CALL TO ORDER:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Commissioner Fleming noted a change to the minutes on page 10 in the packet where the vote was wrong for item PUD-3-21 which was 6-0 and the count should have been 4-2.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Luttropp, to approve the amended minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on December 14, 2021. Motion approved.

Motion by Luttropp, seconded by Mandel, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on January 11, 2022. Motion approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, provided the following statements.

- She announced that Chairman Messina will be voting starting with this meeting.
- She announced that on February 15th we have a second meeting scheduled on the Comprehensive Plan and on the next Planning Commission scheduled for March 8th there are four public hearings scheduled including one administrative item.
- She stated before the public hearing gets started, she wanted to thank the commission for all their time, effort and dedication to this project and to thank staff including Sean Holm, Senior Planner who had taken the lead for the city, Alex Dupey, MIG, CDA 2030, all volunteers that were a part of the committees and Envision Coeur d’Alene.
1. Applicant: City of Coeur d’Alene
Request: The City of Coeur d’Alene is seeking approval for the City’s Comprehensive Plan for 2022-2042 (Envision Coeur d’Alene). The Planning Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to the City Council regarding adoption of the new plan.

Presented by: Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, Sean Holm, Senior Planner and Alex Dupey, Director of Planning Services, MIG

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director provided the following statements:

- She stated with city staff, CDA 2030 and our consultants at MIG bringing forward the final draft of the City of Coeur d’Alene, Comprehensive Plan for 2022-2042.
- She explained this is the Planning Commission public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan in advance of the final hearing for the plan before City Council. She added we are seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission that the City Council adopt the 2022-2042 Coeur d’Alene Comprehensive Plan.
- She provided an agenda showing the outline of how we will be covering the information that will be helpful to the public.
- She presented a Power Point slide explaining that Envision Coeur d’Alene is a unified community vision and a collaborative engagement effort that has been in full force for the past 27 months. This has been a partnership between the city and CDA 2030.
- She added that community and long-range planning was created to develop a city-wide plan and road map for the community’s future through the year 2042. She added through this effort we knew was a collaboration to include our community members to understand the desires of the future as the community grows and making decisions at the council level. She stated we knew that there would be two different plans and for the city it’s the Comprehensive Plan that is State mandated and one for CDA 2030 that is an update to the vision and implementation plan.
- She explained that the city and CDA 2030 have their own plans with some shared overlapping goals, vision and objectives with action items that are different.
- She explained the reason we partner and that the city has a Comprehensive Plan currently adopted in 2007-2027, but in 2014 the city council adopted CDA 2030 vision and implementation plan and in that plan 48% of the action plans were city-led. She added that the implementation plan included an action item that the city and CDA 2030 should align the two documents to have more update on the visioning, validation and implementation plan within our comprehensive plan.
- She addressed the confusion over the years since the implementation plan was adopted and people were confused that his was the comprehensive plan for the city, so it was important to engage our community for this vision and come up with two different plans.
- She explained that the partnership with CDA 2030 and the City has been beneficial providing a single public process resulting in two unified plans, enhanced the staff and financial resources saving lots of money, increased citizen participation in development of the plan and streamlined the engagement process from the citizen perspective.
- The project used volunteers and board and spent lots of hours on this process including this last year looking at the action items, getting input from the community, getting input from the Planning Commission, City Council, CDA 2030 board and heard from the community some of the action’s items don’t fit within the cities Comprehensive Plan and explained those items are more under the CDA 2030 “umbrella” and those aren’t in the City’s plan.
- She explained that there is some shared joint actions and city specific ones.
Sean Holm, Senior Planner and Alex Dupey, Director of Planning Services, MIG provided a Power Point with the following items discussed. Click here to view the Power Point.

- Mr. Holm read the definition for "What is Envision CDA"
- He noted the Comprehensive Plan requirements. The plan guides future growth decisions and land use planning for the next 20 years, meets the State of Idaho Comprehensive Plan requirements and implements the reasons how to achieve the community’s vision.
- Mr. Dupey provided a timeline showing that this was a plan developed by the community with the help of community partners with a public kickoff.
- Mr. Dupey explained that we formed a Community Advisory Committee and Focus Groups with volunteers from the community that came up with a vision and goals including community priorities survey, and held a virtual public open house
- He explained with many hours of discussion the two groups came up with Place Types that will provide guidance on future land uses within the Area of City Impact (AIC), that implement the vision and guiding principles implemented through the City’s development code.
- The following are the Place Types: Single-Family, Compact and Urban Neighborhoods, Mixed Use, Downtown, Retail/Corridor Center, Industrial, Civic, Planned Development, and Historic Overlay, and removed “Neighborhood Center” Place Type, and made an amendment to the Place Types for mobile home parks to reduce the density it to make it more compatible with what there is today.

Mr. Holm and Mr. Dupey finished their joint presentation and asked if there were any questions.

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina noted under the three Place Types is the compatible zoning district and asked if staff could explain why those are listed. Mr. Dupey explained the zoning identified in that Place Type already occurs in that Place Type and that the zone isn’t changed within those Place Types but just suggestions used to provide guidance.

Commissioner McCracken questioned the population numbers we are using and how it filters through the plan. Mr. Dupey explained the population numbers are from KMPO which is the number they used for growth assumption through the city and we used those numbers as a base on how to accommodate the growth. Commissioner McCracken inquired about the requirements for the Comprehensive Plan and questioned what was the source used for those population numbers. Ms. Anderson explained that KMPO’s number were primarily used for population projection and explained that our existing zoning could get us to 85,000 and that we aren’t inviting growth with this new plan, but the plan will be used to direct growth where the community would like to see growth happen in the next 20 years. Mr. Dupey concurred and reinforced that we aren’t changing the zoning and that the population projections predict what the existing zoning could allow with that much growth over time.

Commissioner Mandel questioned how does our Comprehensive Plan relate to KMPO or other regional plans for example. This plan is focused on the city but because we are part of a growing region, asked if staff can clarify other regional efforts. Mr. Holm explained every 10 years we do a census and where we base our 10-year growth patterns looking at projections based on how many buildings permits we are issuing based upon how many people per unit, what the vacancy rate is and over the last 30-40 years the city has grown approximately 1,000 people per year, which is consistent over 10 years, and we took that number and made an assumption to be at a certain point. He added we worked with KMPO and knowing where the vacant land is including corridors and that KMPO looks at the bigger picture and how the city aligns and where those connections either/are or aren’t and where is the traffic coming from etc. based on a modeling system that looks at it regionally. So, we looked at that with KMPO and predict growth in various places inside city limits and our ACI and determine what improvements need to be made. Commissioner McCracken stated so is that number based over 20 years. Mr. Holm explained we estimated high in anticipation on some growth. Ms. Anderson clarified that the city has remained at an approximately 2.5-3% growth rate.
Commissioner Mandel asked for clarification on the process each year and whether the Planning Department and the City will give a report on progress towards the goals, objections, activity. She also stated that the action items are opportunities of what we can do and that nothing in this plan is obligated. It is just a tool to use as a guide when making a decision. Ms. Anderson explained that the implementation plan is required by the State and that the action items are used to implement the goals and objections that are throughout the plan and added that we will be doing a 5-year update on implementation plan portion and an update on some of the accomplishments. She clarified that the Planning Commission’s decisions will mostly be based on goals, objectives, Future Land Use Map and Place Types, and not the action items.

**Public testimony open.**

Jeff White stated he has heard many points regarding rezoning based on developer dollars and everyone is guilty for “Pimping our State out”. He added that he hasn’t seen any development turned down and is in the building industry which has been uncontrolled and unchecked. He added that infrastructure is overloaded and the Prairie is disappearing.

Doug Eastwood stated that he would like to put emphasis on opportunities that will be coming your way over the next 20 years. He stated that parks and trails make lots of money for the city from events scheduled throughout the park system. If you were to take that money out of community, many jobs would be eliminated. He explained living next to a designated trail raises property values between 4-12% and even higher around parks and golf courses. He explained that if we are going to have a vibrant economy, we need to invest in those assets and in time through property values the money will come back to the community many times over. He added in the past, he has heard various elected officials saying “We can’t afford parks, trails and open space” and he responded to that comment saying you can’t afford not to have these assets. He commented that Coeur d’Alene has a good thing and advised to complete the trail connections, stay on top of care for users and staff ahead of population growth by acquiring the land.

Glen Warriner stated that the last Comprehensive Plan was done in 2007 and the city has spent two years on a new comprehensive plan and according to the Coeur d’Alene Press the public has two weeks for comment and based on the importance of the Comprehensive Plan this isn’t appropriate.

Commissioner Mandel inquired if there was a way for people to comment prior to this hearing. Ms. Anderson replied that people could have submitted written comments as well as requesting a hard copy of the plan if online access to review the plan wasn’t available to them.

James Anton commented that long term planning is great, but questioned if this long-term plan been vetted regarding previous comment and questioned if there was a committee designated to look at this plan to vet out all the problems and feels two weeks isn’t long enough. He added this plan looks like the beginning stages of turning Coeur d’Alene into California, Portland and Minneapolis.

Don Eichler stated he is concerned with the many apartments that are going into the city and with those comes crime.

Melissa Moulton inquired if all the community groups that were working on the plan formed by CDA 2030 those ideas are a reflection of the community. Ms. Anderson explained we reached out to all different organizations and the community at large asking for volunteers for the advisory committee or the six focus groups, with the requirement that people who applied lived, worked, owned property or owned a residence or business in the City of Coeur d’Alene. Ms. Moulton stated in the plan it also says “Develop increased housing and shelter options to better address the needs of the homeless community” She questioned where is the homeless community supposed to be in the city.

Tommy Benches commented this plan doesn’t sound like it’s the cities plan but a plan of social engineering and we don’t want it.
David Groth commented he is a retired teacher and thanked the commission for their vision to promote orderly growth, preserve the quality of Coeur d’Alene, protect the environment, promote economic prosperity and foster the safety of its residents. He thanked the people who wants to come to this community and suggested to keep the word “kindness” in the plan - that is something to be treasured in this community.

Todd Butler explained that he has practiced architecture here for many years and is overwhelmed with work. He wanted to say he appreciates what Coeur d’Alene has been doing with their work on the Comprehensive Plan and has heard a lot of opposition and remembers a couple years ago, in the paper when this process was starting and he did sign up to get more information. He regrets not attending any of the meetings. He added that he kept getting notices to join the various meetings and did see a copy of the draft plan so he respects the process. He stated he is confused why there is so much opposition now when the plan is done.

Nash Mahuron commented that he has concerns with the aligned zones associated with the districts and noticed that many of them says C-17 which can be many things within that zone. He added he feels Neighborhood Commercial (NC) and Community Commercial (CC) zoning districts should be used more especially in the medical district. He added that he likes the plan, but feels the zones labeled with those districts makes no sense. Ms. Anderson explained those zones listed on the bottom of the page are suggested zones that might be compatible with future requests and clarified that C-17 is the broadest zone that does allow three story buildings.

Bruce Mattare commented that density is an issue and seen in the last year a lot of growth with an increase in traffic. He added we have a lot of growth going on in the city with a lot of people relocating here.

Daniel Owsley stated is an architect and when looking at this plan it might have been appropriate in 2015 or 2018 and that the pandemic has changed what is occurring in this area with the addition of people who are doing remote work that is increasing dramatically. He suggested we need to focus on single family housing even if that means we move farther out past the city boundary.

Wildman stated that there are many CDA 2030’s all over the state and questioned what is the need for 2030 and explained that there is a state law that nonprofits aren’t allowed to lobby at the state level and feels that CDA 2030 is similar to a lobbyist that represents us at the local level. He noted in the plan many words stating equity that is a fancy word for socialism and that sustainability is another word that means "environmental control" which is designed to be deceptive. He added our City Council has gone rogue and that this commission is following in their footsteps.

The commission took a 5-minute recess and reconvened at 7:43 p.m.

Ms. Anderson clarified that 2030 is a nonprofit and not associated with Agenda 2030 or the United Nations and has nothing to do with the other 2030’s in Idaho.

Mike Birdsong inquired if you are taking money for development and hopes that this commission can be truthful when representing the people.

Ron Hartman stated we don’t have the growth rate right and stated that he has lived all over the United States and life changed with the pandemic since people can work from home and that is why many people are locating here. He suggested that the plan should talk more about control of the lake, the boat traffic, launches, slips, storage and boat rentals and would like a plan to control this situation.

Erin Barnard commented this process started before the pandemic with the goal before that was growth, which is no longer the goal. She added that she fears no developments will be turned down especially if they fit in the required zone and need to go back to the board to stop growth.

Lynda Putz stated most of us have come from other states and that she regrets missing these meetings
but fears that what has happened in the states we have left is going to happen in Coeur d’Alene. She added this is a “Trojan Horse” coming here which looks beautiful, but feels this is connected to Agenda 21 or the UN, then you are naïve.

Mark Anthony commented that he has lived in many big places and has been paying attention to all agendas when traveling to various cities and feels that this plan is meant to take over foreign land and that the UN is taking over local offices.

Ed Austin stated this is the community and we don’t want to lose what we got and doesn’t know what side staff is on but feels 2030 is corrupt.

Chet Gaede commented that this has been a fascinating meeting with some great things said. He stated that I haven’t read the plan, but has been a participant on various city committees and was involved with 2030 when that started in 2010. The plan was supposed to last for 20 years and that is how it came to be known as 2030. He stated one of the values for North Idaho is personal liberty, personal freedom and a lack of regulation. He advised if you want to have the community to stay the way it is, it will take more regulations than what is mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan. He explained many projects that don’t get turned down are guaranteed by the State legislature in an effort to protect personal property rights and that the council is limited by the State legislature. He suggested before you get to the UN that you should stop by the State legislature and tell them to get rid of regulations and they might agree. He commented that he hasn’t heard many comments tonight reference this plan that’s been online. He supports the Comprehensive Plan.

Phoenix commented talked about farms and people growing their own food on their land and that we need to have a balance of community and need to look out for the smaller man. She added the big box stores are taking over the ability to have your own land.

Karen stated she had a question to staff. She is new and that we are looking at crisis of food chain supplies. She questioned what do we do when things break down and agrees we need to keep our farms to have the community to be self-sustaining.

Jeanette Laster commented that she has served on the outside/inside of this process as a community member and a non-profit leader in the community and works with the homeless community and has concerns about the message stating that we don’t have a homeless population. She added that many of the homeless are seen in bigger cities and currently have 400 students considered homeless and receiving services. She stated for her in this plan is on how to provide affordable housing and a need for public transportation. She thanked staff and CDA 2030 who spent many hours working on this plan.

Teresa Baurenpool thanked the commission for all your work done and stated it was “text book” and everything I learned about engaging community members was done through this process. She was impressed how playing games help engaged the community and so thankful to have St. Vincent’s close by to help our community in ways that are important with the visioning for our future. She explained that she had been listening to this meeting online and heard someone referencing the homeless in North Idaho and to please respect the homeless by showing respect.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Chairman Messina commented we have worked on this plan for a long time and he is surprised that people are stating that they are just hearing about this now with so many workshops and meetings we have had throughout the process. He stated that he is comfortable with this plan because it is a vision and not set in stone. It’s something that is going to help us as we grow. Staff has put in many hours including taking input through the community.
Commissioner Fleming stated this is state mandated and she has worked for 7 years with the City of Hayden as a volunteer as a Planning Commissioner working on their Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the city has a lot of existing structures that are dilapidated, mobile homes on their last leg and considered our affordable housing in the city. She respects those people, because that is what they can afford with a deserve to live in this community, as much as anyone else coming from California, Oregon and Washington. She commented that she supports rapid transit and transit to move the disabled and the elderly who can’t drive and can’t expect all people living here will live in a home. She commented that the Comprehensive Plan is a living document and needs a chance to evolve and adapt, react and to solve problems going forward and nothing in this document tells people what they can or should do on their property. She explained that projects come to us we don’t solicitate if someone wants to build a high-rise and can’t tell them what they can do with their money or land. She added that the passing of this plan will protect the assets of the city and hopefully improves them. She noted that the most important asset to the city is the people and would like a better bus system. She concluded this document will give us the tools to help make the city better and supports this document.

Commissioner Mandel thanked staff and the advisors on this process that has taken 2.5 years through some difficult times. She also wanted to thank the public for participating in this process. There has been a lot of passion and testimony. She added that we had 11,000 data points and 1500 people who participated in the process who shared their concerns. So, to say the commission has to listen to the community and to us the people, we did and we can’t make everyone happy. We have listened for 2.5 years. She challenged everyone to read the Comprehensive Plan because there is probably more in common than what you think. She stated that she thinks about density when she takes her kids to school and as a Planning Commissioner she is concerned with where are we going to put all these people and that everyone can’t afford a high-end home. So, we have to manage the growth that honors the vision and principles that have been expressed from the community. She fully supports this plan, which gives us a good tool to use when making decisions.

Commissioner McCracken stated she appreciates the comments and she does notice the growth and shares common goals of being responsible with the growth and not compounding the problems we see including traffic that has changed through the years. But if we don’t plan for growth, we aren’t going to find a solution to catch up from the growth we were expecting at the rate it has come. She added there are important parts of the plan to improve on some of the catch up on above-average growth that we have had through the years. She explained that she has been involved for a couple years with her family in a couple of roles throughout this process volunteering. She added a benefit is this plan doesn’t change the zoning, or individual lot uses and property rights which will come on a case-by-case basis if someone requests a zone change, which will be a public hearing providing comments from the public. This will be used as a tool to make those decisions. She supports the plan and invites the public to use the plan and give us feedback.

Commissioner Luttropp concurs with all comments made and stressed the public to please attend future meetings.

**Motion by Fleming, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item P-1-22. Motion approved.**

**ROLL CALL:**

- Commissioner Fleming  Voted  Aye
- Commissioner Mandel  Voted  Aye
- Commissioner McCracken  Voted  Aye
- Commissioner Luttropp  Voted  Aye
- Chairman Messina  Voted  Aye
ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Luttropp, seconded by Fleming, to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant