

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2021
Virtual (Zoom.us) and In-Person
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Michael Ward (Zoom)
Peter Luttrupp
Lewis Rumpler (Zoom)
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:

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 Mandel, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on January 12, 2021 Motion approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director provided the following comments:

- Ms. Anderson announced that we have scheduled on the March 9th Planning Commission agenda three items; a subdivision request, a special use permit, and an annexation with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in conjunction with a subdivision.
- She updated the commission on the Housekeeping Ordinance which was presented to council who had concerns with the proposed change to the wording for who has the right to appeal a Planning Commission decision, so that will remain unchanged. She added that instead of having the Notice of Decision and the appeal time frame start when the Notice of Decision is published in the paper or when the letter is mailed, that the Council asked that the appeal process be changed to start 15 days from the date of the Planning Commission decision. She stated that these changes will be brought back to Council at a later date.

- She introduced Victor Ramos, Planning Technician, who started last Monday and has a bachelor's degree from Eastern in Urban and Regional Planning.
- Mr. Ramos thanked the commission and said he looks forward to working at the city for many years to come.
- The commission welcomed Victor.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

ENVISION CDA COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Sean Holm, Senior Planner provided the following comments.

- He stated that he wanted to discuss the Envision CDA project and do an update on the recent events, what staff is working on, and what to expect over the short term.
- He noted at our last Planning Commission workshop on December 8 2020 that the commission discussed Place Types and Land Use Scenarios, and that staff has brought back to City Council the sections of the plan that the commission has vetted and recommended, including public input, input from the community advisory committee and six focus groups.
- He announced on Monday Feb 1st the project management team reviewed the policy document with Council asking for feedback for categories in the policy document taken from a survey that focused on Lake Health, Equity and Inclusion, Childcare and Affordable Housing.
- He explained that Council directed staff to include the draft policy document into the plan with the above items mentioned knowing that refinements will be coming at a later date.
- He stated last night staff presented at a workshop to the City Council; Place Types and Land Use Scenarios, and explained to them what a draft Comprehensive Plan Map will look like and asked for direction on which scenarios to use as a basis to generate that land use map.
- He explained that we have looked at three different scenarios and Council agreed that what they would like to see is a mix of Compact and District scenarios.
- He explained after that meeting staff will come up with a mixture of those two scenarios to be included in a land use map and bring back that draft at a joint Commission/Council workshop. Council also directed staff to get more public input and because of timing, will try to have public input taken at the same time.
- Alex Dupey, MIG, briefly discussed a draft transportation analysis that used information from a model used by KMPO to generate traffic, employment population and jobs based on those scenarios just mentioned and when done will send that document to the commission.
- He stated following the refinements to the policy document, Place Types and the Land Use Map recommendations from the Planning Commission and City Council, including public input built in to the process, the project management team will be compiling the segments of the plan according to the table of contents sent to each commissioner and bring forward a final document that will be hopefully presented in June.
- He thanked the commission for helping to shape the next 20 years of growth.

Chairman Messina stated he watched both workshops and that throughout this process has had a lot of public comment regarding the Comprehensive Plan and explained sometimes getting more public input might seem like a good idea, but can be overwhelming. He commented having a workshop with City Council is a great idea to hopefully be on the same page regarding the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if we will be able to have a discussion on the Comprehensive Plan amongst ourselves before we meet with Council because Council might have a different view. He stressed that public input is always important especially as we get closer to getting this approved and more people might feel comfortable sharing their thoughts when this is about to get approved.

Mr. Holm stated that based on last night's comments staff is trying to compile the information for the Land Use Map and want to be able to present what we put together over the next week but will try to build in public input as soon as possible.

ADMINISTRATIVE: *ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM.**

1. Applicant: Charlie Rens
Request: An interpretation for Lots 1&6 for PUD-3-14 (Lilac Glen)
ADMINISTRATIVE, (I-1-21)

Sean Holm, Senior Planner presented the staff report and stated,

- The applicant, Charlie Rens, seeks to clarify two items for the Lilac Glen PUD.
- The first is the density of a specific R-8PUD lot, and the second is to provide an additional architecture rendering showing 2-stories plus materials for the entirety of the approved Planned Unit Development (PUD) duplex lots.
- In June of 2014, the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the request for a preliminary plat, special use permit, and Planned Unit Development known as "Lilac Glen" PUD, a 13.03-acre development that included single family homes, duplexes, and two minimal care facility sites. Planning Commission also recommended approval to City Council for annexation and zoning. Much of the subject property on the east side of the project was constrained by slope (hillside ord.) plus the French Gulch floodway on the northern end. The usable and natural open space areas measure approximately 3.3 acres which represents 25% of the site.
- As part of the approval of the preliminary plat, it allowed for three vacant single family home sites which would be accessed from Fernan Hill Road. On the south side of the project were existing homes and a proposed duplex (now complete/occupied) as part of the Foss Addition. A cul-de-sac existed there which has now been removed, and a new ROW constructed, to provide access to the north that connects to the intersection of 23rd Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. As with any preliminary plat or PUD, staff has limited flexibility to allow for minor changes that may be needed if there are issues that come up as a site is improved. This constrained site was no exception.
- The lane needed slight realignment to deal with contours, the cul-de-sac improvements were removed to allow for less intrusion into the hillside, and one of the single-family R-3PUD lots was allowed to migrate adjacent to the Foss addition, leaving two homesites above and allowing three sites below where there used to be two. This was allowed at a 1:1 ratio which did not affect density.
- The vacant property was sold to a new owner following the recordation of the final plat.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls noted the duplex to the south which is the Foss Lot is it already built and questioned if the other duplex lots that border I-90 do they have permits. Mr. Holm replied they don't.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired if the architectural style of the duplex presented in the staff report if that style will be required for future duplexes. Mr. Holm answered yes with the architectural standard applying to the entire PUD.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Fleming, to approve Item I-1-21. Motion approved

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Dodge Heritage, LLC/JB Dodge Company, LLC
Location: Northeast corner of Wilbur Avenue and Highway 95
Request: A proposed 21.6-acre annexation from County Agriculture, Commercial & Light Industrial to City R-17 and C-17.
LEGISLATIVE, (A-1-21)

Mike Behary, Associate Planner presented the staff report and stated,

- The applicant is requesting approval of an annexation of 21.6 acres in conjunction with zoning approval from County Agricultural, Light Industrial, and Commercial Zones to City R-17 Residential and C-17 Commercial zoning districts.
- The subject property is currently vacant and located in the unincorporated area of the county. The subject site is adjacent to the city limits on the west and south side of the subject site. The property is currently zoned Agriculture, Light Industrial and Commercial, all in Kootenai County. The subject site is located within the City's Area of City Impact (ACI).
- The applicant is proposing two zoning districts as part of this annexation request, the R-17 and C-17 zoning districts. Approximately 5.4 acres is proposed to be C-17 that will allow for commercial and retail uses located in the southwest part of the subject site that is adjacent to the intersection of Wilbur and US-95. The remainder of the property, approximately 16.2 acres is proposed to be R-17.
- The applicant has indicated that the R-17 zone portion of this site will allow for a future multi-family development that will provide additional affordable workforce housing. The applicant is proposing three access points to the subject site, one access off of Wilbur Avenue, one off of Government Way, and one off of Aqua Avenue.
- The City's Comprehensive Plan designates this property within the US 95 Corridor area.
- He noted the various staff comments and indicated that staff has no objection to this request.
- Mr. Behary stated if approved there are 5 recommendations to be included in the annexation agreement.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Fleming commented with frontage on the highway which is zoned C-17 frontage is very valuable and questioned why the applicant chose to split the lot so the R-17 property is along the highway and not the C-17 parcel which would have made the C-17 parcel "golden" being up against the highway.

Mr. Behary stated that is a great point and that the applicant is here to answer that question.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired when there is a request to hook up to the sewer questioned who pays the fees.

Ms. Anderson answered that the applicant is responsible to pay all the setup fees.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated in the staff report it states that the Water Department doesn't want to do it because it is too expensive.

Mr. Behary explained that the Water Department indicated that they didn't have enough capacity and that North Kootenai Water could supply the water to the property.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated that he has concerns if we have a piece of property wanting to be annexed into the city should encourage all people wanting to annex to have city water.

Mr. Behary that this is not an unusual request where there have been other properties using other jurisdictions for water when they couldn't provide water.

Kyle Marine, City Water Department explained the reason the City can't supply water is because we don't have the infrastructure in that area to serve that property and would have to tear up Government Way and extend water lines up from the intersection to the south and stated that we are not allowed to cross Highway 95 and since North Kootenai Water District abuts the property. they serve all the properties to the north.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if there is water available across Highway 95 to the South.

Mr. Marine replied that is correct.

Chairman Messina commented that he is aware of other properties in the city that are served by other water districts and makes sense to use other districts when we don't have the infrastructure available to reach those properties.

Commissioner Luttrupp commented if the city can't supply sewer and water questioned why approve an annexation.

Ms. Anderson explained that the water district and in past annexations when the water department has not been able to supply water used partnerships from other jurisdictions to supply water which is not unusual.

Mr. Adams stated it sounds like it is a prohibitive cost to extend our infrastructure not only the distance, but tearing up Government Way with no legal impediment for an outside water district to supply water to lots within the city.

Commissioner Luttrupp questioned in other annexations if the applicant pays for sewer and water.

Mr. Marine explained that Wastewater already has a sewer line up Government Way, so they would be able to serve that lot. But for Water we don't have a line going that far north and if the property to the south where to be developed. He explained since the North Kootenai Water District is there, they have the right to serve that property and explained with water districts we have different lines of annexation that we are allowed to serve/not allowed to serve and this property falls within that "gray" area to where its available to North Kootenai Water District to supply water to that property.

Commissioner Ingalls stated that this is not an unusual practice for other water districts to supply water and as an example we recently approved a number of annexation requests along Prairie Avenue with each one of them having a letter from Hayden Irrigation that they would be able to provide water.

Mr. Marine replied that is correct and if a property would be within their water service area would have to write us a letter to release their water service before we are allowed to serve water in that section.

Public testimony open.

Steve White, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- He commented by approving this annexation would help fill in a gap within the city.
- He stated they feel that the C-17 and R-17 fits well on this property with an earlier question asked why we wouldn't want to have the commercial frontage along Highway 95 and explained that this property is limited to access on Highway 95. He added that the intent of this project is the ability to provide a multi-family or higher density project for this area which would be compatible with the other properties in the area.
- He stated that by approving this property meets all the policies listed in the Comprehensive Plan.
- He commented since the new Wilbur intersection was added will be a benefit to this property by providing easy ingress/egress into the property.

Mr. White concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Luttrupp noted in the narrative it states will provide "workforce" housing which is needed and can you define "workforce housing."

Mr. White explained that in Kootenai County the growth has made home ownership nonexistent, so we will be providing alternatives such as lower density apartments, townhouses etc. which will give people some opportunities for various types of ways for home ownership.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if we could include workforce housing as a condition in the findings.

Commissioner Mandel replied that the subject before us is an annexation and questioned can we include workforce housing as an "intent" as a condition.

Ms. Anderson explained that the applicant is requesting annexation in conjunction with zoning and that the R-17 zoning district allows for various housing types.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated that he would like workforce housing added as a type of housing.

Ms. Anderson stated that she isn't aware that could be included in the Annexation Agreement as a condition and if we could would have to have the applicant agree to that request.

Chairman Messina explained that the city has not yet defined "workforce housing" and until that happens, we can't make that a condition.

Mr. Adams stated there is limited things we can put in an annexation agreement and that State Statute 50-222 sets the criteria for annexing property which doesn't address what is going to be developed on that annexed property which has more to do with city growth and can't be included as a condition to annexation because we don't know what is going to be on that land and once a development plan comes forward as a PUD or subdivision than we than can restrict what is approved on the property.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated if we can't have workforce housing, they shouldn't have it in the narrative.

Commissioner Ingalls suggested removing the reference to "Workforce Housing," because it is the applicant's words. He added we have to trust that the applicant will provide a type of housing stock that is more affordable than other choices.

Commissioner Mandel commented that we recognize the need for mixed housing stock, but our question is to determine if that zoning makes sense for this area and what the applicant included should take as illustrative but seems premature to be discussed. She stated the question is does that zoning make sense for the annexation and not anything outside of that.

Commissioner Rumpler stated that we should limit our findings to the zoning associated with the annexation and at such time there is additional request as a PUD or some other approach to add a condition or requirements such as a specific type of housing.

Public testimony closed.

Motion by Mandel, seconded by Fleming, to approve Item A-1-21. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	No
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 1 vote.

2. Applicant: City of Coeur d'Alene, Water Department
Location: 4591 N. Atlas Road
Request: A request for a variance to allow a 0-foot setback on the south east corner of the property to install a new 750 KW Generator
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (V-1-21)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner presented the staff report and stated

- The City of Coeur d'Alene's Water Department is requesting a variance to the required setback on the south property line for the installation of a backup power generator in order to meet the State of Idaho's requirements.
- The required side yard setback in the R-8 zoning district is 25' for a nonresidential activity, rather than the requested 0' setback.
- The subject property is a .23-acre site located on N. Atlas Road.
- In July of 1971, the City of Coeur d'Alene drilled a well on the N. Atlas Road site.
- In 1987, the City Water Department obtained an Essential Service Special Use Permit to bring this nonconforming facility for an above-ground Essential Service activity into compliance.
- With new regulations triggered by the State of Idaho, the City is required to install a generator on the site for backup power to ensure continued operation of this well in the event of an emergency.
- The Variance request asks that the Water Department be allowed to place the generator at a 0' setback on the south side of the property rather than the required 25' setback.
- The Generator will be on a concrete pad and hardwired to a transfer switch. It will be inside a sound attenuated enclosure to mitigate noise. There will not be a cover over the Generator.
- The applicant noted in the Narrative submitted with the application that the undue hardship would be the requirement to meet the side yard setbacks of 25' for a nonresidential setback for the installation of the required generator.
- The State of Idaho is requiring the backup generator be installed onsite in case of an emergency, which allows for dedicated standby power to continue to provide water to a portion of the city this well site serves.
- The Comprehensive Plans designate this area as Ramsey-Woodland, Stable Established.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Fleming inquired how tall is the box for the generator.

Ms. Stroud stated that the applicant can answer that question.

Commissioner Luttrupp supports the Water Department, but doesn't understand why this request is considered to be a hardship.

Ms. Stroud explained that this is a requirement from the State of Idaho to have a generator at this site and that the site is limited with by the constraints mentioned in the staff report. She added that the applicant did go back to assess the site to see if there were any other options and because this is a non-residential use it triggers a 25'foot setback rather than a 10' foot setback which is typical for a 10/5 setback per single family dwelling.

Ms. Anderson stated this request is considered an Essential Service, so should be looked at differently than someone saying they couldn't meet the setbacks to put in a garage and that this request rises to a different level especially with the State saying we need this generator to ensure continued operation for water service if the power goes out.

Commissioner Luttrupp suggested maybe the verbiage needs to be expanded or changed if this is different and is not arguing about the project, but the definition for hardship doesn't have any merits.

Ms. Stroud explained that this is a unique situation and, in the past, denied variances who didn't meet the intent of the findings for approval for a variance.

Mr. Adams explained if this request is denied would make this property unusable which is a different circumstance if someone comes in later with a piece of property saying "I don't want to meet the setbacks". He explained that this is a mandatory requirement and if we can't meet the requirement than the property can't be used and that the issue is size of the property that is the hardship where setbacks can't be met.

Commissioner Luttrupp suggested that the wording be changed within the staff report.

Mr. Adams explained the commission must meet finding B8 A which is a simple statement and if the commission wants to expand that finding you can.

Public testimony open.

Kyle Marine, Water Department provided the following statements:

- He explained the size of the generator is 22 feet long by 9 feet tall and 7.5 feet wide with the generators pad will be up to the property line with the generator setting off the property line but need the pad for stabilization and maintenance on the generator.
- He stated that all future wells we put in make sure there is a generator per code and don't install new wells every year and not sure if we will have any new wells installed in the north area as the city expands depending on future annexations. He added that all future wells require that there is back up power for emergency services. and don't install new wells and will not have anymore wells in the north and all wells you have to have a generator.
- He explained that the original well was built installed by Idaho Water and taken over by the City of Coeur d'Alene in 1980, so the lot is undersized and we don't have a choice. He added that the Water Department would have liked to find another location to meet the requirements, but this was the best site on the property to make it fit.

Mr. Marine concluded his presentation.

Ms. Anderson noted on the bottom of page 6 of the staff report the statement noted is from Idaho Code and the last sentence within that statement should be considered when make the Finding B8 that states "it may be granted to an applicant only upon showing undue hardship because of characteristics of the site and that the Variance is not in conflict with public interest".

Commissioner Ward questioned is it common for generators to be up against the building.

Mr. Marine replied on new well sites we have more room to work with by expanding the side, or get a larger piece of property, but most of the time on a new well site the property is in an undeveloped area such as Huetter Road and when we get new wells in, we can fit the generator close to the transmitter switch which saves on expense since cable wires are expensive.

Commissioner Ward inquired what is the reason you chose this site is it because it was closer to a transformer.

Mr. Marine explained we moved to the southside because on the northside of the lot there is a "trough" that is designated for over flow water when we start/stop the well and in between the trough and the well house is a bunch of drywells in the ground and we are not allowed to put a structure over the top of them. He stated that the other spot was on the southside of the building and that a generator couldn't be placed next to the building because that is the access to the building and another reason moved it to the front of the lot is to try and keep it far from the existing homes.

Public testimony closed.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that he appreciates Commissioner Luttropp's comments and feels he is not questioning the merits of this project, but wanting to prevent setting a precedent. He stated in this case, this is different and a requirement by the State.

Commissioner Fleming inquired if there is any way that a different color then the yellow shown that could be chosen for the transformer box since the neighbor will be staring at a 9' foot box next to the fence line.

Mr. Marine stated he can choose another color but has to be careful of the type of paint since the box will get hot. He added with any of our tanks and building we try to hide a building or generator by choosing a color that blends in with the property such as if the unit is by a group of trees, we will use a green color and try to do the best, we can to not make it obvious.

Commissioner Ward stated in the past with cell towers that were approved were made to look like a tree and suggested maybe a hedge against the fence to hide the box. he concurs.

Mr. Marine stated that in all fences we do place privacy slats to try and hide as much of the unit we can.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Luttropp, to approve Item V-1-21. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttropp	Voted	No
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye

Commissioner Ward Voted Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 1 vote.

3. Applicant: City of Coeur d'Alene & Ignite cda
Location: 2598 E. Seltice Way
Request:
- A. A modification to the Atlas Waterfront Development PUD. QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-4-19m.1)
 - B. A modification to the preliminary plat known as "Atlas Waterfront master preliminary plat. QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-3-19m)

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, presented the staff report and stated:

As we were trying to get everything into the staff report and trying to move this project forward as quickly as possible, I noticed that there are a few errors in the staff report and below are the noted corrections.

- The total acreage including the triangle parcel is 70.5; in the staff report it said 60.9.
- Updated open space acreage is 24.5 acres (35%) of the site, exceeding the required 10%.
- The new total count has been reduced because the phase one developers are coming in with lesser unit counts than anticipated; so, it is 571 units, whereas the staff report stated 695.

PUD Amendment

- The PUD Amendment for the Atlas Waterfront project would revise the final Development Standards for the project to include the triangle parcel and allow some slight changes to the standards for the development areas to respond to market conditions and phase 1 of the project. The addition of the triangle parcel allows the option for 15-18 single-family homes or 10-11 single-family homes and 16-20 townhomes. This could result in as many as 571 residential units. With the increased acreage by adding in the 4.6-acre triangle parcel, the overall density of the project would drop slightly to less than 11 units per acre.
- As noted below, this PUD Amendment #2 adds in the triangle parcel, which would be Development Areas 16, 18 and 19. The additional land would allow improvements to the project layout and create new Development Areas 14 and 15. The following information summarizes the proposed additional land uses and deviations as well as justification. This information is also found in table form in Attachment 2.
- This PUD Amendment #2 also requests a modification to the Hillside Ordinance that would apply to the triangle parcel. The request is to replace and deviate from the Hillside Ordinance provisions to allow the project to be developed in a manner that complements the rest of the Atlas Waterfront project. Geotechnical studies will be completed and building envelopes will be shown on the final plat, the trees will be evaluated, and a tree preservation and restoration plan will be developed. Preserved trees will be protected and noted on the final plat.

Subdivision Amendment:

- The proposed amendment to the preliminary master plan and 1st Addition includes the 4.6-acre triangle parcel, modifies the internal roadway network slightly, creates additional development areas and allows slight changes to the prior development areas south of the triangle parcel. It also allows the future option to split Area 13 into two parcels.

History:

- In 2018, the City of Coeur d'Alene, in collaboration with ignite cda, purchased the Atlas Mill site which had operated as a lumber mill for more than 100 years and which had closed in 2005. The mill site was annexed into the City in 2017 and assigned as a C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre) zoning district. In 2017/18 the mill site was master planned to determine the financial feasibility of the property being included in an urban renewal district (URD). Considerable public input was solicited for the public spaces. The intent of the City and ignite cda is to transfer blocks of development in phases over the next couple years as site development efforts progress, instead of selling the property all at once.
- The Atlas Waterfront project is intended to create a unique and desirable neighborhood with a significant waterfront public open space. The City acquired the parcel to achieve two objectives: 1. Preserve the waterfront for the community; and 2. Stimulate private investment on a former mill site that has been vacant for more than a decade. The PUD will allow the higher densities necessary to make the project financially feasible, while protecting the most valuable real-estate, the waterfront, from development and preserving it for the public.

Background Information

- The subject site is located to the west of Riverstone and south of Seltice Way, flanking the north bank of the Spokane River, with the River's Edge development bordering the property to the west. The 70.5-acre site is currently vacant and undeveloped, and the acquisition opens the door for economic development and public access to the river. The former railroad right-of-way that runs through the property was acquired by and annexed into the City in 2015 to provide opportunities for parkland, a trail, and public access through to the waterfront. The project will be developed under the C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre) zoning district with the "Atlas Waterfront Neighborhood Development Standards" in place for the development of residential uses including single-family dwellings, townhomes, commercial, and multi-family units. The Atlas Waterfront project will be primarily residential with opportunities for office/retail on the western edge and near Seltice Way. In addition, two "commercial only" nodes are located adjacent to the waterfront park as both locations are desirable restaurant locations.
- The Atlas Waterfront PUD development will include three different frontage types: Residential fronting Riverfront Drive (rear-loaded); Residential fronting interior streets (rear-loaded); and Residential fronting interior streets (front-loaded), with additional frontage options based upon lot circumstances, as noted in the Development Standards.
- The "Development Areas Key Plan" notes the area of development on the Atlas Mill Site property and the standards that apply to each of those areas including the use, building types, lots (width, depth, area) for the townhouses and duplexes, setbacks, and building height showing different ways that buildings and lots can be configured to meet the design intent and development standards.
- The development will include 25-acres of open space including a 12-acre waterfront park, and upland open spaces to provide pedestrian circulation routes in addition to sidewalks. The waterfront park provides a grassy open play area, playground, picnic shelter, food truck parking, separate pedestrian and bicycle waterfront trails, a water dog park, ADA accessible swim area and kayak launch and several other water access points. The very northeast area of the site is anticipated as a 7.7-acre public space with a use that will be determined by the City Parks and Recreation Department. However, it is also possible that the site could be improved for future development that will be evaluated as the project is developed.

- The project will be developed in phases as shown on the Revised Phasing Map (page 17) over an 8 to 10-year schedule, depending on market conditions. The property will be sold by ignite CDA, the urban renewal district, through a request for proposal (RFP) process, in partnership with the City of Coeur d'Alene.
- She stated that the City's 2007 Comprehensive Plan designates this area as the Spokane River District.
- She noted if approved there are 16 conditions.

Ms. Anderson concluded her presentation

Commission Comments:

There were no questions for staff.

Public testimony open.

Phil Boyd provided the following statements:

- He stated with this request adding the triangle parcel into the Atlas Waterfront project.
- He explained that we have refined some of the Development Standards to accommodate market demands but will not impact the neighborhood character.
- He refreshed the commission on the land disposition process which ignite cda has modified.
- He stated with this modification will be including architectural standards to the Development Standards and explained early in the process the team suggested to ignite cda we should have architectural standards and worried that we might end up with something we are not comfortable with so ignite decided to get through the initial phasing see how things progress and now that we have moved through the initial phase, we are adding the architectural standards.
- He explained that we are modifying how the land is sold and now selling the land in blocks so when a developer come in to purchase a block will be handed a copy of the development standards that would define what you could do within that block of land before a block is purchased.
- He provided a map showing various circulation patterns with streets by adding a better pedestrian circulation pattern that will provide a public open space going east to west.

Mr. Boyd continued his presentation and explained the changes within the triangle piece and the other areas within the development.

To view Mr. Boyd's entire Power Point presentation please click [here](#).

Mr. Boyd concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina commented that he is happy the way the design of the area has been going and asked if Mr. Boyd could explain the phasing plan.

Mr. Boyd explained that the property in Area 1 and 2 has been sold and Area 8 got pulled because when we realized the triangle piece would comeback into play and the reason, we anticipated we thought the road needed to be changed because the position of the road made the triangle piece not easy to develop and, in this area, we added some additional material to raise the road which provides better contours by raising the road 11 feet. He added that the property in this area has not been sold and Ignite will selling

the lots in 4's for the reason there is a lot of administrative processes that ignite has to go through to do an RFP for each lot and give more opportunity for various builders to build in this area.

Chairman Messina inquired if the design standards will be the same for 4 lots versus a whole block.

Mr. Boyd stated that is correct and by having Development Standards will help control what will be built plus a developer will be able to review the standards before he makes a commitment.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ingalls stated he is impressed with the project and doubts we will see this project the last time and will continue to change and become better. He commented there is a synergy in this process and impressive.

Chairman Messina thanked ignite cda for making this happen.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Fleming, to approve Item PUD-4-19m.1. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Luttrupp, to approve Item S-3-19m. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:

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