttrupp said he thinks it is a great process and explained that, as a commission, they are used to meeting in public and the more they have the public involved, the better. He said that he is part of the Environmental and Recreation Focus Group and asked how his group views will be shared with his fellow commissioners, and what the Planning Commission's responsibility is in the process.

Mr. Holm explained that staff will take the suggestions from this group and update the plan prior to bringing it forward formally. He noted that it will first come to the Planning Commission to get feedback on what they do or don't like and they will make those recommendations from the commission to the City Council, which will make the final decision.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated that he has several areas of interest and asked if, as a group, there is a way for them to get together as a group for discussion before they meet with the consultants.

Mr. Holm suggested that if there is a need of a change to an ordinance or other policies, that process is

different and he and suggested that the commissioners send him an email with their suggestions.

Commissioner Luttrupp said that appreciated the suggestion, but would like to have a discussion with the other commissioners.

Commissioner Fleming said that she is part of the Health and Safety Committee which includes representatives from Panhandle Health, Kootenai Medical Center, the School District, and the Mental Health District, but missing representatives from Fire and Ped/Bike. She said that, as a group, they discussed wheel chair accessibility, audio accessibility, elder care, and a way to get children to school safely on a bike. She added that other topics included parks that are underserved, and being aware of not building in our forests.

Chairman Messina said that he is part of the CAC Committee Group and his group is focused on the connectivity of the various districts and how the City will function in the future. He asked the representative from MIG how they would get that information into the Comprehensive Plan, and the representative explained that they will take all the information from the meetings which will be presented it to staff and City Council.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Pacifica L 44, LLC
Location: 840 E. Dalton Avenue
Request: A proposed Minimal Care Facility special use permit in the R-8 zoning district.
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-4-02m)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner, said that Todd Butler, on behalf of the owner, Pacifica L44 LLC, is requesting a modification of a Minimal Care Special Use Permit for an existing care facility with 56 beds and one staff residence within four (4) existing residences. The requested modification is for the addition of two (2) residential buildings to allow 16 beds per building with a total of 32 additional beds. The maximum number would increase from 56 beds to 88 beds.

Ms. Stroud provided the following statements:

- On April 9, 2002, the Planning Commission approved a request for a Minimal Care Special Use
- Permit in the R-8 (Residential at 8 units per acre) zoning district to allow an assisted living facility consisting of 4 dwellings with 14 residents each, for a total of 56 residents, and one staff residence.
- On August 29, 2003, the City received a requested amendment to the approved site plan asking that the setback be adjusted to allow for the standard nonresidential setback of 25' on the side and back, rather than the proposed 30' setback for the sides and rear yard setback. That request was unanimously approved.

The above request had two conditions attached to the approval.

- 1) *The applicant must adhere to the site plan submitted with the Special Use Permit application and,*
 - 2) *The maximum number of residents shall be 56.*
- Due to the above conditions of approval, the applicant is requesting a modification to the original special use permit in order to increase the number of beds from 56 to 88 for the care facility, and to modify the site plan for the proposed project.
 - The original special use permit was approved in 2002 to allow an assisted living facility consisting of 4 dwellings with 14 residents each, for a total of 56 residents, and one staff residence.
 - The requested special use permit would allow for 2 additional buildings and a maximum of 88 beds.

- The design of the architecture for the proposed buildings would be single story and residential in character, blending in with the existing buildings on-site and the residential neighborhoods to the North, South and East sides of the property. Coeur d'Alene High School is located directly to the West, along 4th Street. The proposed Senior Living Community is accessed from an existing driveway on Dalton Avenue.
- The parking requirement for a Minimal Care Facility is 1 space per 6 beds. 27 parking stalls are shown on the site plan, and 15 stalls are required.
- Ms. Stroud provided a copy of a location map showing the property.
- She stated that the Comprehensive Plan designates the area as NE Prairie - Transition
- She provided a list of the Comprehensive Goals that apply to the request.
- The original special use permit was approved in 2002 to allow an assisted living facility consisting of 4 dwellings with 14 residents each, for a total of 56 residents, and one staff residence.
- The approved special use permit would allow for 2 additional buildings and a maximum of 88 beds. The design of the architecture for the proposed buildings would be single story and residential in character, blending in with the existing buildings on-site and the residential neighborhoods to the North, South and East sides of the property.
- Coeur d'Alene High School is located directly to the West along 4th Street.
- The proposed Senior Living Community is accessed from an existing driveway on Dalton Avenue.
- The parking requirement for a Minimal Care Facility is 1 space per 6 beds. 27 parking stalls are shown on the site plan, 15 stalls are required.
- She provided a copy of the existing site plan showing the existing buildings.
- She provided renderings of the applicant's elevations and main level floor plan.
- She provided a list of the other special use permits in the area.
- She provided a copy of various site photos of the property.
- She noted the various staff comments in the staff report.

EXISTING CONDITIONS TO BE REMOVED:

PLANNING:

- *The applicant must adhere to the site plan submitted with the Special Use Permit application.*
- *The maximum number of residents shall be 56.*

Ms. Stroud said that there are three conditions but they received one additional condition from the Water Department, submitted this morning, which states: "There is an existing 6-inch fire hydrant main that will have to be relocated for any new structures on the northwest side, and the public utility easement will be realigned with the new main location, all at the developer's expense."

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation.

Public testimony open.

Todd Butler, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- He noted that staff did a great job covering most of the information and feels this project will be a good fit for the community with available land for the expansion.
- He said that the project fits with the Comprehensive Plan by eliminating urban sprawl.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments

Commissioner Ingalls said that from looking at the property, it looks like the property was set up with an expansion in mind. He questioned if expansion was a vision intended for the future.

Mr. Butler explained that he knew the previous owners and a future expansion had been discussed.

Chairman Messina said that he was serving on the commission when the first request came forward, which was one of the first assisted living places in the area.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if the applicant intended to leave the fencing open.

Mr. Butler said when they get farther into the design of the project and for this type of facility they will provide a fence to be used as a secure area for residents that can come and go, but secure enough they can't wander around too much.

Public testimony closed.

Motion by Ward, seconded by Ingalls, to approve Item SP-4-02m. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

2. Applicant: Atlas Building Group, LLC.
Location: Bellerive Centennial Trail Riverfront Addition
 - A. A modification to the Bellerive PUD QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-1-04m.7)
 - B. A proposed 5-lot preliminary plat known as "Bellerive by the River" QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-6-19)

Mike Behary, Associate Planner, said that Atlas Building Group LLC is requesting approval of a modification of the Bellerive Planned Unit Development and a 5 lot preliminary plat to be known as "Bellerive By The River."

Mr. Behary provided the following statements:

- The existing site is currently vacant and is made up of one parcel consisting of 0.66 acres.
- The subject site was originally part of a larger planned unit development that the applicant is now proposing to modify. The proposed modification will allow for the construction of 5 single family dwellings.
- The approved use of the site was intended to be for a commercial use.
- The applicant has indicated that he intends to develop the PUD similarly to the PUD located adjacent to the southeast of this site.
- The proposed project will be comprised of five residential lots with a private driveway and easement located toward the rear of the property to allow for ingress and egress. The applicant also has an access easement with the adjacent property to the east for access to the proposed lots. The lots all have frontage on Bellerive Lane.
- The proposed development will have a density of 3.3 units per acre. The property is currently

zoned C-17, equating to a density of 17 residential units per acre, which would allow up to 11 units on the subject property.

- The overall Bellerive PUD development has approved open space areas that meet the 10 percent open space requirement. Open space areas for the overall PUD development are not proposed to be modified or reduced.
- The proposed PUD will be comprised of five single family detached houses.
- The applicant has indicated that the proposed development would be a compatible with the adjacent developments and uses in the area.
- The applicant has submitted building elevations of the proposed residential dwellings indicating how they will look from the street.
- The applicant has also submitted a PUD site plan that shows the proposed site layout and the building locations on the proposed PUD.
- Mr. Behary provided a copy of the historical information in regard to Bellerive.
- He stated that the Comprehensive Plan designates the area as Spokane River District – Stable Established.
- He went through the various findings for the PUD and Subdivision.
- He provided a copy of the Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and various site photos of the area.
- He noted the location of staff comments in the staff report.
- He stated that, if approved, there are three conditions as part of the approval.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments

Commissioner Luttrupp asked about the requested deviations and asked how they compared to the previous deviations approved with the Union. Mr. Behary explained that they are similar except the Union had a greater rear setback which was 10-15' feet compared to the current proposal, with a 25' foot rear yard setback. Commissioner Luttrupp asked if Mr. Behary thought the projects are similar, and Mr. Behary said that they would be similar in regard to front setbacks.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if they heard a lot of input from the community who were against the use of private roads at the previous hearing for the Union, and asked if the private road the applicant requested will be a problem. Mr. Behary explained that the private road is existing and will be used as a private access driveway alley.

Commissioner Mandel asked if the request changes the access for the public since it is an existing road. Mr. Behary said it won't change access.

Public testimony open.

Tiffanie Espe, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- She thanked staff for putting together a great presentation.
- She emphasized that the project is similar to the Bellerive 5th Addition, with the exception that the garages would be attached.

The applicant concluded her presentation.

Deb Vernan said she supports the request and likes that it is not a commercial project.

Public testimony closed.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item PUD-1-04m.7. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item S-6-19. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

3. Applicant: Vista Meadows, LLC.
Location: Located off of Prairie Avenue, Moselle Drive, S. of Vista Meadows Subdivision
Request:
- A. A proposed 9.925 acre PUD known as "Vista Meadows 1st Addition PUD".
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-5-19)
 - B. A proposed 20-lot, 6 tract preliminary plat known as "Vista Meadows 1st Addition".
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-5-19)

Sean Holm, Senior Planner, said that Vista Meadows, LLC is requesting approval of the Vista Meadows Planned Unit Development and a 20-lot and 6 tract preliminary plat to be known as "Vista Meadows First Addition" on an existing parcel currently in Kootenai County totaling +/-9.925 acres.

Mr. Holm provided the following statements:

- The property came before the Planning Commission in 2016 as a 3 part request: annexation; PUD; and subdivision. Since that time, the property annexation was completed but the PUD was allowed to expire, thus reverting the property back to an R-8 zone.
- The "panhandle" section has since been subdivided into duplex lots in an R-8 zone. Construction for that portion of the property is underway. The applicant has since decided to bring forward another PUD request (sans the panhandle), although the request differs substantially from the previous approval.
- As part of the development, the applicant worked with Greenstone (Coeur d'Alene Place PUD) and School District #271 to extend sewer to serve the parcels and the new school site.
- The new school is currently under construction which is northeast of the subject property. Mr. Holm noted that water service is provided by the Hayden Lake Irrigation District (HLID) and is not in the Coeur d'Alene water system service area.

- Mr. Holm also noted that the request for subdivision would be made up of two (2) phases. The first phase would build the public street, Moselle Drive, from the northern edge of existing improvements to the southern edge of property ownership where the project meets Coeur d'Alene Place PUD.
- Phase I will provide 13 single family homes and 10 duplex/triplex units. A small extension of Mocha Loop would be built on the north and south sides of the property to complete the intersection and associated pedestrian improvements, as well as provide a temporary Fire Department turn around.
- Utilities will be provided to the extent of road construction, where they will be stubbed out for the next phase which would be the completion of Mocha Loop. Phase II will provide 45 duplex/triplex units.
- Mr. Holm stated that the City's Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Ramey-Woodland.
- He noted the various Comprehensive Plan goals for both the PUD and Subdivision.
- He provided a copy of a Land Use map, existing zoning and various photos showing the property.
- He showed renderings of the types of homes to be built, if approved.
- He stated that, if approved, there are 12 proposed conditions.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation

Commission Comments

Commissioner Ingalls noted that on page 6 of the staff report the City Engineer made a couple of comments, stating: "The applicant will have to receive approval from Lakes Highway District for access" and noted that he has concerns about the comment and feels that it doesn't need to be a condition. He also noted that he was more concerned with the second comment, which stated: "Single family lots currently show the 20' foot parking area to extend into the sidewalk, potentially blocking pedestrian circulation The required parking area should not include any portion of the sidewalk." He asked staff to explain that comment.

Mr. Holm explained that, from looking on the drawing, the driveway length is not 20' feet before the garage, which was not included in their request and is a mistake. He noted that on another drawing it shows the driveway 20' feet from the back of the sidewalk facing the garage. He further noted that he mistook the previous illustration as a swale, and stated that the applicant would address the question.

Commissioner Fleming asked about the road width since Moselle looks like it will be a highly trafficked area, especially when people are trying to get into the school. She questioned if the road was wide enough to put a dedicated bike path for the kids to get safely to school. Mr. Holm said a dedicated bike path was not discussed by the City Engineer or the City Trails Coordinator and explained that a few months ago, when the request included this property, there was a concession made that services of the school only had sidewalk access to the school on the north side because they didn't want kids walking on either side of the street.

Commissioner Fleming asked if all the homes that are proposed will be gated for senior housing, and on Moselle will it be single-family, not dedicated to seniors. Mr. Holm suggested that Commissioner Fleming ask the applicant that question and said that he thought the condo area would be dedicated to ages 55 plus.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if there were other triplexes located close to the area. Mr. Holm noted that apartments are proposed on Fescue Lane, which is close to the area.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if there are other blocks over 600 feet in length nearby. Mr. Holm noted nearby streets on the map where there are block lengths over 600 feet and commented that subdivision design standards were changed to prevent "super blocks".

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if the proposed block length and pedestrian change would create problems with connectivity for neighbors or kids riding bikes. Mr. Holm explained that there will be a connection to Pronghorn street which will go to the school. He added that nobody knows how the 5 acres to the east of the subject property will be developed, which is currently in the County. Without future connectivity to the east, development of the county parcel could force children to enter the school site directly from the south, which is designed as the "looping" area for drop off/pickup of students. Mr. Holm is looking at a way to funnel the kids to where the pedestrian access will be and to prevent children from mistakenly crossing the school parking lot. Commissioner Luttrupp asked if there will be access to the school. Mr. Holm explained that there is plenty of north/south access as designed, and explained if the future 13 homes along Moselle are developed without an east/west access, the property that remains in the County will be difficult to connect to the school in the future.

Commissioner Luttrupp suggested that in the future Planning Commission discuss what the benefits are to the city by approving PUDs. He inquired if staff could explain what the benefits are to the city if this project is approved. Mr. Holm explained that it is the applicant's duty to describe perceived benefits and it is up to the Planning Commission to decide if the proposal is a benefit to the City of Coeur d'Alene. The staff report analyzes current code and describes the deviations the applicant seeks to be approved. Mr. Holm explained it is Planning Commission's duty to review the request and decide if the project will be a benefit to the community (or not). He said that, if asked his personal and professional opinion, that a future connection to the remaining County parcel should be provided which would provide future access the new school.

Commissioner Ward said that on page 8 of the staff report it states: "That the commission must decide if this request meets the intent of the PUD regulations and doing so must wish to consider that certain benefits are to the city."

Public testimony open.

Stephanie Blalack, Verdi's applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- The applicant is seeking approval for a PUD and Subdivision.
- Vista Meadows will be a Senior Living PUD constructed in two phases, for a total of 20-lots with 6 tracts.
- She stated that the proposal fills the need within the community by providing a neighborhood for 55+. She added that they are homes that people can age in by providing smaller yards and less maintenance. They feel it will be a perfect fit for the City of Coeur d'Alene.
- There will be 68 residential units and a mix of single-family duplexes and triplexes that will eventually be condominiums.
- They have provided open space at 14.3% which will be free of structures, parking areas, streets and driveways.
- Ms. Blalack said that they will cluster the homes and the lots required with the density absorbed in the open space, providing a large space for residents. The density shown is 6.8 acres, which falls under the eight units/acre.
- The amenities provided would be 55+ or older requirement for the residents and that is for the entire PUD.
- She stated that Mocha Loop will be gated but the amenities will be provided for all residents.
- Walking paths will be constructed to provide connectivity within the community, with benches provided at intervals to accommodate resting and relaxation in the outdoors. A large common area with a picnic structure and garden boxes will act as a shared venue for neighborhood events

and get-togethers.

- A parking lot will be located near the picnic structure for the residents and guests. There will also be a fenced dog park.
- The Subdivision will be constructed in two phases, with phase one consisting of a continuation of Moselle Drive with 13 single-family homes and 10 triplex/duplex units.
- They will provide a grassy ornamental planting area with a bench in the open space area, as noted on the map.
- Ms. Blalack said that 17% open space will be constructed in the first phase.
- She explained the requested deviation is a 5' foot side set back which will allow for 5' feet on each side of the structure. They will have reduced the 25' foot rear set back by 5' feet. A reduction of the minimum lot size. The R-8 zone is 5500 square feet and the smallest lot is 4826 square feet, which is a reduction of 674 square feet. She stated the block length from the north to the south will be 643 feet without a pedestrian connection, which is only a 43 foot deviation.
- They are asking for rolled curbs which will be placed on Mocha and Moselle.
- Ms. Blalack mentioned the frontage deviations for two lots from the required 50 foot length. Block 1, lot 3 will be 39 feet of frontage and Block 1, Lot 4 will be 47 feet of frontage on the public street.
- The requested deviations in lot size and setback are necessary to keep the lots smaller and manageable for the maintenance and care of the senior residents. She added that the lot depths were determined by Moselle Drive aligning with Vista Meadows to the north and Coeur d'Alene Place to the south.
- She stated that the required deviations are minimal for the size of the proposed development.
- In conclusion, Ms. Blalack said that the request meets the Ramsey-Woodland category district of the Comprehensive Plan by proposing senior housing in an established neighborhood area with passive and active parks. There will be connectivity from adjacent subdivisions which allows for pedestrians, students, residents and citizens to connect to Prairie Avenue or the proposed school through a safe pedestrian travel way.
- Vista Meadows will connect and expand the housing options available in the area.
- Ms. Blalack addressed the question asked, "What is this project to the city." She explained that adding senior housing for the "baby boomers" is much needed. She noted that she talked to the applicant, John Beutler, who is a realtor, and he said that there is not a whole lot of housing out there for seniors, so adding the development would be a great addition to the city.

The applicant concluded her presentation.

Commission Comments

Commissioner Mandel inquired why a gate was proposed for the project. Ms. Blalack explained that the applicant wanted to keep this a private community for seniors.

Commissioner Ward asked if the applicant could explain the parking layout. Ms. Blalack noted on the map the area designated for guest parking. Commissioner Ward asked, if the area is for guest parking, how anyone would get to it if the area is gated. Ms. Blalack explained that guests coming in will have a code to use on the gate to gain access. Commissioner Ward asked if everyone who lives on Moselle would have to use the gate. Ms. Blalack said that was correct and all residents will have a gate code.

Commissioner Fleming asked if the houses on Moselle will be for senior housing. Ms. Blalack said that was correct, and all 68 units will be 55+ or older.

Commissioner Fleming suggested that the design of the homes be different, and explained that as you age, you get confused and if the all the homes look the same, it would be hard to find your house if lost.

Commissioner Ingalls said that when Garden Grove was approved many years ago, they discussed during that hearing deviations regarding rear yard setbacks and the discussion about the backwards "L." He explained that along one boundary for that development they placed a condition that stated not to have a rear setback deviation for a portion of the site, because the development would border Sunshine Meadows with a lot of public comment during that hearing protesting the development, so they approved a condition omitting that deviation to the existing neighbors who border the development.

Commissioner Ingalls said that with the current request, there wasn't any one at the hearing tonight to protest the project. He asked if the development is similar to Garden Grove and questioned if, even though there is no public comment for/or against the development, should they still have the same condition on the west boundary stating that they aren't going to deviate along the boundary for the same reason.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked how the development will be compatible with the other developments in the area. Ms. Blalack explained that the property is surrounded by many housing developments and the deviations they are requesting are very minimal. She explained that they are building to a density of 6.8 units per acre which is lower than the current density which is an R-8 (Residential at eight units/per acre).

Sandy Young explained that the project is similar to Meadow Ranch, The Circuit on Seltice and Riviera Walk. She addressed the parking and said that this is the first project they have designed with a separate parking area. She added that the parking for the project is more than what they show that includes the city requirement of two parking spaces per lot which is provided. She addressed Commissioner Ingalls' question regarding Garden Grove and noted that they did provide a deviation for those neighbors. She commented that she feels with the request presented tonight there is no opposition with the development which is similar to Bellerive with the reduced setback, and it is not an unusual request.

Commissioner Ingalls said the other developments mentioned are very popular with seniors and that he lives in a gated community and with prices rising feels the proposed project might provide a more affordable housing option.

Ms. Young addressed concerns about the gate security and noted that after hearing input from their customers, they want a gate.

Merle Van Houten, Project Engineer, stated that originally he had the project designed as a PUD for all 15 acres, which was approved, but the project expired and after that happened they had to design the sewer alignment before the project came forward. He explained that the lot depth approved a few years ago was for duplexes, but it is now changed for single family. He explained that the total 13 lots with 11 of those lots with a depth of 18 foot driveway and why that commented was generated by the city engineer in the staff report. He stated that 18 feet is acceptable, which meets the criteria for most vehicles and noted that most compact stalls are less than 16 feet in depth. He added with 18 feet, most people will clear the sidewalk. He also explained that parking was placed on the inner loop of Mocha Loop because Mocha Loop is a narrow street that won't allow parking on the street, and because of that they felt they needed to give people extra parking. He said that the project meets the city parking standards with each unit required to have two spots, plus parking in the garage.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if people the cars will stick out on the sidewalk if people park in their driveway. Mr. Van Houten explained that the only lots that don't meet the 20 foot length are the 11 southern residences on Moselle. He added that all the triplexes and duplexes meet the 20 foot setback.

Mr. Holm clarified that the original request didn't ask for reduced driveway lengths and explained the city code requires a 20 foot setback from back of sidewalk or property line whichever is greater. He stated that he would have to direct the question to legal in regard to whether the Planning Commission has the ability to make the concession at this hearing or if the decision needed to be made prior to this hearing.

Mr. Adams replied that the commission does have the authority, but the commission always acts on the analysis and recommendation from staff, and that staff has not had an opportunity to consider that particular deviation.

Mr. Holm clarified that all of Coeur d'Alene Place has an 18 foot driveway length.

Commissioner Luttrupp apologized that he got a little "snippy" with staff and said that he appreciates the comment made by Mr. Adams that the commission relies on Planning to make recommendations to them, which legal clarified.

John Butler, applicant, stated that the project was approved with more density a few years ago, and they decided not to do the project because they felt they needed some more senior housing. He added that the triplexes will be designed as condos so people will have a chance to own them and they will be affordable. He addressed the design of the homes and said that they have hired an architect who will design the houses to not look like a "cookie-cutter" type project. He said that he concurred that seniors do like a gate and Coeur d'Alene Place has a gated community with similar lot sizes.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Luttrupp said that he has concerns about the PUD process. He commented that he doesn't like gates and private roads and is not sure if he supports the request. He explained if they approved that type of project in other areas they need to be consistent and, for him, consistency is more important than deviations, but in the future he would like to have a discussion regarding PUD's, private streets and gates.

Commissioner Ingalls concurred that if they have approved other projects similar to the proposed project and the proposed project is similar to other developments they have approved. He also noted that by approving the request, they will provide a housing product that will help provide some affordable housing. He commented that having a gated community can be a benefit by promoting some unity among the people who live behind the gate. He said that he will support the project.

Commissioner Mandel said that the project does have benefits to the city regarding housing choices. She said she wanted to clarify her thoughts on gates and doesn't disagree that they are attractive to the senior population, but what concerns her is gates in that area, and the proximity to Coeur d'Alene Place, which is not gated and is close to the school. She explained that she understands the market dictates what is needed. She commented that she feels our community is in need of more affordable housing choices such as duplexes and triplexes.

Commissioner Ward stated that a few years ago, at the Cottage Garden hearing, they had a lot of people who showed up in opposition, but tonight with the proposed project, they don't have any of the public present. He commented that he feels if more people would have shown up they would have had a discussion regarding deviations. He added that since they don't have any opposition present tonight, the surrounding neighbors don't have a problem with the request. He commented that he does like the comment from Mr. Holms regarding the de-annexed county property to the east and, if that property is sold and developed, will everyone be required to go around to the main street to go back to Moselle to get to the school. He suggested maybe having a mid-block sidewalk even though it will go up against a fence.

Mr. Holm said that they had a discussion earlier regarding a midblock sidewalk connection to the property to the east and it could be put in an easement and be constructed later. He noted one problem about doing it later is based upon the expectations of the neighbors that end up living there and they would need to be clear when that needs to be done.

Ms. Anderson stated that staff was not aware of the changes in driveways lengths for the 11 lots. She explained that it is not unusual and those 18 feet driveway lengths have been done in other

neighborhoods, but they have a concern with the request even though it's a 2 foot difference from the 20 foot driveway lengths required because of students walking and riding their bikes on the sidewalk. She said that staff wanted the commission to be aware of the change for the driveway depths for the 11-lots.

Chairman Messina commented that sometimes gates are good choice and sometimes they are not, but gates for the proposed project fit for the reason of security. He said that he would support the request if he was voting because he feels there is a need for this type of project.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired about the 18 foot driveway depth and if staff could confirm that Coeur d'Alene Place allowed 18 foot driveways.

Mr. Holm explained that the way Coeur d'Alene Place was constructed, much of it provided for 20 foot driveway lengths but the PUD request allows 18 feet driveway depths.

Mr. Adams said that the motion said, "As described in the application," which did not include the 18 foot driveways, so if the commission wanted to allow it, it should be included in the motion.

Commissioner Ingalls made a motion for approval to include a deviation for 18 foot driveway depths for the 11 single family dwellings. The motion failed for a lack of a second.

Commissioner Ward asked if Commissioner Ingalls would amend his motion to include as condition number 13 the requirement to provide a midblock pedestrian path that will have to be reviewed at a different time to make sure it aligns properly to the easterly block 1.

Commissioner Ingalls said that he liked the added 13th condition, wanted to withdraw his motion and hear from the applicant if was doable.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

Public testimony open.

The Commission took a 5 minute recess.

Ms. Young said that they came up with two options. The first thing they discussed is the 5-acre piece that sits to the east and the fact that it is county property, which was deannexed, and if that piece was ever annexed into the city and developed into anything beyond a single family residence, it would come before the city with a condition stating that access be provided to the school. She added that they are unclear why someone would want to come from the subdivision or from the south and make the connectivity over to the lot when the best connectivity is on a public street. She said the second option would be if the commission sees the need for connectivity, they will provide a 5 foot easement and ask that the easement be developed dependent upon development of the property next door, because it could stay a single family residence for the next twenty or thirty years but, if needed, they would provide a 5 foot easement between lots 6 and 7.

Ms. Anderson explained that 5 foot easement would only be used in the event of a future residential development and used for those residents and students to come through and get on Moselle to get to the school. She stated that, in the future, they are not prohibiting another residential development from getting safe access to the school.

Commissioner Fleming asked if the applicant could show on the map where the fence will be located around the gated part of the community as she was curious which houses are in or out.

Ms. Harris noted on a map where the gated portion was located and said that the fence will be put on the northern boundary with the fences connecting.

Mr. Holm explained that with smaller PUD's like this, nine times out of ten the open space is private and now he is hearing that the open space could be public. He explained the way the project is designed, it would restrict vehicle access, so you wouldn't get the people driving in the area and if someone is walking their dog, they could access the public space and would like clarification if this should be a condition added to the project.

Ms. Young clarified that the open space is accessible by the public walking by foot. She asked if the commission would consider that if the property to the east is developed that the accessibility for any kind of subdivision or PUD that the responsibility lies with that developer more than it does with this PUD, which they feel has met all the conditions.

Commissioner Ingalls clarified that Ms. Young had stated that it would be reasonable if the commission said they record on the final plat a 5 foot easement between block 6 and 7 and the plat gets recorded, and then years later the parcel to the east comes into the city and they have an Annexation Agreement and designate that person to do the improvements.

Commissioner Ingalls said that he would add a 13th condition that states, "A five foot pedestrian access easement will be recorded on the final plat between lots 6 & 7 of Block 1 to accommodate a possible future pedestrian path access to the parcel of the east of the property upon annexation and development and to be improved by the developer of the annexation property."

Public testimony closed.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item PUD-5-19, Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Ward to approve Item S-5-19, Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant