

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION & PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JOINT WORKSHOP
MINUTES**

MARCH 26, 2025

City Hall – Conference Room #6

HPC COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Walter Burns, (Chair)
Anneliese Miller, (Vice Chair)
Anne Anderson, (Secretary)
Doug Harro
Sandy Emerson
Shannon Sardell
Dan McCracken
Stephen Shepperd
Rick Shaffer

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director
Traci Clark, Admin. Assistant

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT:

Kiki Miller, Council Liaison

P&Z COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Jon Ingalls (Vice-Chair)
Lynn Fleming
Phil Ward
Sarah McCracken
Mark Coppess (on Teams)

P&Z COMMISSIONER ABSENT:

Peter Luttrupp
Tom Messina (Chair)

11:00 P.M CALL TO ORDER:

The Historic Preservation Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Burns at 11:00 a.m.
The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Ingalls at 11:00 a.m.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

None.

WORKSHOP DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that he wanted to give a quick update on the work of the Downtown Core/Infill Working Group to evaluate the Downtown Development Regulations and Design Guidelines. There's been kind of a perfect storm of towers popping up – The Thomas George, the Marriott that drew a lot of attention, and the new Resort Tower. There is a lot of Interest on how high buildings should be in the downtown core. We think we've found some blind spots in the regulations and guidelines that are probably well over 15 to 20 years old. It's time to update those. We've had an ad hoc committee with representatives from the Planning and Zoning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and Design Review Commission, and other representatives, such as the Downtown Association. We have

gotten the point where we have strikeout draft documents. The next step is to give an update to the City Council and roll it out to some stakeholders, developers, business folks and whatnot, and get their input.

Ms. Patterson stated she will be presenting to Council on April 15, 2025. She will check in and let them know where we are at. Also, staff will do a check-in with the Design Review Commission and do some stakeholder updates. We will be working with the University Idaho.

Historic Preservation Commission Efforts

Chairman Burns stated there is a new demolition code for historic properties that was put into effect last November. This allows us the opportunity to identify and review anything that is going to be knocked down that was built before 1960. There have been twelve demolition permits so far and only one that has gone before the full commission. There was some discussion about the replacement structures. The other structures the subcommittee members felt they could go ahead with the demolitions. We did discover in some of the older neighborhoods that the trend of newer homes is to fill up the lots with homes that are much larger than what we have seen historically. This is a concern. We would like to explore how to keep some consistency in the older neighborhoods. We have been talking with some folks on Government Way on perhaps doing a Historic Overlay, which is a tool that was given to us with the Comprehensive Plan that allows the neighborhood to opt-in to special design standards for their neighborhoods. They would have to opt-in with the majority. We are in the early stages of this process.

Ms. Patterson replied she wanted to recap some of the feedback from the neighbors on Government Way. They really like the character of the neighborhood and are concerned with the pole barns and new construction being out of scale. The focus of today's agenda is not only the Historical Overlays but other things with the Zoning Code and to hear the desires of the two commissions.

Feedback from Government Way Corridor Stakeholders:

- They like the old character, landscaped islands with trees, the walkability, that the neighborhood is identifiable, and the proximity to downtown, Tubbs
- They are concerned about losing "gateway houses" – the ones that are historic and significantly contribute to the neighborhood
- They would like to have protections in place in older neighborhoods to generally protect the character. They would like to prevent pole barns, as they don't match the character of the neighborhood.
- They also have concerns with additions and new construction that do not fit.

Chairman Burns stated the Garden District's listing in the National Registration of Historic Places is imminent. This was a grassroots effort going back to 2018. There is a lot of neighborhood support of maintaining the character and integrity of the older neighborhoods of the Downtown area. We would like the builders to be sensitive to the surrounding area and incorporating characteristics such as mass, size, height, roof pitch, etc. that are consistent with the neighborhood as a whole.

Zoning Code Challenges in Historic Neighborhoods & Desired Outcomes to Address Compatibility

Chairman Burns stated there are two pieces to this discussion – the Zoning Code and the design review issue that might be addressed with a historic overlay.

Commissioner Ingalls stated if we can do some tweaks to the codes, that would be great.

Ms. Patterson showed images from a PowerPoint of structures that were constructed under the Zoning Code. The first is a structure at First and Foster that could no longer be built under the code. It shows the incompatibility of some infill development with historic structures that are one and one and a half stories tall. The homeowner pushed the code to the limit. Another slide shows a structure at 1732 E. Elm Ave that is an example of a duplex. Because we do not have standards that it has to look like a house, it now

looks like a huge shop structure with living space above that is next to a historic bungalow. This does not fit into the character of the neighborhood. Another example is an older home with a very large shop and a garage with a ADU above it. The homeowner has maxed out the lot, height and the new structures are towering over the home. The additional images show shop houses ("shouses") and barndominiums. The code does not state they have to look like a house. They are out of scale and do not look residential. They look very commercial.

Commissioner Ingalls asked what could be some of the code amendments if we used those as some examples of what we do not want?

Ms. Patterson replied that the code could specify a visible front door and that the structure has to appear residential in nature. This would live in the Zoning Code. Moving forward some things that would need to be changed would be you cannot have a 14' tall garage door on the front – taller garage door openings would have to be on the side or the rear of the building if you had an RV. Other items to include are percentage of garage door on the house frontage, transparency, etc. There are challenges with balancing market demands and implications to the neighborhoods.

She provided a list of possible code considerations including:

- Possible expansion of existing infill districts
- ADU setbacks and location
- Garage/Shop setbacks and size ("accessory to")
- Lot Coverage
- Shop Houses/Barndominiums
- Twin Homes
- Other?

Commissioner Sarah McCracken stated that the City of Hayden has an ordinance that a shop could not exceed a certain amount of square footage. She said she thinks the County has a similar code. It would be worth looking at those codes as possible examples.

Commissioner Ingalls asked if there could be a green space requirement in the front yard so that the entire front yard isn't consumed with pavement for parking areas.

Ms. Patterson replied the only time that applies now in the code is if you are building an ADU, you will have a pervious surface requirement. This can be achieved with existing setbacks. As we are seeing, many homeowners are wanting to maximize the use and coverage of their lots.

She presented a list of possible code amendments related to ADUS including:

- Increase setbacks instead of step backs
- Increase pervious surface requirement to reduce lot coverage
- Consider detached ADUs to be in the rear yard, not side or front yards

Commissioner Ingalls asked for clarification on the lot coverage. If he wanted to put a shop in his big back yard, those rules about pervious surface don't apply unless he had an ADU, correct?

Ms. Patterson replied, correct.

Commissioner Ingalls stated, so he can go to the setback lines and doesn't have a separate green space percentage?

Chairman Burns asked can we apply the ADU's rules to shops and other separate buildings?

Commissioner Anderson asked if we should make the 30% pervious requirement in addition to setbacks?

Ms. Patterson replied in order to achieve that, we would need to increase the pervious surface percentage and setbacks to achieve that.

Chairman Burns stated we could also suggest some things like using alley access and setbacks.

Commissioner Dan McCracken stated there is also concern about knocking down other older buildings to make room for that ADU.

Ms. Patterson stated the Planning and Zoning Commission has been discussing twin homes that would have similar standards as duplexes. They would look like a duplex, but there is a lot line in between the units. There are a couple of hiccups with utilities for the front loaded twin homes due to spacing requirements and location of the utilities, street trees, access of the driveways, etc. The alley loaded twin homes would work really well.

Chairman Burns stated if we could get some restrictions on the zoning side it would help the older neighborhoods. Using the tool we have in our historic code for demolition review we can require a meeting simply just to discuss the replacement structure. If a developer who likes to build in the older neighborhoods keeps coming to us with new modern structures and we keep putting them through the process and it keeps getting delayed because we have to do these meetings and all these reviews, maybe we can convince them that we could maybe work together a little bit more and if they brought something better to us, they wouldn't have to go through this process.

Commissioner Emerson stated as we work through these historic neighborhoods part of our mission is to focus on consistency and compatibility. That is important, but he's not sure how the enforcement is meant but if we're going to say you can't have a bathroom in your garage because that is easy to make into an ADU. It gets really tough on the enforcement side but he thinks there's some consistency gaps in these older neighborhoods because they've just evolved that way.

Ms. Patterson commented that Chairman Messina wanted to speak about possible expansion of existing Infill Districts. This is something that the Downtown Core/Infill Working Group is looking at in terms of what are the boundaries of the Downtown Core and then will be evaluating the Downtown North and Downtown East overlay boundaries. We don't have time to get into the details and the nuances today. But in the Working Group we've talked about looking at the boundaries considering how the downtown has kind of grown and evolved and even looking at East Sherman as a possible extension of the Downtown East, or it could be its own Infill District. She thinks this is why it's great to have some representatives from the Historic Preservation Commission on the Working Group to kind of look at those characteristics in the design guidelines and the development standards.

Chairman Burns stated he is very encouraged by some of the things that have been discussed today and that there seems to be so some willingness and some appetite to look at the existing code and maybe make some tweaks that would be beneficial to the older neighborhoods. He thinks that's really what we all came in here today hoping to achieve.

Commissioner Ward stated there are two separate issues. If he is a homeowner and he wants to renovate his home, he will probably listen to the City. But if he is a developer, he will want to maximize his money on this piece of property and will build as much as he can. Part 2 is the zoning; we need to make sure the zoning does not allow some of this. This is something we need to look at. How do we deal with brand new construction? Some of the new buildings going in are terrible. The designs do not fit into the neighborhoods. He does not like the driveways that are 20 or 30 feet wide. We could require a certain percentage of front yards to be landscaped. He would like us to require driveways off of the back of the property if there is alley access. He would like to limit the amount of square footage and height allowed with an accessory use. He also suggested a design review process.

Ms. Patterson stated the challenge with having items go through the Design Review Commission would be keeping up with it. There is also a push in the State Legislation that we require turn around building permits and complete within 10 days for residential and 20 days for commercial. Staff also wanted to mention currently the code says if you are doing an accessory structure, such as a garage in the principal building envelope, it could go up to 32 feet. We can change that to max it out to 18' if it's pitched or 14' for a flat roof.

City Council Liaison Miller stated you need to do something sooner than later. You are all on the right track. Let's tweak what you all ready have to get something done quickly. The loop holes have been found and the lawsuits will follow. What is happening in some of the neighborhoods, people are very unhappy. Taking action and letting the citizens know that there are conversations happening, this is very important.

Chairman Burns asked what do we do next with the discussions we have had today?

Ms. Patterson replied that this has been great input and staff will communicate with other city departments that weigh in on other development review and then report back to both commissions. She noted that she Chairman Burns had spoken previously about having a smaller working group and get this fast tracked to come up with proposed amendments for consideration by City Council.

The commissions summarized the items they would like to be part of the code amendments:

- Change accessory structure maximum height within principal building envelope to 18' for pitches roofs and 14' for flat roofs.
- Add in a maximum percentage for shops and other accessory structures so that they are smaller than the main home. Look at Hayden and Kootenai County codes. The commissioners suggested % based on square footage or just saying it had to be smaller than the home. They also suggested requiring % of green space on lot.
- Increase setbacks to account for stormwater/snow runoff from roofs.
- Increase ADU setbacks to avoid step back measurement and achieve the same or a better result.
- Increase pervious surface requirement – look to see if 40% is adequate or if it should be increased – and require for all structures on all single-family residential lots in all residential zoning districts (including MH-8) – not just for lots with ADUs.
- Require alley or side street access (if exists) unless there is a hardship/site constraint (other than an unmaintained alley or a slight slope).
- Require a certain percentage of front yard to be pervious/green and growing – to avoid the shop house scenarios we have.
- Consider requiring a visible front door and 50% max coverage of garage door space to avoid Shop House/Barndominium.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Historic Preservation Commission Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Dan McCracken, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

Motion by Planning & Zoning commission Commissioner Sarah McCracken, Seconded by Commissioner Ward, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Submitted by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant