

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
AUGUST 8, 2023
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Sarah McCracken
Mark Coppess

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Phil Ward
Peter Luttrupp

CALL TO ORDER:

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

OATH:

Lynn Fleming
Tom Messina
Mark Coppess

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Fleming , seconded by McCracken, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on May 9, 2023. Motion approved.

Motion by Ingalls , seconded by McCracken, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on May 17, 2023. Motion approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Shirley Freeman commented that she used to live at 1513 N. 3rd Street that recently burned down in August of 2021. She explained that she moved into her garage and was evicted by the city. She stated that she was unfairly treated by the city and is now living in a motor home which was on my property and didn't see a reason why she couldn't stay in it and is now living in my car.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Patterson provided the following statements.

- She stated that we have scheduled one public hearing for September which is a special use permit on Schreiber Way.
- She announced that we have a new Planning Technician. Virginia Loustalot has joined our team and is helping us tonight.
- She announced that Shana Stuhlmiller our Administrative Assistant is retiring on September 15th.
- She welcomed our new Planning Commissioner Mark Coppess and congratulated Chairman Messina and Commissioner Fleming for their reappointment. She added that she wanted to thank Brinnon Mandel for her service and appreciated all her efforts on this commission.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: North Idaho Archery
Location: 3848 & 3846 N. Schreiber Way
Request: A proposed Commercial Recreation and Specialty Sales special use permit in the M (Manufacturing) zoning district
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-5-23)

Sean Holm, Senior Planner presented the staff and provided the following comments:

- North Idaho Archery is a full-service archery pro shop with a 20-yard indoor range. Our retail space sells high end archery and outdoor related products. We provide a recreation site that can be utilized 365 days a year; a recreation source that has been highly requested and applauded by the community. In addition, we will be offering outdoor survival education, hunting education, archery education courses as well as many other seminars to help grow the outdoor community in Coeur D'Alene.
- Our long-term goal is to get connected with the schools and offer an archery physical education class to get students more involved in outdoor recreation as well. I believe North Idaho Archery is adequately serving the community with its offered services that cannot be located anywhere nearby. The next closest full service certified pro shop is in Spokane Valley.
- The owners of North Idaho Archery have spent 5 months remodeling the space to be as community friendly as possible and kindly request your granting of a special use permit to continue operating in the space. We are an all veteran owned and operated business.
- He noted that the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as "General Industrial".
- He noted that all city staff reviewed the request with no issues.
- He stated that there are no conditions.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that this area was zoned manufacturing and noted the map in the staff report referencing all the special use permits that have been approved. He inquired if staff would agree this area has been reshaped and asked if there are more alternative uses in this area than manufacturing uses. Mr. Holm concurred with that statement and commented that we have had these discussions over the years and explained if the zone is changed that the other businesses that are manufacturing will become non-conforming uses. He said he sees the options as continuing to have special use requests or come up with a specialty zone for this area. Commissioner Ingalls inquired if there have been any complaints since there is a mix of various uses in this area. Mr. Holm responded that it does work to have the mix of uses and explained there is a difference between manufacturing and light manufacturing that has different performance standards which include light, noise, dust etc. and because of those standards, we don't get complaints. He added we do occasionally get business moving in and find out they will need to get a special use permit for their use. Commissioner Ingalls explained from reading the applicant's narrative that this is what happened with this applicant. Mr. Holm stated that is correct and after speaking with them they were happy to comply.

Public testimony open.

Austin Johnson provided the following statements:

- He is one of three owners of Idaho Archery
- He explained that when they started this business a few years ago they saw a need for a pro archery shop located that people can come in and get their questions answered, the full experience.
- He commented all of the owners are military veterans and have a law enforcement background. They are involved in that community and people in these professions need an outlet and hopefully this will fulfill that need.

Jon Fontaine commented that he is one of the owners and one of their goals is to get the schools involved with archery by forming leagues and to be involved in the Jr. Olympics.

Commissioner Fleming inquired about hours of operation. Mr. Johnson explained that they are open Tuesday thru Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

John Padula stated that he supports these owners and the business – there is a huge need in our area with most people are tired of going to the “big box” stores and not getting the help they need.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Fleming commented that this is a great indoor business for this community and a plus is that the owners are passionate about this business. She supports this request.

Commissioner McCracken concurs this is a great fit and stated that in this area there is a half and half on zoning and suggested that maybe in the future we can discuss the zoning further.

Chairman Messina concurs great fit and hopes they do pursue getting into the schools.

Commissioner Ingalls concurs and likes working with schools. He will support this request.

Commissioner Coppess asked the City Attorney from a legal perspective if there is anything that “caught your eye” with this process. Mr. Adams explained that the process conforms with the city code and state law. Commissioner Coppess commented that he loves their vision and supports this request.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Ingalls, to approve Item SP-5-23. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Coppess	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

2. Applicant: Todd Kaufman
Location: 2810 N. 17th
Request:
- A. A proposed 2.3-acre PUD known as "Kaufman Estates PUD" QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-1-23)
 - B. A proposed 18-lot preliminary plat known as "Kaufman Estates" QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-5-23)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner provided the following statements:

- Olson Engineering, on behalf of Todd Kaufman, is proposing a Planned Unit Development request to allow 18 lots and two (2) tracts known as "Kaufman Estates" PUD in the R-12 (residential at 12 units per acre) zoning district.
- The subject property is located at 2810 N. 17th Street, slightly southeast of Stiner Avenue, north of Gilbert Avenue and south of Nettleton Gulch Road. The property is an approximately 2.3-acre site with an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structure that will be removed. The applicant is proposing a planned unit development (PUD) as part of this request. (See PUD map on page 14).
- The PUD will consist of 18 lots, with two open space tracts, one tract that will contain a private road and the other tract will contain the required Open Space. The applicant has indicated that the 18 lots are designed for twin homes, which are like duplexes except that they are on individual lots with one shared wall and zero lot line construction, each with separate utilities, and each can be sold as real property. The project is designed for one of the units in each structure to contain a one-car garage with a smaller overall footprint, while the other unit will be larger and contain a two-car garage. The 18 proposed buildable lots will have access to a private road within the development and the private road will have a single public access connection to N. 17th Street. The total number of units would be 18. The applicant has also proposed 22 parallel parking stalls along the south side of the private road.
- The applicant is proposing 12,400 SF of open space, or 12% of the total area, that will be located in a tract known as "Tract B" on the preliminary plat. The open space amenities include a grassy area with a walking path, trees, shrubs, and a picnic area with a gazebo. The applicant has indicated that the open space area will be maintained by a Homeowners' Association (HOA).

- The applicant has indicated that this project will be completed in one phase with construction beginning in spring/summer of 2024 and completed by late 2024/early 2025. See the attached Narrative by the applicant at the end of this report for a complete overview of their PUD, and subdivision request.

HISTORY:

- This proposal originally came before the Planning Commission on August 9, 2022. As presented to Planning Commission, it was a request for 24 twin home units on the 2.3-acre parcel with two (2) Open Space tracts and a private road. Many of the owners/occupants of neighboring parcels testified in opposition to the request. The request was unanimously denied on the grounds that it was not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, it was not compatible with the adjacent properties or natural features of the site, and would not be adequately served by existing streets, public facilities, and services.
- On February 10, 2023, the applicant’s development team, including Jeramie Terzulli, Olson Engineering and Todd Kaufman, the owner and developer of Kaufman Estates, met with several of the neighbors surrounding the proposed development to discuss the project. The neighbors shared their concerns with the density, compatibility with adjacent uses, and their hope that single-family homes would be built on the parcel. Jeramie and Todd explained that they would like to build the twin homes and sell them individually.
- In response to the comments and feedback made at the hearing on August 9, 2022, the applicant thereafter modified his request to propose 18 twin homes, +/- 12,000 SF of Open Space that will be open to the public, and 22 parallel parking spaces proposed on the south side of the private street for visitor parking.

The applicant is requesting approval of a the “Kaufman Estates” PUD with the following deviations.

1. A residential planned unit development (PUD) that will allow for 18-lots and two tracts with the following modifications.
 - a. Lots fronting on a private street rather than a public street.
 - b. Allow for twin home type construction in the R-12 Zoning District.
 - c. Minimum Lot Area of 2,663 SF for a twin home unit rather than 3,500 SF.
 - d. Side Setback (interior) of 5’ and 0’ rather than 5’ on one side and 10’ on the other.
 - e. Street Side Setback of 5’ rather than 10’.
 - f. Sidewalk on one side of street rather than sidewalks on both sides of street.
 - g. 30-foot lot frontage for each twin home lot.
2. An 18-lot, two tract preliminary plat to be known as Kaufman Estates
 - The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Compact Neighborhood and Mixed-use Low.
 - City staff reviewed the project with no objections.
 - If approved, there are 20 recommended conditions.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina inquired about the R-12 zone and if duplex and Townhouses are allowed, and also questioned if there was a definition for twin homes. He said the applicant's narrative references the design of the twin homes which were based on R-17 zoning. Ms. Stroud explained in the R-12 zone that duplexes are allowed but townhomes and twin homes are only allowed with a PUD which would allow separate ownership and deviations to house style and setbacks. Chairman Messina inquired how many units would be allowed in the R-12 zone versus what they are proposing. Ms. Stroud commented and explained that 2.3 acres divided by 5500 for a single-family dwelling would allow 20 or more units taking in consideration that the applicant needs to put sidewalks on both sides of the street, swales and street trees and meet setbacks that minimizes the number of units you could actually build and still meet setbacks. Chairman Messina inquired if there are other properties around this project that are similar. Ms. Stroud noted on a map where other duplexes and triplexes are located.

Commissioner Ingalls explained a year ago, when this project was originally in front of us, one of the struggles we had was compatibility as stated in Finding B8B that needs to be met and couldn't be met. He added that we have a neighborhood that is surrounded by various mixes of homes but Finding B8B states "Compatible with adjacent properties" and explained looking at the houses on the north, south, east etc. those properties adjacent are bigger. Mr. Adams explained that the word adjacent is defined in our code "Adjacent means near, close or abutting".

Mr. Coppess commented that there are two additional parking spaces per unit. Ms. Stroud explained that there are 22 parallel parking stalls on the street and explained that our code requires two parking stalls per unit. They have met that requirement with one parking stall in the garage and one in the driveway.

Public testimony open.

Jeremie Terzulli, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- He stated that this project is a perfect location for an Infill development based on location, services, and proximity to ped/bike trails.
- He noted that there are a lot of infill projects in this area located within a ½ mile radius.
- He explained the difference between duplexes and townhomes with the difference that a duplex is two units within one structure on one parcel and a townhome can be multiple units sharing a zero-lot line, each owner shares a common wall going all the way to the property line. Each unit has their own waterline similar to a single-family home.
- He added financing for this project is different than a condominium where you get a conventional mortgage because you have a legal description, and own the lot.
- He explained that the vision of the applicant is to provide entry level home ownership.
- He commented based on feedback from last year's hearing we changed the architectural style so its more conventional and compatible with the area.
- He noted on an area map four different areas that represent 10-acre parcels east of 15th Street. He said, with our proposal, those 18 twin homes would have less density compared to the homes in these four different areas.
- He described the property as vacant, with a house on it that will be demolished and that the larger trees on the property will be preserved to act as a barrier between property owners.
- He stated the property is located over the aquifer.
- He stated that we will be required to pave 17th Street.
- He commented that staff did a great job covering the Comprehensive Plan policies stating that this property is consistent with the land use map, compact neighborhood and close to commercial corridors. He added that we intend for this project to be entry level workforce housing.
- He explained that the owner employs many people in the area and is struggling to find help as his business expanded with the biggest complaint not able to buy a house in this community.
- He stated the development team previously met with city staff many times to discuss various designs.
- He explained that the city engineer indicated that there might be some traffic impacts, but

increases on 17th Street will be minimal.

- He commented that our open space exceeds 10%
- He stated that we will offer 54 off-street parking spaces that includes parking in the garage and based on information from staff people will use the garage for storage. He added that, with an additional 22 parking stalls along the street, we don't anticipate parking to spill out into the roadway.
- He showed a rendering of what the homes will look like using a 3-D image of the area and explained that we eliminated one of the homes in the southern portion to provide additional open space. We are asking for sidewalks on only one side of the street, but we intend to provide crosswalks for safety.
- He explained the differences that were made from last year's project.
- He added that we did change the style of the homes from modern to contemporary.
- He stated by adding two car garages eliminates the need for additional parking on the street.
- He stated that, "By Right" with the current zoning, we could submit eight (8) duplexes without going through this process. He added that, after last year's denial, the development team took the feedback from the neighborhood to see if we could get only duplexes in this area and noted that design on the screen. He explained the duplex project would meet all city standards.
- He stated that staff encouraged us to meet the neighbors to see if we could come up with a compromise.
- He explained that they later came back with a plan we are submitting tonight which is the twin home design.

The applicant's representative concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner McCracken appreciates the comparison on the two options but curious between the two what is the parking difference. Mr. Terzulli said the only difference would be not to have any on street parking that would have to be contained in the driveways.

Commissioner Ingalls explained our mission is to look out for property owner rights and questioned if this was denied and appealed by council would the applicant choose option 2. Mr. Terzulli explained that the owner bought the property a year and a half ago and has incurred over \$50,000 in costs from design fees. If this request does not get approved, he has a decision to either develop it as a duplex project or sell the property. Commissioner Ingalls explained after hearing a bunch of emotional testimony last year, we still have to meet our findings and even through it was denied I made the comment at last year's hearing that "change is coming" and the only way for the neighborhood to keep this property as a park would have the neighbors to buy it.

Commissioner Fleming questioned if the park is going to be public. She said that, with cars allowed to park on the street in front of the park, it would be hard to access the park for people who are walking to the park. She suggested removing the parking stalls in front of the park or adding curb cuts with two dedicated entry points for ingress/egress. Mr. Terzulli explained that staff has a slide showing a crosswalk going to the sidewalk with curb cuts. He added that the lines on the drawing represent parallel parking stalls.

Commissioner Fleming commented that she draws designs for a living and these elevations are "scary," with four different roof lines and stair-stepping windows up a staircase, and commented this project is a mess and that doesn't have a unified look. She described the design as a big box with two pop-outs and a shed roof. She suggested trying to be thoughtful with the design and make it look like one building. She added that she wouldn't want to see this design of building built in the neighborhood. It doesn't have a traditional look.

Chairman Messina inquired if the design of the project would be part of the PUD if this project were approved. Ms. Patterson said that design is out of the Commission's purview unless it's tied to one of the

findings. Chairman Messina inquired if we could put a condition on this project if approved, saying something about changing the design. Ms. Patterson explained that the design could be addressed if the Commission felt like it was part of Finding B8B. Mr. Adams added that it would be difficult for the commission to micromanage the design and that the Code talks about design compatibility with the location, setting and existing uses, and it is not the purpose of this Commission to impose their personal views on design. Commissioner Fleming commented that she recognizes that the Commission is not a Homeowner's Association, but she won't give her blessing to something that is below her standard.

Commissioner McCracken inquired if the applicant has determined a price point for these homes. Mr. Terzulli said we estimate mid-\$400,000 for the units with a two-car garage and mid-\$300,000 for units with a one-car garage.

Tom Hungerford provided a PowerPoint comparing the lot sizes of the surrounding area, which are .68 acres, with these lots, which are .08 acres, and talked about the neighborhood and compatibility. He cited Finding B8B and feels that finding can't be met based on the lot sizes. He added that there are 17 duplexes on the west side of 15th Street. If 17th Street is the dividing line, there are 113 duplexes and on the east side there are only 14 on the west side. So, the proposal doesn't fit in this location. He added that we did meet with the applicant who presented a 3rd option and we proposed to put 5-6 single family homes on the property, which would still make money for the applicant and would be compatible with the neighborhood. He showed an example on Willow and 19th of a similar setup that could be built and fit the neighborhood.

Rick Rainbolt commented he lives on Gilbert and the applicant didn't address where the snow is going. He said the previous plan showed the snow going to his property line and now, on this plan, snow storage isn't addressed. He doesn't get the applicant's calculations on parking spaces. He explained that, based on nine homes with three off-street parking, there would be 27, and he said that with 22 on the street, there would be 49 not 54 total spaces.

Kevin Jacobson commented that, on this plan, there are no cul-de-sacs which means the applicant intends to expand the project to the east or wait for the aging community to leave. He questioned the length of the driveways and said if the driveways are not long enough cars will block the sidewalk. He stated that the traffic is terrible on Nettleton Gulch Road and trying to turn on 15th Street is impossible. He added that 17th Street isn't paved and that the applicant will pave that street with this project. But he is concerned that this project's required improvements to 17th Street will be taking property from the people living on the east/west of 17th Street who have no parking and have to park on the road.

Megan Johns commented that she abuts the northern boundary and that she also testified last year about incompatibility. She commented that the big difference with this plan versus the one last year is instead of 5 units will have 4 units to look at from her back yard. She added with this plan it is lower density, but is concerned with compatibility with the design of the neighborhood. She feels that if approved this has the potential for many short-term rentals. She added she was at the meeting with the developer in February and in that meeting the owner stated "He will buy from whoever sells". She asked that if the Commission approves the applicant, to stress to the applicant that they need to work with the neighborhood.

Dave Patzer stated he lives on Nettle Gulch Road and wasn't able to attend last year's meeting and is opposed to two things: He doesn't like PUD's and knows that the developer gives tradeoffs for deviations in a PUD. He added the developer is promising to pave 17th Street and provide 12% open space that will be available to the public. He explained that he served on the Park/Rec Commission and was part of the group that worked on the Riverstone Park. He remembers the concessions that the developer gave to the city for Bellerive, which was riverfront access to the public for perpetuity, and he commented that when he and his wife were walking on that boardwalk, he felt the residents don't want the public on that boardwalk. He worries when this developer promises that the open space will be open to the public, that the new residents would not want it to be open to the public.

Amber Hicks is concerned with the safety for all kids who play and ride bikes on this street. She has concerns with the definition for a compatible neighborhood that states a Compact Neighborhood has an

established street grid with bike/ped facility and we don't have any of that in our neighborhood.

Mike Oliver stated that he was on the fence about this project when coming here tonight and he supports private property rights, but after hearing the presentations he is now opposed to this project. He commented that, after hearing the applicant's presentation, it lacks integrity and explained that the applicant stated that they met with neighbors and lived in this area for 25 years and that nobody came to his door. He added that 17th Street is too small and that the applicant is proposing this street goes to the end of the development. He asked how are they going to widen the street to make it safe for the kids.

Shannon Sardell commented that she lives on Nettleton Gulch Road and that the south side of her property will be directly affected by this proposal. She is opposing the current plan for 18 units. She added that her family is very active in the neighborhood and they like this neighborhood, and she feels that everyone is accountable to each other and if one person speeds through the neighborhood that everyone would know about it and would ask them to slow down. She added that the density proposed doesn't fit and what is proposed is doubling the density of what exists today.

Elise Bell stated she is going to start driving soon and she is concerned about the snow and where people will park. She likes to ride her bike and is concerned that there will be no storage for people who have bikes and other toys since garages are generally used for storage and not to park their cars.

Todd Kaufman stated that he bought this property a year ago and wanted to build some houses. The property is zoned R-12 which is 12 units/per acre. When the older residences in the area are demolished, they will be replaced by more units per acre. That was the intention of how the area was zoned. He added we are proposing 76 parking spaces between garages, driveways and the on-street parking on the private street. We are only required to provide 36 parking spaces. He addressed the design of the homes and said he wasn't going to spend a lot of money on the architecture at this time, which isn't what we are approving today. They will figure out the design later when it will be addressed at the building permit stage. He added the city isn't concerned about traffic and that snow will be stored in the swales. He added that he doesn't want to have rental properties and that is why they designed these as townhomes.

Keith Clemans commented he lives near Nettle Gulch Road and stated that this proposal doesn't fit this area and is concerned with the number of parking spaces

Robert Mesah stated we have seen this proposal before and feels these units will be rentals with parking issues. He added that people are getting upset and moving out of the area. He explained that 17th Street is an alley. He said the entire property slopes to the south and west and will shed water, which will go onto his property.

Nathanael Hause stated that his family has been in his house for 60 years and doesn't want to have a lot of houses in their backyard.

Shelly Costco stated this property is intended for single family homes and has concerns with the beauty of the land and that is the reason we moved into this area.

Rebuttal:

Jeremie Terzulli made the following comments

- He explained that there would be nine (9) homes with two stalls in the garage and two stalls in the driveway. Each unit with a one-car garage would each have one space in the garage and one in the driveway with a total of 54 off-street parking spaces. Additionally, there would be 22 parallel parking spaces on the road.
- He explained the stormwater by saying there is a swale on the southside of the private street that will be able to catch water and hold snow.

- He noted the staff report on page 27 where it states that all stormwater will be contained onsite and that a stormwater plan is required by the city.
- He commented that people are speculating that these homes will be rentals and stated that he believes in the free market. If an investor wanted to buy all of these lots to use as rentals, they would be wanting a discount on the land price. He explained that it's the applicant's intent to provide an entry level home and to turn a modest profit.
- He commented that he did discuss with Mr.Hungerford about his proposal for six (6) custom homes versus twin homes. Custom homes would be expensive and would not meet the applicant's goal or community need. The applicant's goal is to provide entry level housing and hopefully getting a modest profit. He explained that, by the time you put in the infrastructure, the home price plus the lot would be around \$1.2 million, which is not an entry level home.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ingalls stated this is a better plan than what we saw last year. The parking is better and there are fewer units. He added this is better than an alternative of having duplexes which is doable by right. He stated in previous testimony it was stated that the individual said they didn't like PUD's because of the concessions that are made. He would disagree. He explained that there are appropriate places for PUD's. He added that PUD's give you cluster housing which can provide additional open space and may result in a better project. He added he struggles with this project. He acknowledged that this meets the gross density and is less than what is allowed (18-27 units). He stated in previous testimony they showed a slide of a pocket housing development on the north side of Lunceford and the homes were all lined up like a "drill team." There is a question of compatibility with that pocket housing development and with this proposal. He can't support this request.

Commissioner Coppess commented that he went back and watched the previous hearing and that there has been an effort by the applicant to approach the community. He noted that there were numerous remarks on safety, Wastewater/Stormwater, and discussion on what the free market will look like. He commented that he doesn't think the city is going to approve something that isn't safe. But, he added the issue with growth and development and recognizing a neighborhood's distinct identity. He referenced how the project would affect the abutting properties and said even with a 3-D picture showing how this development will fit on the property that it won't look like that. Maybe this design might fit in another area of the city.

Commissioner McCracken commented she sees both sides and appreciates the efforts from the developer to make some changes but neighborhood integrity is a concern and concurs that this might not be the right area for this development. She added that she appreciates being able to buy your home but she can't get past the neighborhood character and that the project doesn't fit with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fleming concurs and maybe this project is too soon and the impact overrides this unified community but she appreciates the efforts.

Chairman Messina concurs. He acknowledged that they can do single-family homes and duplexes by right in the R-12 zoning district. This project is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ingalls went through the findings required to approve a PUD.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Coppess, to deny Item PUD-1-23. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye

Commissioner Coppess Voted Aye
Commissioner McCracken Voted Aye
Chairman Messina Voted Aye

Motion to deny carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

Commissioner Ingalls went through the findings required to approve a subdivision.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Fleming, to deny Item S-5-23. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming Voted Aye
Commissioner Ingalls Voted Aye
Commissioner Coppess Voted Aye
Commissioner McCracken Voted Aye
Chairman Messina Voted Aye

Motion to deny carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8.27p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant