PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
COEUR D’ALENE PUBLIC LIBRARY
LOWER LEVEL, COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE
MARCH 12, 2019

THE PLANNING COMMISSION’S VISION OF ITS ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY

The Planning Commission sees its role as the preparation and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan through which the Commission seeks to promote orderly growth, preserve the quality of Coeur d’Alene, protect the environment, promote economic prosperity and foster the safety of its residents.

5:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: Messina, Fleming, Ingalls, Luttropp, Mandel, Rumpler, Ward

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
January 8, 2019

OATH:
Peter Luttropp

ELECTIONS:
Chair and Vice-Chair

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

STAFF COMMENTS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS: ***ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS.

1. Applicant: Tammi Kerr
   Location: 1781 W. Alps Street
   Request: A proposed zone change from R-3 to R-17
   QUASI-JUDICIAL, (ZC-1-19)

2. Applicant: Ted Burnside
   Location: 7725 N. Ramsey Road
   Request: A proposed 4.6 acre annexation from County Commercial to
   City R-17.
   LEGISLATIVE, (A-1-19)

3. Applicant: Habitat for Humanity of North Idaho, Inc.
   Location: 601 W. Neider Avenue
   Request: A proposed zone change from MH-8 to R-17
   QUASI-JUDICIAL, (ZC-2-19)

ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:

Motion by __________, seconded by __________,
to continue meeting to __________, __, at __ p.m.; motion carried unanimously.
Motion by __________, seconded by __________, to adjourn meeting; motion carried unanimously.

*The City of Coeur d’Alene will make reasonable accommodations for anyone attending this meeting who requires special assistance for hearing, physical or other impairments. Please contact Shana Stuhlmiller at (208)769-2240 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting date and time.
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
JANUARY 8, 2019
LOWER LEVEL – COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Michael Ward
Peter Luttropp
Brinnon Mandel

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:
Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director
Tami Stroud, Associate Planner
Sean Holm, Senior 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.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:
None.

STAFF COMMENTS:
Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, provided the following statements:

- She wished the Commission a Happy New Year.
- She stated that she had the honor of being part of the Mayor’s State of the City address and spoke about growth, development and some of our future projects.
- The East Sherman Master Plan is getting close to the “finish line” and they will be scheduling meetings with the leadership committee and a workshop with the Planning Commission. Staff is trying to decide if this workshop will be a joint workshop with City Council.
- The Atlas Mill project is moving forward with the final design work and development standards, with Chairman Messina involved in those discussions. Ms. Anderson stated that they would also like to schedule a workshop sometime in February with the Planning Commission to dive into the project.
- She stated that later this evening Sean Holm, Senior Planner, will be doing a presentation on the Comprehensive Plan.
- She stated that they did not receive any applications for February.

Chairman Messina requested that the Planning Commission e-mail staff to let them know the dates they are going to be out of town, so staff can schedule future workshops.
PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Ian and Julie Mahuron  
Location: 1344 E. Young Avenue  
Request: Grant variance of 18’ height restriction of accessory building.  
Ridge of accessory garage exceeds the restriction by 10 inches.

QUASI-JUDICIAL, (V-1-19)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner, stated that Ian and Julie Mahuron are requesting a variance to the height requirement for accessory structures in the rear yard, to allow an accessory structure to be 18 feet 10 inches, rather than 18 feet as required by code

Ms. Stroud provided the following statements:

- On August 8, 2018, a building permit was issued for a +/- 3,954 sq. ft. addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit located on the southeast corner of 14th Street and Young Avenue.
- The addition includes living space, a 3 car garage which faces Young Avenue, and a +/- 532 sq. ft. “garage/shop” with a garage door access along the alley.
- The property owner’s contractor contacted city staff to inform them of an error in the manufacturing of the trusses at the truss plant, and rather than the 6:12 truss, trusses with a 7:12 pitch were installed on the accessory structure portion of the home.
- The purpose of the request is for the approval of a variance to allow the height of an accessory structure, located in the rear yard (rear 25’) to exceed the required maximum height limit of 18’ and be allowed to be over height by 10”. She explained various site photos of the applicant’s property.
- She stated the zoning is R-12
- She presented a land use map showing the existing land uses, which are single-family residential.
- She explained the applicant’s site plan used for the remodel.
- She listed the various findings that will need to be made and noted:

  - Finding B8A: There is an undue hardship because of the physical characteristics of the site.
  - Finding B8B: The variance is not in conflict with the public interest.
  - Finding B8C: The granting of said variance will be in conformance with the comprehensive plan.

- There is a slight elevation change on the far west side of the subject property; however, the remainder of the lot is flat. There is an alley along the west side of the property where the garage door is located to access the portion of the accessory structure that is over height by 10 inches (10”). The home is currently under construction.

- The applicant noted in the narrative submitted with the application that it would be an undue hardship to require the removal of the portion of the structure over height and it would cause construction delays and a financial burden for multiple parties related to the construction project.
- There are no physical characteristics of the site, such as topography changes, steep slopes, or rock outcrops that would prevent the property owner from meeting the required 18' height limit for the accessory structure in the rear yard.

- In staff’s opinion, the hardship is self-imposed and not due to the physical characteristics of the site.

- She stated per the Comprehensive Plan that the area is designated Historical Heart – Stable Established.

- Staff’s recommendation:
  - Even though 10” does not seem like a significant amount for a building to be over height, it exceeds the allowable maximum under the Zoning Code. This variance request does not meet the findings for a variance because it is self-imposed and not based on physical characteristics. If 18’ is not an appropriate maximum height in the rear yard, the Zoning Code should be re-evaluated. Staff recommends denial of this variance request.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation and stood for questions.

Commission Comments:

There were no questions for staff.

Public testimony open.

Ian Mahuron applicant provided the following statements:

- He explained that when he applied for the Variance, he knew the issue was self-imposed.
- Staff let them know, under advisement from Legal, that the recommendation to the Planning Commission from staff was to deny the request and gave them the opportunity to withdraw the variance request.
- He explained, after getting input from various neighbors, that the vast majority of them were concerned about waste and throwing away perfectly good trusses.
- This project is self-funded and Mr. Mahuron said that he hopes this is their last project with the intent to build their dream home in the future.
- He explained that another home in the neighborhood made headlines in the local news a few years ago, with the house being over the 32 foot height limit by several feet. He added that his wife was interviewed on that project for comment and the project was approved. He feels that there was a precedent set for this type of variance.

Mr. Mahuron concluded his presentation and stood for questions.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Lutroppe wondered if there is recourse against a contractor and architect who claim that they don’t know how this happened.

Mr. Mahuron stated this will ultimately affect their contractor and framer if the variance is not approved, but they had a choice to tear the roof off and opted to go this route.

Commissioner Luttopp inquired about the other variance

Mr. Mahuron stated that the other variance was exceeding the 32 feet and that the city approved that request and the house is still there.
Ms. Anderson said that she is not aware of that specific case, but since then the code has changed and now matches state law.

Commissioner Mandel inquired what the amount of waste is or what will be required to meet the 18 feet requirement.

Mr. Mahuron explained that the entire roof would have to come off and all the sheeting would be destroyed with the trusses being disposed of.

Commissioner Ingalls asked if, when staff gave Mr. Mahuron an opportunity to withdraw, they explained that the commission has to make specific findings for the project to be approved. He explained that one finding that they would have to make is that the property has a peculiar “site” characteristic or constraint and after hearing Mr. Mahuron’s testimony, he did not hear that the site has any physical constraints to grant the variance.

Mr. Mahuron concurred that there are no physical characteristics of the site that would require that this happen.

Charlie Rens, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- He stated that he has been building in this area for 26 years and was past president of the North Idaho Building Contractors Association (NIBCA) two times and as a County Planning Commissioner in 2006-2007.
- He explained that he designed the house. The main body of the house is 7:12 and the roof pitch on the garage was intentionally made 6:12 and that put the height at 17 feet 8 inches.
- He commented that when working with his truss designer he recognized there was an error and that the trusses were constructed at 7:12, making them over 14 inches.
- He explained that there was no intent to try and gain additional space to provide living area above the garage and believes that the city picked 18 feet to prevent a living area being constructed above an accessory building.
- He stated that on the morning of November 26th he had a discussion with the owners and framer and determined that the roof pitch was off because the ridge was higher than what the elevation showed, and the framer confirmed the error.
- He stated that they could have said nothing and doubted the building inspector would have measured the elevation of the roof, so the next day, he contacted Ted Lantzy, City of Coeur d’Alene Building Official, to explain what happened.
- He stated that there was no intent to go higher and beyond the code requirements, but it happened. He stated when talking to staff on that morning, it was brought up in that discussion that in 2006, staff red tagged the homes in the Edge Water Subdivision at Mill River because they were too high. Staff explained that a special meeting was called to determine that the height limit of 35 feet was exceeded, and the height limit was raised again and they were allowed to keep building.
- He stated that the definition of a variance is to allow a change from prescriptive rules, regulations and ordinances and each variance should be granted on an individual basis and it is not intended to change the zone but to take a look what is in place and what the choices are. He stated that this is considered the “gray area” and said that in the county you can get a variance by not having a public meeting but by paying a fee for 12 inches if you are outside of the setbacks. He explained the intent behind the 18 feet was to limit living space above buildings, and this project, when done, will not have an impact on the community. He stated that to replace the trusses, do the tear off, replace the material, build new trusses, etc., will cost $7,500 to $8,000 to remove 10’ inches.

Mr. Rens concluded his presentation and stood for questions.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Luttropp inquired if Mr. Rens had contacted staff to explain this situation.
Mr. Rens stated that he did.

Commissioner Luttropp said that the codes are specific. He commented that the language in a Variance states that it can't be self-imposed and that in previous testimony from the applicant stated, he that it was self-imposed.

Mr. Rens explained that it happened not by their choice and they should not be penalized for something that won’t make an impact.

Commissioner Luttropp stated that it is not a penalty, but is what the code states.

Commissioner Ward asked if the accessory portion of the house was attached to the house would it be within the height requirement. He asked if the roof line was dropped down 10 inches, would it correct the problem.

Ms. Anderson stated that they would have to modify the entire roof line to be within the 18’ feet limit.

Mr. Rens questioned why the code was amended to an 18’ feet in the rear yard?limit.

Ms. Anderson explained they would have to go back and check their records, but 18’ feet was recommended by the Planning Commission and adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Holm explained that many years ago he received a number of calls and complaints from neighbors that accessory structures in the rear yard that were 25 feet tall were creating shadows preventing people from growing gardens adjacent to ADU’s (accessory dwelling units). The City Council decided that 18 feet would provide a big enough garage that you could still fit an RV in with scissor trusses, so the 18’ feet was a number in the middle that council passed.

Commissioner Ward questioned if they were to deny the request, would they have to go back to determine that 18 feet is too low and require an ordinance change to grant the variance.

Mr. Holm stated that is correct and noted that he explained this to the applicant before the hearing was scheduled.

Rufino Diaz aid that standing in his front yard you can see the project and it is a delight to see a wonderful home go into the neighborhood. He explained that he just recently moved in to the neighborhood less than two years ago, and the house was on the market when they were looking at homes to purchase. He said that the applicant has done a remarkable job but it is unfortunate that this issue has come up to slow down the process. He said that the structure is an accessory building and not considered part of the main house. He believes that if the request is approved, it wouldn’t create a precedent in the neighborhood in an area with many custom homes. He explained that the home sits at the base of a hill, so the next door neighbor would not be impacted by the extra 10 inches blocking views and creating shadows. He said that it would be a shame to have to tear it all down. He believes the entire property, including the accessory building, is consistent with the neighborhood. He further commented that previously he worked as a judge in California and one thing he appreciated about his job was the amount of discretion that was available for finding fact and applying the laws to those facts. He explained there was always the ability to go beyond what the letter of the law stated and to be able to look at undue hardship or an honest mistake. He asked the commission to please exercise their discretion and grant the variance.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that Mr. Rens made the analogy of law enforcement on the criminal side of things, comparing a speeding ticket for two miles over the speed limit to a Planning Commissioner acting as a “quasi-judge” giving minimum sentencing, but noted that their hands are tied. He stated that
they don't have that discretion and need to make a finding that there is or is not an undue hardship based on the physical characteristics of the site. This is a finding they have to make for the project to be approved and said that the applicant and builder have both said that it is not due to a physical characteristic of the site, he asked how they would make a finding that says it is a matter of a physical characteristic of the site. Mr. Ingalls said that he wishes he had more discretion, but the ordinance says 18’ feet.

Commissioner Fleming commented that she would agree with the applicant that the 10 inches looks about two inches higher than what it is, and that the addition sits back from the street. She said that she feels confident they won’t always say “yes” to everyone who has a variance request. She noted that it was “human error”. She further commented that the neighbors didn’t notice there was anything wrong and feels that they are “nit-picking” and sees bigger problems than this in other areas of the city. She commented that this is not significant enough to be turned down and doesn’t like seeing trusses being thrown away. She further said that they do have findings but thinks they should have the right and capability to say, “We accept we are human.”

Commissioner Ward stated that when looking at the size and scope of the main home, he noticed that the addition doesn’t overshadow the main home and that he would concur with Commissioner Fleming in this case. He commented that, for him, this doesn’t fall into the guidelines of undue hardship due to the physical characteristics of the property, but in this case they need to exercise some discretion.

Commissioner Luttropp said that he concurs that 10 inches is not a lot, but they do have a code that is well-defined and he will not support the request.

Commissioner Fleming said that the applicant has met two out of the three findings needed to be made for this project but the first finding is the big “hitch” -- whether the project meets the criteria as an undue hardship.

Commissioner Ingalls stated that he would not disagree with that statement, but they need to make all the findings, not two out of three. He stated that a variance is the wrong tool for the project.

Commissioner Fleming said that 10 inches is not a lot, and the price tag to tear it off would be $7,500, which is a lot for 10 inches. She said that if it was 2 feet there would be an issue, but this impacts no one and is not worth debating.

Commissioner Ingalls commented that the tool for a variance doesn’t fit and maybe the better way would be to change the ordinance to open the door to everybody.

Commissioner Fleming explained that she has been in and out of various city agencies and when you show up at a building department it is expected that building inspectors will have the latitude to say, “You’re 10 inches over and you are ok. We will let you pass this time, but don’t broadcast it to everyone,” and with this request they did that. She stated that in Kootenai County the building inspectors do have latitude and she sees it all the time.

Commissioner Mandel stated she appreciates the transparency of the applicant and his representatives. She commented that, yes, it is 10 inches, which seems like a small amount, and concurs with Commissioner Ingalls who said that there is a code written specifically with language that can’t meet the language in the findings. She referenced finding 8b, “Not in conflict of public interest,” and said that she would define public interest as having a code that people follow. She said that she is worried about setting a precedent and that the current neighbors don’t represent all public interest and neighbors come and go. She noted that she got a speeding ticket for being 2 miles over the speed limit, went to court, and got a lesson in why we have speed limits and that being 2 miles over had no impact and no danger and was frustrating. She stated that her role as a Planning Commissioner is to make the findings and follow the code and she is struggling to do that. She explained the hardship is the delay born by the applicant, and the people who made the error must have some accountability for those errors.
Chairman Messina explained mistakes have been made and agreed that the builder did bring this forward and could have just swept it under the door. He commented that there is cost involved, it feels that those costs will be passed down the line to someone else,

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Luttropp, to deny Item V-1-19. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Voted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Fleming</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ingalls</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Messina</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Luttropp</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ward</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion to deny carried by a 3 to 2 vote.

UPDATE:

Comprehensive Plan – Sean Holm

Sean Holm, Senior Planner provided the following statements:

Goal:
- Visioning --
  Validate and update the 2030 Vision and Implementation Plan to ensure it is current and relevant. The original vision and plan was released summer 2014.
- Comprehensive Plan Update --
  Rewrite the current Comp Plan using present-day data using modern technology with a designated life to 2040. The original plan was adopted by City Council in January 2008.

Where did we come from?
- Staff has been working with Jake Garringer, a former student rep on the Planning Commission, who came back to work initially as an intern and now on the Envision Coeur d’Alene project.
- The 2007 Comprehensive Plan was determined to need an update in late 2017
- CDA 2030 and city staff joined efforts to update both plans
- CDA 2030 Visioning / Implementation Plans & 2007 Comprehensive Plan
- The largely thematic plan needs more definition for hearing decisions

Three workshops were held to gather feedback and direction, which included:
- Joint workshop with Planning Commission and City Council
- Economic and Demographic review for our region (Wolkenhauer/Metts)
- SD #271, NIC, U of I, and Charter Academy spoke about future educational needs (Student growth/Land acquisition)

Where are we now?
- Although it has been quiet, staff has been working diligently toward the effort.
- An RFP for long-range planning and visioning will be released this month, which will result in the hiring of a Consultant for the update(s)
- Staff has been reviewing options for online Community Engagement software
• Two software programs have been short listed & staff is reviewing price/functionality
• An Advisory Group and six working groups are being formed for oversight based on the six CDA 2030 themes:
  Community and Identity; Growth and Development; Education and Learning; Health and Safety;
  Environment and Recreation; and Jobs and Economy.
• Lakes Middle School TV271 class is producing a PSA to promote public participation (CDATV, Website, YouTube, & Social Media)
• Branding effort completed: Naming the project “Envision Coeur d’Alene -- Your Voice. Our Future”
• He showed the project logo and remarked that it looks great and thanked the Coeur d’Alene
  Association of Realtors for their contributions to fund the project branding for community
  engagement.

Where are we going:

• We will be entering into a contract with a consultant for services to assist with updating the CDA 2030 Vision & Implementation Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and a Housing Assessment.
• Staff will be responsible for public input and engagement; pop-up kiosks at events, informational video(s), and workshops.
• A software solution for community engagement will be utilized which will include:
  ➢ A “place-based” feedback tool using a map of Coeur d’Alene to track location-based comments, multiple surveys, an idea board, timeline, and blog. It will also function as the project website.

ASSIGNMENT: Chairman Messina requested that each of the commissioners take a look at the six focus groups, pick one, and send an email letting them know what group they have chosen.

Commissioner Ward thanked Ms. Anderson for her presentation this morning at the Chamber Upbeat Breakfast and speaking about CDA 2030 along with the Comprehensive Plan and how these two entities are going to start working together, to send that message to a large group of community members, city leaders, business leaders and what we need to help do our job as commissioners.

Ms. Anderson stated that she wanted to thank Jake and Sean for their efforts on the Comprehensive Plan Update (Envision Coeur d’Alene) and noted that it seems quiet but the scope of work is a huge effort and they both have put in many hours.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
Public Hearings
FROM: TAMI STROUD, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: MARCH 12, 2019

SUBJECT: ZC-1-19 - ZONE CHANGE FROM R-3 TO R-17 ZONING DISTRICT (4.9 ACRES)

LOCATION: +/- 4.9 LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF RAMSEY ROAD ALONG ALPS STREET & SOUTH OF PRAIRIE AVENUE

APPLICANT: Lake City Engineering
Owner: Tammi Kerr
126 E. Poplar Avenue
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83814
7725 N. Ramsey Road
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815

DECISION POINT:
Lake City Engineering, on behalf of Tammi Kerr, is requesting approval of a proposed +/- 4.9 acre zone change from R-3 (Residential at 3 units/acre) to city R-17 zoning district (Residential at 17 units/acre).

AERIAL MAP:
Located on the west side of the “Province Twenty” development and on the north side of Alps Street. (Subject property outlined in yellow)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The 4.9 acre zone change request is located on the west side of Ramsey Road and south of Prairie Avenue along Alps Street. The property was annexed into the city in July of 2005, with the R-3 (Residential zoning at 3 units/acre) zoning district. The applicant is requesting the R-17 (Residential at 17 units/acre) zoning district and has noted in the narrative that the request for the R-17 zone is to allow for the development of a multi-family project in coordination with the previously approved multi-family project to the north.
REQUIRED FINDINGS:

A. **Finding #B8:** That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

1. The subject property is within the existing city limits.
2. The City Comprehensive Plan Map Designation:
   Ramsey-Woodland (Transition)

Ramsey-Woodland Comprehensive Plan Map:

*Transition:*
These areas are where the character of neighborhoods is in transition and should be developed with care. The street network, the number of building lots, and general land use are expected to change greatly within the planning period.

**Ramsey - Woodland Tomorrow**
Characteristics of the neighborhoods have, for the most part, been established and should be maintained. Development in this area will continue to grow in a stable manner. Lower density zoning districts will intermingle with the existing Coeur d'Alene Place Planned Unit Development (PUD) providing a variety of housing types. The northern boundary is the edge of the community, offering opportunities for infill.
The characteristics of Ramsey – Woodland neighborhoods will be:

- That overall density may approach three to four residential units per acre (3-4:1), however, pockets of higher density housing and multi-family units are appropriate in compatible areas.
- Pedestrian and bicycle trails.
- Parks just a 5-minute walk away.
- Neighborhood service nodes where appropriate.
- Multi-family and single-family housing units.

Significant Policies:

- **Objective 1.06 - Vistas:** Enforce minimal tree removal, substantial tree replacement, and suppress topping trees for new and existing development.

- **Objective 1.11 – Community Design:** Employ current design standards for development that pay close attention to context, sustainability, urban design, and pedestrian access and usability throughout the city.

- **Objective 1.12 - Community Design:** Support the enhancement of existing urbanized areas and discourage sprawl.

- **Objective 1.13 – Open Space:** Encourage all participants to make open space a priority with every development and annexation.

- **Objective 1.14 - Efficiency:** Promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure, thereby reducing impacts to undeveloped areas.

- **Objective 1.16 – Connectivity** Promote bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and access between neighborhoods, open spaces, parks and trail systems.

- **Objective 2.05 – Pedestrian & Bicycle Environment:** Plan for multiple choices to live, work, and recreate within comfortable walking/biking distances.

- **Objective 3.02 – Managed Growth:** Coordinate planning efforts with our neighboring cities and Kootenai County, emphasizing connectivity and open spaces.

- **Objective 3.04 - Neighborhoods:** Encourage the formation of active neighborhood associations and advocate their participation in the public process.
Objective 3.05 - Neighborhoods:
Protect and preserve existing neighborhoods from incompatible land uses and developments.

Objective 3.07 – Neighborhoods:
Emphasize a pedestrian orientation when planning neighborhood preservation and revitalization.

Objective 3.08 - Housing:
Design new housing areas to meet the city’s need for quality neighborhoods for all income and family status categories.

Objective 3.16 - Capital Improvements:
Ensure infrastructure and essential services are available prior to approval for properties seeking development.

Objective 4.01 - City Services:
Make decisions based on the needs and desires of the citizenry.

Objective 4.02 - City Services:
Provide quality services to all of our residents (potable water, sewer and stormwater systems, street maintenance, fire and police protection, street lights, recreation, recycling, and trash collection).

Objective 4.06 - Public Participation:
Strive for community involvement that is broad-based and inclusive, encouraging public participation in the decision-making process.

**Evaluation:** Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the Comprehensive Plan policies do or do not support the request. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.

B. **Finding #B9:** That public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use.

**STORMWATER:**

City Code requires a stormwater management plan to be submitted and approved prior to any construction activity on the site. The applicant will be required to include a stormwater management plan with any building permit submittal for the subject property.
STREETS:

The subject property is bordered by Alps Street to the South. Alps Street must be reconstructed to City standards along the southern frontage of the subject property, with any construction on the property. Alps Street intersects with Ramsey Road to the east. No changes to Ramsey Road will be required.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

WATER:

The Water Department had no comments or conditions. The subject property is within Hayden Lake Irrigation District (HLID).

-Submitted by Kyle Marine, Assistant Water Superintendent

WASTEWATER:

Public sewer is available to this project at the west end of Alps Street within the adjacent Provence Twenty Development to the east.

Development of this property will required Public Sewer to be extended “To and Through” this development as to not deny the adjacent property public sewer access.

-Submitted by Mike Becker, Utility Project Manager

FIRE:

The Fire Department works with the Engineering, Water and Building Departments to ensure the design of any proposal meets mandated safety requirements for the city and its residents:

Fire department access to the site (Road widths, surfacing, maximum grade and turning radiiuses), in addition to, fire protection (Size of water main, fire hydrant amount and placement, and any fire line(s) for buildings requiring a fire sprinkler system) will be reviewed prior to final plat recordation or during the Site Development and Building Permit, utilizing the currently adopted International Fire Code (IFC) for compliance.

The CD’A FD can address all concerns at site and building permit submittals with the corrections to the below conditions.

-Submitted by Bobby Gonder, Fire Inspector

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the public facilities and utilities are adequate for the request.
C. **Finding #B10:** That the physical characteristics of the site (make) (do not make) it suitable for the request at this time.

**PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:**
The subject property is located off of Ramsey Road and Alps Street. The 4.9 acre parcel is relatively flat. There is currently an existing single-family residence with an accessory structure on a portion of the site, while the remainder of the northern portion of the property is vacant. A small grove of trees also exist on the parcel. Any future development will require that all code requirements are met.

**SITE PHOTOS:** (Along Ramsey Road/Alps Street)

*View from Ramsey Road looking west along Alps Street toward Provence Twenty, with the subject property in the background*
View of a portion of the subject property looking northwest from Alps Street

View of a portion of the subject property looking north toward Prairie Avenue
View from Alps Street toward a portion of the subject property

View along Alps Street near the subject property, looking south
Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable for the request at this time.

D. **Finding #B11:** That the proposal (would) (would not) adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, (and) (or) existing land uses.

**TRAFFIC:**
The proposed zone change itself would not adversely affect the surrounding area with regard to traffic. However, residential construction under the zone change to R-17 may generate approximately 5.6 times the amount traffic that would be generated under the existing R-3 zoning. Ramsey Road has the available capacity to accommodate additional traffic generated from the subject site, but access in and out of the development could be challenging during peak hours, especially for left turns. The Streets & Engineering Department has no objection to the zone change as proposed.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer
NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:

This is a rapidly charging area within Coeur d'Alene. Multiple annexations, subdivisions, and Planned Unit Developments have been approved in the area within the last five years. Some of the larger projects include: Garden Grove, Vista Meadows, Kerr Properties, and the Prairie Trails subdivision.

The subject property abuts the “Province Twenty” development to the east and a single-family dwelling to the west that remains in the County. Just north of the property there is a proposed multi-family project “Bluegrass Lodge” that is currently awaiting building permit approval. The applicant has noted that the subject property may be integrated as part of the overall multi-family project in the future.

See the “Ramsey-Woodland” descriptions from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan listed in Finding #B8 as well as the photos of subject property. A land use and zoning map are provided below to assist in depicting the context of the area.

GENERALIZED LAND USE PATTERN:
Approval of the zone change request could intensify the potential use of the property by increasing the allowable uses by right from R-3 uses to R-17 uses (as listed below).

Existing R-17 Zoning District:

The R-17 district is intended as a medium/high density residential district that permits a mix of housing types at a density not greater than seventeen (17) units per gross acre.

Principal permitted uses in an R-17 district shall be as follows:

- Administrative
- Childcare facility
- Community education
- Duplex housing
- Essential service
- Home occupation
- Multiple-family
- Neighborhood recreation
- Pocket residential development
- Public recreation
- Single-family detached housing as specified by the R-8 district

Permitted uses by special use permit in an R-17 district shall be as follows:

- Automobile parking when the lot is adjoining at least one point of, intervening streets and alleys excluded, the establishment which it is to serve; this is not to be used for the parking of commercial vehicles
- Boarding house
- Commercial film production
- Commercial recreation
- Community assembly
- Community organization
- Convenience sales
• Group dwelling - detached housing
• Handicapped or minimal care facility
• Juvenile offenders facility
• Ministorage facilities
• Mobile home manufactured in accordance with section 17.02.085 of this title
• Noncommercial kennel
• Nursing/convalescent/rest homes for the aged
• Rehabilitative facility.

Permitted uses by special use permit in a C-17 district shall be as follows:
• Adult entertainment sales and service
• Auto camp
• Criminal transitional facility
• Custom manufacturing
• Extensive impact
• Religious assembly
• Residential density of the R-34 district as specified
• Three (3) unit per gross acre density increase
• Religious assembly
• Retail gasoline sales
• Single-family detached housing (as specified by the R-8 district)
• Specialty retail sales
• Veterinary office

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal would adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, and/or existing land uses.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS:
None

ORDINANCES & STANDARDS USED FOR EVALUATION:
2007 Comprehensive Plan
Transportation Plan
Municipal Code
Idaho Code
Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan
Water and Sewer Service Policies
Urban Forestry Standards
Transportation and Traffic Engineering Handbook, I.T.E.
Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
2017 Coeur d'Alene Trails Master Plan

ACTION ALTERNATIVES:
The Planning Commission must consider this request and make separate findings to approve, deny or deny without prejudice. The findings worksheet is attached.
ALPS STREET ZONE CHANGE

PROJECT NARRATIVE

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho
January 17, 2019
INTRODUCTION

Copper Basin Construction, as the Applicant, is hereby requesting the zoning designation of approximately 4.6 acres of property be amended to R-17 Residential. The subject property is located near the southwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Ramsey Road along the North side of the future extension of Alps Street. Currently, there is an existing single-family residential house on the subject parcel; however, the majority of the land is vacant.

SUBJECT PARCELS

The property being requested for annexation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>C-4537-27-329-AC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1781 W. Alps Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area:</td>
<td>4.96 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>R-3 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning:</td>
<td>R-17 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description:</td>
<td>The East half of Tract 329 of Hayden Lake Irrigated Tracts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Vicinity Map
ZONING CLASSIFICATION

The parcel is currently zoned R-8 Residential and is located at the northern boundary of the City of Coeur d’Alene City Limits. The surrounding property consists of residentially zoned parcels to the North (R-17) and South (R-8). An Annexation Application for the property immediately to the East is being submitted concurrently with this zone change request, and the applicant is asking for an R-17 Residential zoning designation. The project proponent is requesting a zoning classification of R-17 for the subject property to allow for the development of a multi-family project in coordination with the previously approved multi-family project to the North and the new annexation parcel.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ANALYSIS

The property lies in a Transition area along the northern boundary of the Ramsey-Woodland land use area per the City of Coeur d’Alene Comprehensive Plan. Neighborhood characteristics for this land use tend to be single-family and multi-family housing with an overall density of 3 – 4 units per acre with pockets of higher density housing. Neighborhood service nodes and commercial uses should be placed where appropriate. The proposed zoning would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as this is located near the intersection of two major arterial streets and is appropriate for high density residential uses adjacent to commercial uses.

The City of Coeur d’Alene Comprehensive Plan is the guiding document for all land use development decisions. It is important that land use decisions meet, or exceed, the goals, policies and objectives as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. The project proponent believes that the following Goals and Objectives (shown in italics) as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan are applicable to the requested annexation and zone classification:

**Goal #1 – Natural Environment**

*Objective 1.12 – Community Design: Support the enhancement of existing urbanized areas and discourage sprawl.*

The subject property is currently an undeveloped parcel located within the boundary of the City of Coeur d’Alene. This zoning amendment will allow for the development of this property to match that of the surrounding residential land uses.

*Objective 1.14 – Efficiency: Promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure, thereby reducing impacts to undeveloped areas.*

Existing utilities including sanitary sewer and domestic water are extended to this property in Ramsey Road and Prairie Avenue, are readily available, and have the capacity to serve future development. This property is already included in the
Sewer, Water and Transportation Master Plans for the City, and will be developed in accordance with the same.

**Goal #2 – Economic Environment**

**Objective 2.02 – Economic and Workforce Development:** Plan suitable zones and mixed use areas, and support local workforce development and housing to meet the needs of business and industry.

It is the intention of the proponent to develop this property into multi-family residential housing in coordination with the previously approved multi-family project to the North. This will provide mixed-use opportunities to the area as it is located directly adjacent to commercial property at the intersection of Ramsey Road and Prairie Avenue.

**Objective 2.05 – Pedestrian & Bicycle Environment:** Plan for multiple choices to live, work, and recreate within comfortable walking/biking distances.

The subject property is located near the intersection of two major arterials with bicycle and pedestrian friendly facilities including bike trails, bike lanes and pedestrian walkways/paths.

**Goal #3 – Home Environment**

**Objective 3.05 – Neighborhoods:** Protect and preserve existing neighborhoods from incompatible land uses and developments.

The proposed zoning will allow for the future development of the subject property in a similar character and style of the surrounding land uses and neighborhoods and act as a buffer between the less intense residential uses to the South, and the commercial uses to the North and East.

**Objective 3.06 – Neighborhoods – Protect the residential character of neighborhoods by allowing residential/commercial/industrial transition boundaries at alleyways or along back lot lines if possible.**

The subject property is adjacent to both residential and commercial uses, and the proposed multi-family zoning designation will provide a natural buffer and transition between the uses.
PRE-DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

The subject property currently contains a single-family residence and outbuildings. Access to the single-family residence is currently off the end of Alps Street. There are no other structures located on the property.

The Alps Street frontage improvements are not complete adjoining the subject property. These improvements include curb and gutter, swales and sidewalks and will need to be completed during development of the property. No additional improvements to Ramsey Road are anticipated to be required during development of the subject property.

Figure 2 below shows the existing site conditions.
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PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

FROM: TAMI STROUD, ASSOCIATE PLANNER
DATE: MARCH 12, 2019
SUBJECT: A-1-19 – ZONING PRIOR TO ANNEXATION OF A +/- 4.6 ACRE PARCEL FROM COUNTY COMMERCIAL TO R-17 (RESIDENTIAL AT 17 UNITS/ACRE)
LOCATION: +/- 4.6 ACRE PARCEL LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF RAMSEY ROAD AND SOUTH OF PRAIRIE AVENUE.

APPLICANT: OWNER:
Lake City Engineering Ted Burnside
126 E. Poplar Avenue 7725 N. Ramsey Road
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83814 Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815

DECISION POINT:
Lake City Engineering, on behalf of Ted Burnside, is requesting approval of a proposed +/- 4.6 acre annexation from County Commercial to city R-17 zoning district (Residential at 17 units/acre).

AREA MAP:
GENERAL INFORMATION:
Lake City Engineering on behalf of Lake Ted Burnside is proposing to annex a +/- 4.6 acre parcel as noted on the above annexation map. The subject property is near the southwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Ramsey Road.

ANNEXATION HISTORY MAP:

The allowable uses by right under the R-17 zoning district are listed below.

Existing R-17 Zoning District:
The R-17 district is intended as a medium/high density residential district that permits a mix of housing types at a density not greater than seventeen (17) units per gross acre.

Principal permitted uses in an R-17 district shall be as follows:
- Administrative
- Childcare facility
- Community education
- Duplex housing
- Essential service
- Home occupation
- Multiple-family
- Neighborhood recreation
- Pocket residential development
- Public recreation
- Single-family detached housing as specified by the R-8 district

Permitted uses by special use permit in an R-17 district shall be as follows:
- Automobile parking when the lot is adjoining at least one point of, intervening streets and alleys excluded, the establishment which it is to serve; this is not to be used for the parking of commercial vehicles
- Boarding house
- Commercial film production
- Commercial recreation
- Community assembly
Permitted uses by special use permit in a C-17 district shall be as follows:

- Adult entertainment sales and service
- Auto camp
- Criminal transitional facility
- Custom manufacturing
- Extensive impact
- Residential density of the R-34 district as specified
- Underground bulk liquid fuel storage - wholesale
- Veterinary hospital
- Warehouse/storage
- Wireless communication facility

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR ANNEXATION:

Finding #B8: That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

2007 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN- LAND USE CATEGORIES: RAMSEY WOODLAND

- The subject property is contiguous with existing city limits
- The City Comprehensive Plan Map designates this area as: Ramsey- Woodland Transition
Comprehensive Plan Map: Ramsey- Woodland -

Transition:
These areas are where the character of neighborhoods is in transition and should be developed with care. The street network, the number of building lots and general land use are expected to change greatly within the planning period.

Land Use:
Ramsey - Woodland Today:

The development pattern in this area is mixed with established subdivisions, such as Coeur d’Alene Place, that are continuing to expand to the north. Passive and active parks have also been provided for the residents of these housing developments. Industrial uses are prominent to the west of Atlas Road with a mix of residential zoning on the south side of Hanley Avenue.

Neighborhood service nodes can be found throughout the Ramsey-Woodland area.

Ramsey - Woodland Tomorrow

Characteristics of the neighborhoods have, for the most part, been established and should be maintained. Development in this area will continue to grow in a stable manner. Lower density zoning districts will intermingle with the existing Coeur d’Alene Place Planned Unit Development (PUD) providing a variety of housing types. The northern boundary is the edge of the community, offering opportunities for infill.

The characteristics of Ramsey – Woodland neighborhoods will be:

- That overall density may approach three to four residential units per acre (3-4:1), however, pockets of higher density housing and multi-family units are appropriate in compatible areas.
- Pedestrian and bicycle trails.
- Parks just a 5-minute walk away.
• Neighborhood service nodes where appropriate.
• Multi-family and single-family housing units.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES:

 Objective 1.02 - Water Quality:
Protect the cleanliness and safety of the lakes, rivers, watersheds, and the aquifer.

 Objective 1.11 - Community Design:
Employ current design standards for development that pay close attention to context, sustainability, urban design, and pedestrian access and usability throughout the city.

 Objective 1.12 - Community Design:
Support the enhancement of existing urbanized areas and discourage sprawl.

 Objective 1.13 - Open Space:
Encourage all participants to make open space a priority with every development and annexation.

 Objective 1.14 - Efficiency:
Promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure, thereby reducing impacts to undeveloped areas.

 Objective 1.16 - Connectivity:
Promote bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and access between neighborhoods, open spaces, parks, and trail systems.

 Objective 2.02 - Economic & Workforce Development:
Plan suitable zones and mixed use areas, and support local workforce development and housing to meet the needs of business and industry.

 Objective 3.05 - Neighborhoods:
Protect and preserve existing neighborhoods from incompatible land uses and developments.

 Objective 3.16 - Capital Improvements:
Ensure infrastructure and essential services are available prior to approval for properties seeking development.

 Objective 3.18 - Transportation:
Provide accessible, safe and efficient traffic circulation for motorized, bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation, requesting input from authoritative districts and neighboring communities when applicable.

 Objective 4.02 - City Services:
Provide quality services to all of our residents (potable water, sewer and stormwater systems, street maintenance, fire and police protection, street lights, recreation, recycling and trash collection).

 Objective 4.06 - Public Participation:
Strive for community involvement that is broad-based and inclusive, encouraging public participation in the decision making process.
**Evaluation:** Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the Comprehensive Plan policies do or do not support the request. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.

**Finding #B9:** That public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use.

**STORMWATER:**

Stormwater will be addressed as the area proposed for annexation develops. It is anticipated that the residential development will typically utilize curb adjacent swales to manage the site runoff.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**TRAFFIC:**

Ramsey Road has the available capacity to accommodate additional traffic generated from the subject site, but access in and out of the development could be challenging during peak hours, especially for left turns. The Streets & Engineering Department has no objection to the annexation as proposed.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**STREETS:**

The subject site is currently undeveloped. The site has frontage along the west side of Ramsey Road. Any necessary improvements to this site would be addressed during the site development process. The Streets and Engineering Department has no objection to this annexation request if the right-of-way is provided.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**WATER:**

The Water Department has no comments or conditions. The subject property falls within Hayden Lake Irrigation District (HLID).

-Submitted by Kyle Marine, Asst. Water Superintendent
WASTEWATER:

The nearest public sanitary sewer is located within the Ramsey Road Right-of-Way which borders the easterly boundary of the Subject Property. The Subject Property is within the City of Coeur d’Alene Area of City Impact (ACI) and in accordance with the 2013 Sewer Master Plan; the City’s Wastewater Utility presently has the wastewater system capacity and willingness to serve this annexation request as proposed.

-Submitted by Mike Becker, Utility Project Manager

FIRE:

The Fire Department works with the Engineering, Water and Building Departments to ensure the design of any proposal meets mandated safety requirements for the city and its residents:

Fire department access to the site (Road widths, surfacing, maximum grade and turning radiiuses), in addition to, fire protection (Size of water main, fire hydrant amount and placement, and any fire line(s) for buildings requiring a fire sprinkler system) will be reviewed prior to final plat recordation or during the Site Development and Building Permit, utilizing the currently adopted International Fire Code (IFC) for compliance. The CD’A FD can address all concerns at site and building permit submittals.

-Submitted by Bobby Gonder, Fire Inspector

Evaluation: Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the public facilities and utilities are adequate for the request.

Finding #B10: That the physical characteristics of the site (make) (do not make) it suitable for the request at this time.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:

The +/- 4.6 acre parcel is located on the west side of Ramsey Road and approximately ¼ mile south of Prairie Avenue. The site fronts Ramsey Road and is generally flat. Currently, there is an existing single-family dwelling unit and an out building on a portion of the property; however, the majority of the subject property is vacant. The physical characteristics of the site appear to be suitable for the request at this time.
PHOTOS OF SUBJECT PROPERTY:

Looking west at the existing single-family and trees on the subject property

View of a portion of the subject property looking northwest. There are a number of existing trees located on the site.
View of a portion of the subject property from Ramsey Road, looking southeast at the existing trees on the site and “Provence Twenty” development in the background.
Looking west at the view of a portion of the subject property that abuts the future multi-family project known as “Bluegrass Lodge” from Ramsey Road

View of a portion of the subject property on the left looking north toward Prairie Avenue
**Evaluation:** Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable for the request at this time.

**Finding #B11:** That the proposal (would) (would not) adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, (and) (or) existing land uses.

**TRAFFIC:**

Ramsey Road has the available capacity to accommodate additional traffic generated from the subject site, but access in and out of the development could be challenging during peak hours, especially for left turns. The Streets & Engineering Department has no objection to the annexation as proposed.

- Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:**

This is a rapidly changing area within Coeur d'Alene. Multiple annexations, subdivisions, zone changes and PUD's have been approved in the area within the last five years.

There is an existing coffee stand (in city “C-17”) to the north of this project, and a residential subdivision abutting the subject property, “Province 20”, directly to the south. A multi-family project is proposed on the abutting lot directly to the north. The surrounding property consist of residentially zoned parcels (R-8) south (R-3) and (R-17) to on the north.

The applicant has stated in the narrative that the goal is to incorporate the subject property and the property to the west with the existing multi-family zoned property to the north to create a larger multi-family project.
GENERALIZED LAND USE PATTERN:

**EXISTING ZONING:**

- R-17
- C-17
- R-3
- R-8
- AG
- SUBURBAN

**ZONING:**

- R-17
- R-3
- R-8
- C-17PUD

**SUBJECT PROPERTY**

- AG-Suburban

**SUBJECT PROPERTY**
**Evaluation:** Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal would adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, (and)/(or) existing land uses.

**PROPOSED ITEMS FOR AN ANNEXATION AGREEMENT:**

**BUILDING:**
Prior to the competition of the annexation, the applicant must address any outstanding code violations for the existing structures onsite if they are to remain.

**ORDINANCES & STANDARDS USED FOR EVALUATION:**
2007 Comprehensive Plan
Transportation Plan
Municipal Code
Idaho Code
Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan
Water and Sewer Service Policies
Urban Forestry Standards
Transportation and Traffic Engineering Handbook, I.T.E.
Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
2010 Coeur d'Alene Trails Master Plan

**ACTION ALTERNATIVES:**
Planning Commission must consider this request and make separate findings to approve, deny or deny without prejudice. The findings worksheet is attached.
APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE
INTRODUCTION

We are hereby requesting the annexation of approximately 4.6 acres of property into the City of Coeur d’Alene. The subject property is located near the southwest corner of the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Ramsey Road. Currently, there is an existing single-family residential house on a portion of the property; however, the majority of the land is vacant.

SUBJECT PARCEL

The property being requested for annexation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>0-3560-27-330-AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>7725 N. Ramsey Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>4.58 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td>Commercial (County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>R-17 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>The North half of Tract 330 of Hayden Lake Irrigated Tracts, excepting and right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Vicinity Map
ZONING CLASSIFICATION

The property is currently zoned Commercial in Kootenai County and is located at the northern boundary of the City of Coeur d’Alene City Limits. The surrounding property consists of residentially zoned parcels to the North (R-17), South (R-8) and West (R-3), and commercial property to the East (C-17). The project proponent is requesting a zoning classification of R-17 for the subject property to allow for a future multi-family development in coordination with the existing multi-family property to the North and in accordance with the City of Coeur d’Alene Zoning Ordinance.

A Zone Change application is being submitted concurrently with this Annexation for the property to immediate West. Said property is currently zoned R-3, and the project proponent is requesting a zone change to R-17. The goal is to incorporate this subject property and the property to the West with the existing multi-family property to the North to create a larger multi-family project.

The requested zoning classifications are in conformance with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and are compatible with the surrounding land uses.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ANALYSIS

The property lies in a Transition area along the northern boundary of the Ramsey-Woodland land use area per the City of Coeur d’Alene Comprehensive Plan. Neighborhood characteristics for this land use tend to be single-family and multi-family housing with an overall density of 3 – 4 units per acre with pockets of higher density housing. Neighborhood service nodes and commercial uses should be placed where appropriate. The proposed zoning would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as this is located near the intersection of two major arterial streets, and is appropriate for commercial uses.

The City of Coeur d’Alene Comprehensive Plan is the guiding document for all land use development decisions. It is important that land use decisions meet, or exceed, the goals, policies and objectives as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. The project proponent believes that the following Goals and Objectives (shown in italics) as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan are applicable to the requested annexation and zone classification:

Goal #1 – Natural Environment

Objective 1.12 – Community Design: Support the enhancement of existing urbanized areas and discourage sprawl.

The subject property is currently an undeveloped County property located on the northern boundary of the City of Coeur d’Alene. This annexation will allow for the development of this property to match that of the existing surrounding land uses.

Objective 1.14 – Efficiency: Promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure, thereby reducing impacts to undeveloped areas.
Existing utilities including sanitary sewer and domestic water are extended to this property in Ramsey Road, are readily available, and have the capacity to serve future development. This property is already included in the Sewer, Water and Transportation Master Plans for the City, and will be developed in accordance with the same.

**Goal #2 – Economic Environment**

*Objective 2.02 – Economic and Workforce Development: Plan suitable zones and mixed use areas, and support local workforce development and housing to meet the needs of business and industry.*

*Objective 2.05 – Pedestrian & Bicycle Environment: Plan for multiple choices to live, work, and recreate within comfortable walking/biking distances.*

The subject property is located near the intersection of two major arterials with bicycle and pedestrian friendly facilities including bike trails, bike lanes and pedestrian walkways/paths.

*Objective 2.04 – Downtown & Neighborhood Service Nodes: Prioritize a strong, vibrant downtown and compatible neighborhood service nodes throughout the City.*

**Goal #3 – Home Environment**

*Objective 3.05 – Neighborhoods: Protect and preserve existing neighborhoods from incompatible land uses and developments.*

The proposed annexation and zoning will allow for the future development of the subject property in a similar character and style of the surrounding land uses and neighborhoods.

*Objective 3.06 – Neighborhoods – Protect the residential character of neighborhoods by allowing residential/commercial/industrial transition boundaries at alleyways or along back lot lines if possible.*

The subject property is surrounded by mixed zoning including both residential and commercials uses. Multi-family is a natural fit for this area, and will provide a transition from the existing single-family residential to the South and West to the commercial properties near the intersection of Ramsey Road and Prairie Avenue.
PRE-DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

The subject property currently contains a single-family residence, an outbuilding, and a cell phone tower. Access to both the single-family residence and the cell tower are off of Ramsey Road. There are no other structures located on the property.

The Ramsey Road frontage improvements are complete and include curb and gutter, swales and walking paths. No additional improvements to Ramsey Road would be required during development of the subject property.

Figure 2 below shows the current site conditions.
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

FROM: SEAN E. HOLM, SENIOR PLANNER
DATE: MARCH 12, 2019
SUBJECT: ZC-2-19 A ZONE CHANGE REQUEST FROM MH-8 TO R-17 ON A SINGLE PARCEL MEASURING 0.82 OF AN ACRE
LOCATION: PROPERTY BOUND BY HOWARD STREET AND FRUITLAND LANE, NORTH OF NEIDER AVENUE, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 601 W NEIDER AVENUE

APPLICANT/OWNER:
James Casper, Executive Director
Habitat for Humanity of North Idaho, Inc.
176 W. Wyoming Ave.
Hayden, ID 83835

DECISION POINT:
Mr. Casper, Executive Director for Habitat for Humanity of North Idaho, is requesting a zone change of property in city limits. The request is to allow a change of zoning from MH-8 (Mobile Home at 8 units/acre) to R-17 (Residential at 17 units/acre).

AERIAL PHOTO:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The MH-8 to R-17 zone change request abuts Howard Street on the west, Fruitland Lane on the east, and Neider Avenue on the south. Directly north are mobile homes that are accessed by vehicle through Lake City Lane. Lake City Lane does not share a boundary with the Habitat for Humanity site.

The subject property was deemed as surplus by the City’s Water Utility due to the inability to support a viable well as a source of water for the city and was auctioned through a sealed bid process which was due by May 30th, 2018. Habitat for Humanity of North Idaho was the highest bidder and has successfully transferred legal ownership.

PRIOR ZONE CHANGE REQUESTS NEAR SUBJECT PROPERTY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>REQUEST</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>C6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZC-1-16</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-3-10</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-2-08</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-2-07</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-2-07</td>
<td>MH-8 to C-17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-8-06</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-6-06</td>
<td>M to R-17 &amp; C17</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-11-04</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-10-04</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-8-02</td>
<td>MH-8 to C-17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-3-99</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-4-96</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-2-92</td>
<td>MH-8 to C-17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-11-91SP</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-17</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-10-91</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-4-91SP</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-17</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-11-90</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-5-90</td>
<td>MH-8 to C-17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-3-90</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-2-89</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-3-88</td>
<td>C-17 to M</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-12-87</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-17-86</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-1-86SP</td>
<td>MH-8 to R-12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-8-85SP</td>
<td>R-12 to MH8</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-14-84</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC-8-84PUD</td>
<td>R-12 to C-17</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUIRED ZONE CHANGE FINDINGS:

Finding #B8: That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

1. The subject property is within the existing city limits.
2. The City’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as Fruitland:
Transition:
These areas are where the character of neighborhoods is in transition and should be developed with care. The street network, the number of building lots, and general land use are expected to change greatly within the planning period.

Fruitland Today
Fruitland is generally known as the area bordered by commercial uses along US 95, Kathleen Avenue to the north, commercial uses on Appleway Avenue south, and the area separated by manufacturing and residential along the west. The Fruitland area is home to diverse land uses. Commercial uses are common near major corridors transitioning to single-family housing with pockets of multi-family housing and mobile home parks. Manufactured homes are prevalent in areas removed from the US 95 corridor, and continued growth provides affordable housing for residents. Fruitland has the largest concentration of mobile home zoned property within city limits.

Topography is generally flat and development opportunities exist. A recent wastewater main extension north to Bosanko provides opportunity for development.

Fruitland Tomorrow
Generally this area is envisioned as a commercial corridor with adjacent multi-family uses and will maintain a mix of the housing types that currently exist. Commercial and manufacturing will continue to expand and care must be used for sensitive land use transition. A traffic study for US 95 is underway which may affect future development in this area.

The characteristics of Fruitland neighborhoods will be:
- That overall density will approach eight residential units per acre (8:1).
• That single- and multi-family housing should be located adjacent to compatible uses.
• Pedestrian and bicycle connections are encouraged.
• Uses that strengthen neighborhoods are encouraged.

The characteristics of Fruitland commercial areas will be:
• Commercial buildings will remain lower in scale than in the downtown core.
• Native variety trees will be encouraged along commercial corridors.

Significant Comprehensive Plan policies for consideration:

Objective 1.12
Community Design:
Support the enhancement of existing urbanized areas and discourage sprawl.

Objective 1.14
Efficiency:
Promote the efficient use of existing infrastructure, thereby reducing impacts to undeveloped areas.

Objective 1.16
Connectivity:
Promote bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and access between neighborhoods, open spaces, parks, and trail systems.

Objective 2.02
Economic & Workforce Development:
Plan suitable zones and mixed use areas, and support local workforce development and housing to meet the needs of business and industry.

Objective 2.05
Pedestrian & Bicycle Environment:
Plan for multiple choices to live, work, and recreate within comfortable walking/biking distances.

Objective 3.01
Managed Growth:
Provide for a diversity of suitable housing forms within existing neighborhoods to match the needs of a changing population.

Objective 3.05
Neighborhoods:
Protect and preserve existing neighborhoods from incompatible land uses and developments.

Objective 3.07
Neighborhoods:
Emphasize a pedestrian orientation when planning neighborhood preservation and revitalization.
Objective 3.08  
**Housing:**
Design new housing areas to meet the city’s need for quality neighborhoods for all income and family status categories.

Objective 3.10  
**Affordable & Workforce Housing:**
Support efforts to preserve and provide affordable and workforce housing.

Objective 3.16  
**Capital Improvements:**
Ensure infrastructure and essential services are available for properties in development.

Objective 4.01  
**City Services:**
Make decisions based on the needs and desires of the citizenry.

Objective 4.06  
**Public Participation:**
Strive for community involvement that is broad-based and inclusive, encouraging public participation in the decision making process.

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the Comprehensive Plan policies do or do not support the request. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.

**Finding #B9:** That public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use.

**STORMWATER:**
City Code requires that all stormwater remain on the property and for a stormwater management plan to be submitted and approved prior to any construction activity on the site. The applicant will be required to include a stormwater management plan with any building permit submittal for the subject property.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**STREETS:**
The subject property is bordered by Neider Ave to the south, Fruitland Lane to the east, and Howard Street to the west; all of which are fully developed street sections. No changes to the streets adjoining the subject property will be required.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**WATER:**
There is adequate capacity in the public water system to support domestic, irrigation and fire flow for the proposed zone change of 601 W Neider Avenue.
There is an existing 3/4” water service off of Neider Avenue. There is also a well on the property that can only be used for irrigation purposes.

-Submitted by Kyle Marine, Assistant Water Superintendent

WASTEWATER:
Public sewer is available to this property via existing 4" sewer lateral extended from the Fruitland Street Right-of-Way which borders the easterly boundary of the Subject Property.

-Submitted by Mike Becker, Utility Project Manager

FIRE:
The Fire Department works with the Engineering, Water and Building Departments to ensure the design of any proposal meets mandated safety requirements for the city and its residents:

Fire department access to the site (Road widths, surfacing, maximum grade and turning radiuses), in addition to, fire protection (Size of water main, fire hydrant amount and placement, and any fire line(s) for buildings requiring a fire sprinkler system) will be reviewed prior to final plat recordation or during the Site Development and Building Permit, utilizing the currently adopted International Fire Code (IFC) for compliance. The CD’A FD can address all concerns at site and building permit submittals.

-Submitted by Bobby Gonder, Fire Inspector

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the public facilities and utilities are adequate for the request.

Finding #B10: That the physical characteristics of the site (make) (do not make) it suitable for the request at this time.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:
The site is vacant and flat with many smaller trees and a couple large pines. There are no topographical or other physical constraints that would make the subject property unsuitable for the request. Site photos are on the following pages.
SITE PHOTOS:

Photos of narrow “flag lot” portion of subject property along Fruitland Avenue (looking west):

Close up of the northern property boundary showing rear yards of mobile homes:
Interior of property looking northwest across Neider Avenue (fence on right is a SFDU parcel): 

Narrow west end of property looking northwest across Neider Avenue toward N. Howard Street:
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable for the request at this time.

**Finding #B11:** That the proposal (would) (would not) adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, (and) (or) existing land uses.

**TRAFFIC:**
The proposed zone change would not likely adversely affect the surrounding area with regard to traffic. Neider Ave has the available capacity to accommodate additional traffic generated from the subject site. The Streets & Engineering Department has no objection to the zone change as proposed.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:**
The Fruitland area has changed dramatically over the planning period, with multiple pocket housing projects built and under construction. These include developments associated with the following streets: West Cherry Lane, West Link Lane, West Clady Lane, as well as mobile home infill of existing areas like West Lake City Lane and the spurs adjoining. To the south of the subject property along Neider Avenue, two civic uses were approved and constructed by way of an approved zone change from MH-8 to R-17, followed by an approved PUD which allowed for construction of the Kathy Reed House and the Lynn Peterson facilities.

**GENERALIZED LAND USE PATTERN:**
Approval of the zone change request could intensify the potential use of the property by increasing the allowable uses by right from MH-8 uses to R-17 uses. In addition, the site performance standards would adjust to allowable dimensional standards for R-17 if approved (see the zoning matrix following the MH-8 and R-17 district information).

**Existing MH-8 Zoning District:**

17.05.410: GENERALLY: The MH-8 district is intended as a moderate density residential district for mobile homes at a density of eight (8) units per gross acre.

17.05.420: PERMITTED USES; PRINCIPAL: Principal permitted uses in an MH-8 district shall be as follows:

- Administrative.
- Essential service (underground).
- Home occupation.
- Individual mobile homes.
- Neighborhood recreation.
- Public recreation.
- Single-family detached housing.

17.05.430: PERMITTED USES; ACCESSORY: Accessory permitted uses in an MH-8 district shall be as follows:

- Accessory dwelling units.
- For individually sited mobile homes, private recreation facilities.
- Garage or carport.
- Mailroom or common use room.
- Management office.
- Outside area or buildings for storage when incidental to a mobile home park.
- Private unenclosed recreation facilities.
17.05.440: PERMITTED USES; SPECIAL USE PERMIT:
Permitted uses by special use permit in an MH-8 district shall be as follows:
- Commercial film production.
- Community assembly.
- Community education.
- Community organization.
- Convenience sales.
- Essential service (aboveground).
- Ministorage facility.
- Mobile home park.
- Noncommercial kennel.
- Religious assembly.

Proposed R-17 Zoning District:

17.05.250: GENERALLY:
The R-17 district is intended as a medium/high density residential district that permits a mix of housing types at a density not greater than seventeen (17) units per gross acre.

17.05.260: PERMITTED USES; PRINCIPAL:
Principal permitted uses in an R-17 district shall be as follows:
- Administrative
- Childcare facility
- Community education
- Duplex housing
- Essential service
- Home occupation
- Multiple-family
- Neighborhood recreation
- Pocket residential development
- Public recreation
- Single-family detached housing as specified by the R-8 district

17.05.270: PERMITTED USES; ACCESSORY:
Accessory permitted uses in an R-17 District shall be as follows:
- Accessory dwelling units.
- Garage or carport (attached or detached).
- Mailroom and/or common use room for or multiple-family developments.
- Outside area or building for storage when incidental to the principal use.
- Private recreation facility (enclosed or unenclosed).

17.05.280: PERMITTED USES; SPECIAL USE PERMIT:
Permitted uses by special use permit in an R-17 district shall be as follows:
- Automobile parking when the lot is adjoining at least one point of, intervening streets and alleys excluded, the establishment which it is to serve; this is not to be used for the parking of commercial vehicles
- Boarding house
- Commercial film production
- Commercial recreation
- Community assembly
- Community organization
- Convenience sales
- Group dwelling - detached housing
- Handicapped or minimal care facility
- Juvenile offenders facility
- Ministorage facilities
- Mobile home manufactured in accordance with section 17.02.085 of this title
- Noncommercial kennel
- Nursing/convalescent/rest homes for the aged
- Rehabilitative facility
- Religious assembly
- Residential density of the R-34 district as specified
- Three (3) unit per gross acre density increase

**Zoning Matrix (MH-8 to R-17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Performance Standards</th>
<th>Principal Height</th>
<th>Accessory Height</th>
<th>Minimum Yards</th>
<th>Minimum Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Street Side</td>
<td>Rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-8</td>
<td>MH-19’ '/ SFDU-32’</td>
<td>14’ / 18’</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>5’/10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-17</td>
<td>SFDU-32’ / MF-45’</td>
<td>14’ / 18’</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal would adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, (and)/(or) existing land uses.

**PROPOSED CONDITIONS:** None.

**ORDINANCES & STANDARDS USED FOR EVALUATION:**
- 2007 Comprehensive Plan
- Transportation Plan
- Municipal Code
- Idaho Code
- Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan
- Water and Sewer Service Policies
- Urban Forestry Standards
- Transportation and Traffic Engineering Handbook, I.T.E.
- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
- 2017 Coeur d'Alene Trails Master Plan

**ACTION ALTERNATIVES:**
The Planning Commission must consider this request and make separate findings to approve, deny or deny without prejudice. This recommendation will be forwarded onto City Council for final determination. Your findings worksheet is attached.
APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE
02/01/2019

City of Coeur d’Alene Planning Department
710 E Mullan Ave
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83814

Re: Zone Change Application

In June of 2018 Habitat acquired the following property at public auction from the City of Coeur d’Alene:

601 W. Neider Ave., Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815

Lot 1, Block 2, Clark Addition, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Book 1 of Plats at Page 187, records of Kootenai County, Idaho

That property is currently zoned MH-8 and we would like to change that zoning to R-17.

Habitat’s mission which is focused on affordable housing development requires us to constantly evaluate appropriate construction types for the demand in our area. Recent increases to property values indicate that single-family homes are not truly affordable class units in this area. Multi-family development is more appropriate in this environment and can allow more units to be created in each area. This is in-line with Objective 3.01, Managed Growth, in the city’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan. The scope of the individuals in our area that need affordable housing will continue to grow as property values increase, and increased density is one solution to that issue.

Nearby this property is a similar development owned by St. Vincent DePaul, along with many mobile homes. We believe the proposed R-17 zoning change will have either a neutral or positive impact to the neighborhood makeup.

Regards,

James Casper
Executive Director