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

NOVEMBER 8, 2022

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, Lutropp, Mandel, McCracken, Ward

PLEDGE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:  ***ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM. October 11th

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

STAFF COMMENTS:

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

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

1. Applicant: Richard and Susan Bennett
   Location: 1095 E. Timber
   Request: A proposed zone change from R-3 to R-8 QUASI-JUDICIAL, (ZC-2-22)

   Presented by Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director

   Location: 601, 603 & 609 E. Best Avenue
   Request: A proposed Warehouse/Storage special use permit in the C-17 zoning district QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-3-22)

   Presented by Tami Stroud, Associate Planner
3. Applicant: Dennis Cunningham  
Location: Beebe Boulevard & Lakeview Drive  
Request:  
   A. A modification to the proposed PUD known as “The Union PUD” QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-3-19m1)  
   B. A modification to the proposed preliminary plat known at “The Union” QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-4-19m1)  

Presented by Mike Behary, Associate Planner  

4. Applicant: 15th Street Investments, LLC  
Location: 3525 N. 15th  
Request:  
   A. A proposed 1.61 acre PUD known as “Birkdale Commons PUD” QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-4-22)  
   B. A proposed 10-lot preliminary plat known as “Birkdale Commons” QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-3-22)  

Presented by Mike Behary, Associate Planner  

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.  

*Please note any final decision made by the Planning Commission is appealable within 15 days of the decision pursuant to sections 17.09.705 through 17.09.715 of Title 17, Zoning.
CALL TO ORDER:
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Messina at 3:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Mandel, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on September 13, 2022. Motion approved.

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

• She announced last week she attended the APA Idaho planning conference held in Garden City. She announced that the city, CDA 2030 and our Consultants from MIG received the Outstanding Plan Award for our work on the Comprehensive Plan.
• She noted that there is a tour planned next week for the Atlas Mill/Atlas Waterfront project given by the Urban Land Institute (ULI).
• She announced for the November 8th Planning Commission meeting we have four scheduled hearings with two of the items having two parts.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:
Commissioner McCracken stated that she wanted to disclose she is a resident of the Indian Meadows
neighborhood, but that she does not have a conflict of interest or any financial association with the Coeur Terre request.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Kootenai County Land Company, LLC (Coeur Terre)
   Location: North of I-90, south of W. Hanley Avenue, East of Huetter Rd.
   Request: A proposed +/- 442.64-acre annexation from Ag Sub to R-8 & R-17, C17 and C-17L
   LEGISLATIVE, (A-4-22)

Sean Holm, Senior Planner provided the following statements.

- Kootenai County Land Company, LLC, through their representative Connie Krueger, is requesting consideration of annexation for a +/-440-acre parcel in Kootenai County, currently zoned AG-Suburban, to be incorporated into city limits with a mix of zoning designations described within this staff report including: R-8, R-17, C-17L, and C-17.

- The subject property is located on the west side of the city, north of I-90 and W. Woodside Ave., south of the future W. Hanley Ave. extension, east of N. Huetter Rd., and west of N. Buckskin Rd., Lancaster Rd., N. Arthur St., and W. Industrial Lp. The subject property is vacant except for a large water tower owned by the City on a leased parcel in the northeast corner. There are two homesites east of N. Huetter Rd. that are not included in the request.

- Planning Commission makes a recommendation to City Council whether or not an annexation request complies with the evaluation criteria and what zoning designation(s) Council should consider. As a part of the recommendation, Planning Commission may suggest items to be included in an annexation/development agreement to Council for consideration.

The applicant has provided legal descriptions and a zoning district exhibit laying out the requested zones over the existing parcels.

**Requested Zoning Districts Include R-8, R-17, C-17L, and C-17 as defined below:**

**R-8:**
- Main District
  - 10,199,661.12 SQ FT (234.152 acres more or less)

**R-17:**
- North District
  - 5,006,829.96 SQ FT (114.941 acres more or less)
- Middle District
  - 264,670.56 SQ FT (6.076 acres more or less)
- South District
  - 1,329,407.64 SQ FT (30.519 acres more or less)

**C17L:**
- Existing Water Tower Site: To be dedicated to City
Future Well Site: To be dedicated to City

22,500 SQ FT (0.517 acres more or less)

C-17:

North District
- 533,130.84 SQ FT (12.239 acres more or less)

South District
- 1,705,722.48 SQ FT (39.158 acres more or less)

The City’s 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as:
- Single Family Neighborhood
- Compact Neighborhood
- Urban Neighborhood
- Mixed-Use Low

Mr. Holm presented the required findings for annexation, including:
- Finding B8, conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. The 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as Single-Family Neighborhood, Compact Neighborhood, Urban Neighborhood, and Mixed-Use Low. He shared the Future Land Use Map and applicable Place Types, transportation, walking and transit network maps, and applicable goals and objectives.
- Finding B9, that public facilities and utilities are/are not available and adequate for the proposed use.
- Finding B10, that the physical characteristics of the site make/do not 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.

Mr. Holm referenced the pages where the staff comments were located.
He noted in the staff report the suggested conditions for the Planning Commission to consider in Annexation and Development agreement (see below).

Water:
- Existing public utility easements for the City’s 24” transmission main will be maintained or replaced at the developer’s expense.
- The property for an existing water storage facility under the tank, as mutually agreed upon, shall be transferred to the City.
- A well parcel for a potential new water source is required to be transferred to the city as the developer’s contribution toward the expense of developing an additional water source to adequately serve the community. The well site is requested to be transferred upon confirmation of acceptable water quality through City installation of a test well on an agreed upon site.
- Water rights for the property, both domestic potable and irrigation, will be addressed in the annexation and development agreement.

Wastewater:
- There are 5 potential projects highlighted by Lakeside Real Estate Holdings and JUB Engineering to upgrade sewer collection system sewer capacity. These projects are laid out in the “Coeur Terre Development Wastewater Collection Study” (May 2022) from the developer and JUB Engineering. Five (5) “limiting reaches” were identified when adding planned flow from the Coeur Terre project into the City sewer collection system at 2013 Master Plan Flows. Below is a list of these. The development agreement specifies Wastewater’s response and defines the necessary corrective projects proposed in this study.
  1. HAWKS NEST LIFT STATION
  2. LAUREL/SHERWOOD TRUNK MAIN
3. APPALOOSA TRUNK MAIN
4. FAIRWAY TRUNK MAIN
5. RIVERSIDE INTERCEPTOR

Streets & Engineering (Transportation/Traffic):
- In the areas where the Bypass project does not impact the existing Huetter Road, Huetter Road shall be reconstructed to the Post Falls and City of Coeur d’Alene standards, as applicable. The City desires that Huetter Road shall be reconstructed from the southern extent of the development to Hanley Road for three lane Arterials, including bike lanes, a shared-use path on the east side, and dedication of right-of-way to meet the City Standard of 100 feet minimum. The design, alignment and extent of improvements are subject to the location and design of the proposed Huetter Bypass.
- Additional right-of-way shall be set aside and made available as determined by the Idaho Transportation Department for the future Huetter Bypass.
- The Hanley Avenue/Huetter Road intersection shall be reconstructed to its future configuration as modeled for 2045, which includes five lanes on Hanley Ave, reducing to three lanes at the planned collector street into the proposed development. Bike lanes and shared-use paths are also required on both sides of Hanley Ave.
- The Nez Perce Road/Hanley Ave intersection shall be constructed to its future configuration as modeled for 2045. In order to manage increases in traffic, connectivity to existing streets is required without delay throughout the construction of the phased development. The owner shall commit to constructing five road connections to existing streets to the south and east by phases and in a manner that does not allow for this connectivity to be delayed to future phases.
- Any property owned by the applicant that is west of the city’s ACI along Huetter Road must be subdivided and conveyed or dedicated to Post Falls Highway District per conversations with the applicant, Post Falls Highway District, and Kootenai County. Property outside the ACI should not be annexed into the City at this time.

Parks:
- Ten (10) acres for one Community Park
- Eight (8) acres of land for one Residential Park
- Two (2) traversing north-south trails that connect out of the development
- Two (2) traversing east-west trails that connect out of the development

Planning:
- Proposed use limitations: No Adult Entertainment, Billboards, Industrial Uses, Heliports, Outdoor Sales or Rental of Boats, Vehicles, or Equipment, Outdoor Storage of materials and equipment (except during construction), Repair of Vehicles (unless entirely within a building), Sewage Treatment Plants and other Extensive Impact activities (unless publicly owned), Work Release Facilities, Wrecking Yards, and Vehicle Washing (unless located within a building or parking structure).
- Five percent (5%) of the residential units qualify as “affordable/workforce housing” in conjunction with PAHA (or similar organization as exists at the time of implementation) as the administrating entity. This level of commitment was discussed with the applicant prior to any hearings with details to be addressed in the annexation and development agreement.
- Ongoing concurrency analysis for total acreage developed, open space improvements (parks and trails), transportation improvements (volume and connections), and affordable/workforce housing will be provided by zone and phase.
- This request is for annexation and zoning designations only. The applicant has provided preliminary conceptual design information that is not binding at this time. Staff suggests that at a minimum the annexation and development agreement include language that ties future
subdivision applications to generally adhere to: alignment of transportation, product types (place
types), trails and public parks as shown in the conceptual design.

Other:
- The developer has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with School District #271 for two (2)
  future school sites. While the City is not a party to the MOU between the developer and the
  School District, this commitment should be considered in the annexation and development
  agreement.
- Electric transmission lines, natural gas, and any other existing easements for utilities may exist on
  the subject properties. The applicant must adhere to the required easements or seek legal
  changes to alter/extinguish, if needed.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation

Chairman Messina inquired how a Development Agreement will be designed for this project. Mr. Holm
explained that after this goes before City Council, staff will work with the applicant to negotiate that
agreement. Chairman Messina asked for clarified on whether the Planning Commission was only making
a recommendation for annexation and zoning and not the development agreement. He also noted the
district zoning map submitted by the applicant and inquired how this map compares to the future land use
map in the staff report. Mr. Holm explained that the applicant had requested that our consultants MIG
look at this property as we were doing the Comprehensive Plan. It is up to the commission to decide if
this is something they can support. Chairman Messina commented that from looking at the map R-8 is the
most compatible with the land use map in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Mandel inquired if this annexation is approved is the zoning submitted by applicant binding
and explained that there are four different zones and how do we make sure that a lot of C-17 is replaced
by the R-8 properties. Mr. Holm explained that staff looked at this application with the same concerns
and, based on the zoning, staff recommended to require from the applicant legal descriptions for each
zone. If council approves this request, those legal descriptions for each zoning district would be part of
that approval which mirrors their exhibit.

Commissioner McCracken inquired about the two school site locations zoned R-17 and questioned if the
applicant decided to change their mind, could they put something else on those sites. Mr. Holm explained
if council approves this annexation there are uses by right for each zone and that R-17 does allow some
other uses within that zone. He added that the applicant does have a Memorandum of Agreement (MOU)
with the school district to provide two schools on the property and if council approves this request, they
could require those sites for the school to be part of the Development Agreement.

Commissioner Ingalls stated that they received a packet of comments from citizens with a lot of concerns
with traffic and inquired how the traffic study was done without knowing how many housing units will be
constructed and from those comments were letters of support from various agencies of support for more
housing and inquired if staff knew how many units are proposed for this site and if there will be a variety
of housing types. He also noted that there is an understanding that the applicant will provide a 5%
commitment for workforce housing. Mr. Holm commented that he wished he could answer that question
and that the applicant is here to answer that question.

Commissioner Ward inquired if the decision tonight is to recommend approval for the annexation and the
zoning for the parcels. Mr. Holm stated that’s correct. Commissioner Ward noted in the staff report it
references site reviews which are administrative, so if the applicant wanted to build per the zoning on the
individual parcels, they could apply for a building permit and wouldn’t need approval from the Planning
Commission. Mr. Holm explained it depends on the level they plan to construct and stated that the city
code would allow two units on a parcel in the city that includes everything except the R-17 sites that
include multi family. He added for the R-8 district and “use by right” they can have two single family
houses, or a single-family house and an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) for that entire parcel without going through the subdivision process, if the parcel meets minimum size requirements. Commissioner Ward commented that we now have a Development Agreement ordinance and questioned if the school and park sites binding. Mr. Holm explained that the applicant and school district have an MOU, but the city isn’t part of that MOU. So, if it’s the desire of the Planning Commission to recommend to council that the school sites be included in the future development, that should be noted.

Chairman Messina noted on page 38 in the staff report on the last paragraph it states “This request is for annexation and zoning designations only. The applicant has provided preliminary conceptual design information that is not binding at this time. Staff suggests that at a minimum the annexation and development agreement include language that ties to future subdivision applications to generally adhere to: alignment of transportation, product type (place types), trails and public parks as shown in the conceptual design.” He inquired if this will be a future discussion and, if this is approved, will the design change. Mr. Holm explained staff added that language because within the applicant’s narrative they stated a desire for a degree of flexibility depending on what the market will be and didn’t want to have to come back for future amendments for the PUD if the market changes. He added they do have a master plan that they provided to staff that doesn’t specifically apply to this annexation request, so you may see some things presented tonight but the decision is only for the annexation and zoning and nothing else is binding. Chairman Messina commented what we are looking at might not be what the finished product will look like. Commissioner Mandel commented if there is nothing binding, questioned if there is an exception to adhere to some of the principles. Ms. Patterson concurred and explained the language is so the applicant can have flexibility. Mr. Adams explained that the Planning Commission is making a recommendation for zoning to council and the council will make the decision on whether to annex and accept the recommendations on zoning. The Planning Commission is not making any binding decisions tonight.

Mr. Holm explained based on the zoning presented on the underlying parcels they can build more in the county. He is confident that this project will come back to the Planning Commission, but he is not sure what form that will take. Commissioner Mandel commented that we are making a recommendation to council that is not binding and requested clarification on what is listed in comments for an Annexation/Development Agreement if staff is requesting that those items be included in a future development agreement, which isn’t being done tonight. Mr. Adams concurred and noted that any recommendations tonight will be considered by council with a negotiation between city, staff, and the developer on what will be in the Development Agreement. Ms. Patterson explained if the applicant comes forward with a subdivision or PUD, we can open the Development Agreement again that will have amendments with more detail added. This is not the only chance to make changes.

Ali Marienau, KMPO Transportation Planner provided the following comments.

- She explained that the city asked KMPO to do the modeling, since the KMPO model is regionally focused to provide an analysis of how this project will impact the city. She notes that this information would hopefully provide clarification on the modeling process and the results.
- She stated KMPO was established in 2003 and that it is a federally mandated organization.
- She commented that they do have a board that consists of representatives from the four major cities - Coeur d’Alene, Post Falls, Hayden and Rathdrum - the four Highway Districts, the Idaho Transportation Department, Kootenai County and the Coeur d’Alene Tribe, and they work with a technical committee that is made up of members from those agencies.
- She explained the travel demand model is used for long-range transportation planning to help identify existing and future issues, so the region can be proactive and plan for transportation investments going into the future.
- She explained this model helps determine the type, size and location of transportation improvements. She added this is a peak hour model and it only looks at a.m. and p.m. peak trips.
- She explained the type of data inputs used based off of land uses and are measured by number of dwelling units, employment, students, acres of agriculture land, etc. These units are grouped in Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) because every unit cannot be represented in the model analysis. The model takes into account the numerous people living in the county. The TAZs are structured
so that they separate residential from commercial.

- She provided an example of data they use in their modeling/planning processes. She shared a screenshot of Inrix signal data for the intersection at Atlas Rd and Hanley, which showed how the intersection is operating.
- She explained KMPO has a current model that is used, which consists of 2020 land use data, as well as forecast models through 2045, which incorporate population growth and future developments; she explained the various models used to be based on the scope of the project.
- She commented the models include future 2035-2045 projects, including the Highway 41 widening, improved I-90 interchanges and widening, etc. Future land use projects are also incorporated, including Prairie crossing, more development on the west side of Huetter and the east side of Highway 41, and the buildout of the Atlas Waterfront project.
- She explained the 2035-2045 model scenarios both with/without Coeur Terre and with/without the Huetter bypass. She provided maps showing potential congestion. She added with additional collector roads constructed by the Coeur Terre project there would be less congestion on Hanley because increased traffic on Kathleen. Travel patterns shift due to additional collector road network, and verified the much-needed east/west connection.
- She added that in the 2045 scenarios, it includes the plan to widen Huetter Road to three lanes. This facility can tolerate this development including schools and commercial.
- Some locations will, generally, need to be addressed for future growth.
- This is a regional model and traffic specific to this area. Some trips from the Coeur Terre project won’t go to Coeur d’Alene. The city wanted to use the regional model and expectations for the future to better understand traffic through this area.

Commission Comments.

Commissioner McCracken commented we had many comments from people who had concerns using Arrowhead as a through street and, when looking at the map, it looks like the school is located where Arrowhead connects to the neighborhood. She noted on the KMPO map the traffic is routed through Nez Perce without a connection into the neighborhood. Ms. Marienau explained with this analysis not all local roads are included and understands that in the staff report the city engineer noted, as this development progresses and each stage comes to the Planning Commission, additional traffic analysis will be done. She noted on the map a decrease in traffic where Appaloosa meets Atlas Road.

Commissioner Ingalls noted that we received comments from the City of Hayden who hopes we preserve the footprint of the Huetter Bypass. He asked if this project threatens the future Huetter Bypass. Ms. Marienau stated we can’t say this project will impact the Huetter Bypass and explained that the bypass is still being reviewed by KMPO/ITD who have had past discussions with the applicant. She added the main footprint with the Huetter Bypass would be within the vicinity of Poleline and Hanley where the first interchange would be located, with more work needing to be done.

Public testimony open.

Brad Marshall, Applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- He introduced various members of the Coeur Terre team.
- He stated that he has seen a lot of changes in this area through the years and can remember when Ramsey Road was a two-lane country road.
- He commented that Coeur Terre, when completed, will be similar to Coeur d’Alene Place spanning 20-30 years.

Melisa Wells, President of the Kootenai County Land Company, provided the following comments:

- She stated we are a local company with most of our members living in this area minus 3 and that most of our contractors, suppliers and consultants are local.
- She added that we have many active communities in our region and as an example, in Coeur d’Alene they are developing The Trail’s community north of the annexation area. As we develop
our communities, we will be focusing on collecting input from the community and incorporating
that feedback back into our design. She added we are mindful of the local working housing
shortages in our area and working to provide housing types that help address these needs.

• She commented that we have been working on this project for many years and started with many
conversations with Roy Armstrong and was selected by Mr. Armstrong for our vision for this
project.

Brad Marshall provided the following statements.

• He stated that staff did a great job with the staff report and with this request we are seeking
annexation/zoning. He explained that a large portion of the property is proposed to be zoned R-8
single family homes adjacent to the neighborhoods, R-17 denser housing, C-17 L for the well site
that will be dedicated to the city, C-17 will be 51 acres with design similar to what is in the
Riverstone area providing first floor retail commercial with second and third floor residential.

• He explained that we won’t be developing to the density within the various zones.

• He explained that we had been part of the past discussions on the Comprehensive Plan and how
the requested zones fit within the Comprehensive Plan.

• He explained that we had done stakeholder interviews, notified surrounding property owners with
a mailer, ads in the paper etc. and a voluntary public open house at the Kroc Center.

• He added this site has been within Coeur d’Alene’s Area of City Impact (ACI) boundary for 30
years.

• He explained that we have reviewed the staff report and agree with all the conditions.

• He discussed the economic benefit to the city that will supply future housing for current residents
and employees, providing schools, professional jobs, and expanded services.

• He stated that we are proposing two school sites elementary and middle school and have been
working with the Coeur d’Alene School District to try and get the middle school up and going as
soon as possible.

• He explained sales/property tax revenues will be provided to the city during the construction of
phases with an estimate that 4.5 million dollars sales tax will be generated from this project.

• He estimates that this project will invest 2.5 billion dollars into our community over the next 30
years to build out.

Connie Krueger, provided the following comments.

• She noted on a map the cities of the ACI area, Hayden, Coeur d’Alene and Post Falls, this is an
area in the early ‘90’s that engaged in a multi-agency process that requires per code to create
ACI impact and how they were formed. She added this property has been recognized by the city
for future annexation and planned for future growth in the newly adopted Comprehensive Plan.

• She stated that we began planning 10 years ago with the prior owner Mr. Armstrong.

• She explained in 2019 a third round of planning began to ensure that the various housing types
selected would be consistent with the Coeur d’Alene area and that Kootenai County Land
Company approached City Council requesting specific planning for this area to be included in the
current Comprehensive Plan update with the approval of the city to go forward.

• She stated this project is primarily a residential development with similar lot sizes, structures and
density’s similar to Coeur d’Alene Place.

• She explained that they met with stakeholders and held public open houses in May 2022 at the
Kroc Center that was attended by 65 people.

• She explained at the open house a lot of discussion was on lack of housing and the need to
provide local worker housing. She added we are working with Panhandle Affordable Housing
Alliance (PAHA) and are dedicating 5% of the housing for workforce housing.

• She stated another discussion was on the need for schools and when we met with the school
district, they located sites within the property that would be desirable for two new schools and
recently entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the school district to provide
those two schools.
Gabe Gallinger, Civil Engineer for Kootenai County Land Company, provided the following statements.

- He commented that parks and trails were the main topic at the public outreach stakeholder meeting. After hearing that, they met with staff to discuss where to locate these parks that would go with the Parks Master Plan. He explained from those discussions they decided that a 5.4-acre park will be located in the North Half of the project, A 12.3-acre community park located in the southern half of the project for a total of 18 acres of public park area and in addition will dedicate a significant amount of open space that will be maintained by the Home Owners Association (HOA).
- He noted a central corridor that will be running down the middle of the site providing a meandering pathway that connects the proposed school site and the two proposed public park areas with an off-street parking corridor providing great circulation through the center of the project.
- He added we will also provide private pocket parks through the neighborhood promoting high utilization due to the proximity to the homes.
- He commented we want to enhance the existing trail system and will add 4 miles of new trails that will be installed in common area landscaped tracts located around the perimeter of the project, north/south through the center and east/west through planned landscape corridors.
- He stated access to the project will be provided by two existing arterial streets Huetter Road on the west, Hanley Avenue to the north in addition three existing local stub streets to the east and one stub street to the south as required by staff.
- He explained we have met with staff to discuss the new streets in the development which included a plan modification reducing long straight corridors to discourage speeding while providing intersections, spacing and sizing to accommodate large emergency vehicles.
- He explained that KMPO conducted the traffic modeling for this project to gauge the local and regional impacts for future years 2035 and 2045. Impacts were analyzed with and without their project and with and without the Huetter Bypass. The results of the model illustrated that the project works in all scenarios modeled.
- He explained that this site has existing water on three sides north, south and east and existing water improvements within the project boundary with an existing water tank on the northeast corner of the project. He added that we met with staff and will dedicate the existing tank site including an additional site for another public well on the property.
- He added that Wastewater doesn’t have any issues and will connect to the existing system one on the north, east, and southeast corner will be able to extend the pipes with no lift stations proposed.

Brad Marshall provided a conclusion.

- The city has done an excellent job and that this site has been in the City’s ACI for 30 years.
- He stated we are only asking for annexation and zoning approval and agree with staff recommendations for conditions.
- He addressed a question asked earlier regarding the Annexation/Development agreement how the selected zones for the property won’t be changed and that we will be providing a map that illustrates the zoning with legal descriptions of those boundaries.
- He stated that we are working with PAHA and agree to dedicate 5% of housing areas to professional workforce housing.
- He is requesting that the Planning Commission approves this project.

Connie Krueger provided the following comments
• She explained within the application we have provided a pamphlet called “The Local Worker Housing Tool Kit” that is a list of a variety of ways on how to use the tool kit and will be working with PAHA and Maggie Lyons on Deed Restrictions.
• She stated that we haven’t determined specific housing types for this project but will be provided when this project is heard by the City Council.

Commissioner Mandel inquired about a timeline for the project. Ms. Kruegar stated that we have discussed timelines that haven’t been established yet.

Chairman Messina inquired about a land trust and other options that might be available. Ms. Kruegar stated that they have discussed a land trust looking at a model in Sandpoint plus others but haven’t committed yet with a desire by the owner to develop it himself and not sold to land trusts. She explained another factor is within 20 years housing needs will change and the owners needs/desires change and will want to keep it open and flexible.

Chairman Messina inquired about the timeline for this project and when homes will be available. Mr. Gallinger stated if this goes forward, we would start with the north 163 acres portion in 2023, start foundations in 2024, and have the first phase of homes move-in ready in 2025.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired about the five connections, one coming off of Hanley, one at Huetter, two going to the east, and one to the south. Mr. Gallinger explained that we will have a local connection to the south, one at Arrowhead, Nez Perce and Laurel.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired if a round-about will be proposed at Hanley Avenue or a signal at the Huetter intersection, and if that has been discussed with Post Falls Highway District. Mr. Gallinger explained that they are in development of The Trails Subdivision with the requirement from that subdivision to provide a connection of Hanley to Poleline, from its current terminus at Carrington as soon as they cross the Prairie Trail. It will be done with the next phase of The Trails subdivision. He added that we are currently working on a signal warrant analysis with our traffic engineer and if there is a need for a signal, they are required to pay for a portion of that signal based on traffic counts and modeling.

Commissioner Mandel inquired about the middle school and questioned how soon can the school district be able to construct that school. Mr. Gallinger explained once the school district owns the property, they have to go for a bond to get funding for the school which could take a year or more. He anticipated construction to begin on the school around the same time as Coeur Terre, in 2025.

Commissioner McCracken inquired about the greenspace buffer going along the east side. Mr. Gallinger explained when we first looked at the site there was an existing farming road around the perimeter of the site that has been used by many people as a trail. Within the project master plan, they wanted to preserve that perimeter trail. It will be 20 feet wide and provide a paved shared use access trail that will connect to the Prairie Trail. Commissioner McCracken inquired if Fire is able to service this area or will there be a need for a new fire station. Mr. Gallinger explained when they met with the Fire Department, they said this project wouldn’t require a new fire station.

Commissioner Ward inquired if the phasing will begin at the north end of the property. Mr. Gallinger explained the plan is to begin with the north 160 acres based on having an existing sewer connection that will serve the entire 160 acres. Commissioner Ward inquired if the same development company will build the entire project or will you be selling off parcels to other builders. Mr. Gallinger explained that the intent is for this developer to build the entire project.

The commission took a break at 5:30 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 6:00 p.m. with public testimony.

Commissioner Fleming inquired if staff knew where KMPO is with the Huetter/ Prairie and Myers/Prairie
traffic signals and questioned what would happen with the streets going into Indian Meadows where there are no curbs or sidewalks. Chris Bosley, City Engineer, answered that we will have to look at those sections when connections are proposed through the traffic study. He added we don’t know where all the connections will be and based on the construction of the road at the time and in 20 years the entire road may need to be reconstructed.

Commissioner McCracken explained that Arrowhead is a dead-end street with lots of people who walk in that area and have heard concerns what will happen to the neighborhood character if traffic is allowed to go through the property. Mr. Bosley answered that it’s too early to know where this project will begin.

Maggie Lyons, Executive Director for Panhandle Affordable Housing Alliance (PAHA), stated that the mission for PAHA includes trying to help our community resolve our current crisis for local worker housing. She added that Coeur Terre has made a commitment to the community to set aside a portion of this development for worker housing with the goal to build homes in a price range that our local workers can buy. She provided a Power Point that explained who can buy a home and who can’t. She stated that the housing crisis is real and to please approve this annexation.

Jeff Voeller, Director of Operations for the Coeur d’Alene School District, commented that this is the first time in 25 years the developer has reached out to the school district asking about our needs, which is appreciated. He added when we first met with the applicant, we let them know we are in need of a 20-acre site for a middle school and a 10-acre site for an elementary school. He added after numerous meetings with the applicant they came back with areas picked for these schools and appreciates this applicant listening to our needs and supports this project. He said the School District did enter into an MOU with the developer and asked the city to include the school sites MOU in the Development Agreement.

John Bruning, President of PAHA, represents the board members who are in support of this project. He addressed the 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan and stated that Goal 3 “Community Identity states “Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and low-income levels including young families, working class, low income and fixed income households” and Objective 3 states “will support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for affordable and workforce housing.” He added we need affordable housing and feels this applicant gets this and to please consider this request and to make sure the 5% designated for workforce housing stays in the proposal.

Don Webber explained that when they purchased their home more than 20 years ago, they chose the location for the quiet streets within a peaceful setting. He added that we support the new development but please protect our neighborhood. He explained that the earlier version of the plan showed no intent to use Arrowhead or Appaloosa Road for ingress/egress and now the new concept shows a different version of the plan that will impact our neighborhood by encouraging people to use our local streets for access to the property. He also suggested that the commission should consider R-8 and R-17 away from existing neighborhoods and R-1 next to large lots that are an acre in size.

Scott Krajack stated he spends a lot of time at Coeur d’Alene Place dropping off his kids to visit their friends and questioned why does every one live in Coeur d’Alene Place. When comparing this development with Coeur d’Alene Place, he said they are similar in that they are providing similar housing types. He added that in the future as his kids go off to college, he hopes they will be able to afford to move back and to please approve this request.

Suzanne Knutson lives in Indian Meadows and is concerned with the following things: Scope and Scale, the loss of agricultural buffer land that separates Coeur d’Alene, Post Falls and Spokane, and Impact of increased noise and traffic on established neighborhoods by connecting this development to the narrow quiet residential streets of the established neighborhoods. She cautioned to please use restraint in growth, so that the quality of life of existing residents won’t be impacted by this development.

Sharmon Schmit commented we are in favor of this development that will create a great community and to please protect the existing residents in Indian Meadows by denying traffic to go through this
Don Schmit stated he doesn’t want his street to change and to please protect this neighborhood.

T. Rahm commented about Idaho’s Monopolies and Trade Practice Act and according to Idaho’s Statues there are laws against persons who conspire to monopolize any area. She added these laws should apply to Lakeside Corporation that owns Coeur Terre property they are a private firm that has resources and influences over regional government and that this is a problem.

Nancy Barr stated she lives on Arrowhead Road adjacent to Coeur Terre. She explained that Indian Meadows was developed in the 60’s and 70’s designed with one acre lots. She stated that she is concerned with traffic going through this neighborhood.

Patrick Wilson lives on Arrowhead Road and stated this is a special place and by approving this development will destroy this neighborhood. He added this is unplanned development and before we go forward, we need to know what is going to happen with the Huetter Bypass.

Jason Arthur has concerns about the zoning and with R-17 in the northern part of the property will put a lot of traffic on Hanley and with the addition of a new middle school will increase traffic and feels a middle school isn’t needed in that area.

Roger Ruddich lives in Indian Meadows and was surprised this was going to happen. He stated that he has concerns with increased traffic and how the approval of this development will change this neighborhood.

Brett Haney stated that he submitted his comments in writing and has three concerns 1,000 acres 4,500 homes, and 10,000 people will be in this area on both sides of Huetter. He has concerns about the aquifer and the impact of so many people, and how many units will be available for affordable housing.

Greta Gissel commented will support the city for the need to provide affordable housing and as the new Executive Director for CDA 2030 that is engaging in a strategic planning session to rebrand as a regional community visioning group with the focus on housing. She mentioned the Regional Housing Growth Housing Issues Partnership (RHGIP) that was started with Kiki Miller, City Councilmember, with its successes and PAHA having developed deed restriction templates. She appreciates Coeur Terre for implementing the need for housing.

Dustin Ainsworth stated many people have relocated to northern Idaho with the need for smart growth and supports the Coeur Terre project.

Chairman Messina asked about water irrigation and noted in the packet water testing for the water in this area. Terry Pickel, Water Director, explained that the applicant is proposing a greenbelt including water features with two irrigation wells in the area that we can’t use. He added that within this development is a proposed new well site that we will be using those to supply water to the greenbelt that will take a load off of our future infrastructure. He answered the question about water testing and explained that we had issues further east and why we are proposing a new well located at the end of Nez Perce between Atlas/Huetter well that supplies 4000 gallons per minute and feels good by having another well north of the city that will not be for this development but will supply the northern part of the city. He predicts the new well will be in before there is full development with this project.

Commissioner Fleming inquired about the ground covering used in Atlas and questioned can we assume this is drier grass land where local plants should be used. Bill Greenwood, Parks and Recreation Director explained the use of blue grass is a good choice that is harder and will be working closely with Water to be using water saving measures. Commissioner Fleming commented that in this area it would be nice to have a community garden area. Mr. Greenwood stated that is a great idea and the city has been involved with a couple of those, but noted problems with the upkeep without having the support of the people to care for the garden or an HOA.
Rebuttal:

The applicant team requested a 5-minute break prior to the rebuttal. The commission granted a 5-minute break.

Brad Marshall made the following statements.

- He stated he heard a lot of great testimony and nobody was really opposed to this development.
- He explained development is a tough business with land costs, carrying costs with the property, construction costs etc.
- He addressed traffic impacts to Indian Meadows and noted the applicant team respects the neighborhood. He explained they won’t be getting to the south end of the development for many years. He added that there will be numerous subdivision applications coming forward and we will look at those access points and may find we may need them and maybe find that we can reduce some of those. He stated that we aren’t opposed to include that language in the Annexation/Development agreement.
- He stated that he feels that this development conforms to the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies and is asking for the Planning Commission for the recommendation to City Council for approval.

Mr. Marshall concluded his presentation.

Chairman Messina inquired about the development agreement with the addition of the proposed connectivity of the streets in the existing neighborhood and sympathizes with the neighbors that could be a great impact and questioned as the Development Agreement is developed and those sections are developed through the years can the connectivity to those existing neighborhoods be used only by emergency services. Ms. Patterson explained in the staff report under Streets/Engineering we have discussed future connections and can work with the applicant team to have the ability to evaluate those future phases and explained in our city ordinances we need connectivity and likely we will need some connections and may be able to do some mitigation and different ways to design.

Commissioner McCracken explained when we looked at the traffic study there weren’t any detailed maps showing the connectivity to the smaller neighborhoods and questioned can we require in the Annexation/Development agreement that a more detailed traffic study be required especially before the school sites are constructed. Ms. Patterson explained that we already have some language that we will be requiring traffic study with each of the future phases. Commissioner McCracken explained that she is more concerned with the Arrowhead connection since this one will be a “straight shot” to the school site.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that he has lived in this area for a long time and now lives in Coeur d’Alene Place which is considered a superior development. He explained the only short coming living in this area is there isn’t a lot of commercial opportunities and with this development he sees the potential of commercial mixed in that will be buffered from the neighborhoods. He stated that he supports this project that is well planned especially the open houses that were done, including the involvement of the school district where the developer asked them what they wanted in a school. He commented that he appreciates the agencies involved working towards the issue of housing shortage and the need for more housing.

Commissioner Ward explained the difference between developers and builders: a developer will buy 20 lots and build 20 homes and then move on to another area. That is called urban sprawl which isn’t consistent with the type of development we want. He explained when he first saw this proposal and looked at the plan he saw an issue with traffic, but realizes that will be evaluated as the project develops. He is surprised with the generosity of the applicant for the 5% given for affordable housing and will
Commissioner McCracken concurs and after hearing comments hopes that compatible commercial and affordable units will be incorporated. She is excited for the trail connectivity and the addition of two new schools, and will support this request.

Commissioner Fleming stated the annexation is brilliant and will be a valuable piece of property. She cautioned the industrial park is noisy and dirty. The recycling area is next to the property. She stated that the R-8 portion is large and suggested the applicant include R-5 so there is some compatibility with existing neighborhoods. She would like it if staff could show how many of these streets will be impacted with traffic and supports this project.

Commissioner Mandel concurs with the other commissioner’s comments and when first looking at this project thought, “it was “enormous”. Once we figured out what our role was and that Planning Commission will have more “bites” and opportunities to discuss the details, she felt more comfortable with the request. She wanted to thank the community for coming forward and participating in this process, and staff for the amount of work that went into this development, and supports this request.

Chairman Messina concurs and supports this project for the reasons stated earlier and for the applicant to please continue to work with the neighborhood and applauds their time.

**Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item**  Motion approved.

**ROLL CALL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Voted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Fleming</td>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ingalls</td>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Mandel</td>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner McCracken</td>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ward</td>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Messina</td>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

FROM: HILARY PATTERSON, COMMUNITY PLANNING DIRECTOR
      SEAN E. HOLM, SENIOR PLANNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 8, 2022

SUBJECT: ZC-2-22 A ZONE CHANGE REQUEST FROM R-3 TO R-8 ON A
          PARCEL MEASURING 0.914 ACRE

LOCATION: PROPERTY EAST OF HONEYSUCKLE DRIVE, WEST OF E.
          SHOREWOOD COURT, ON TIMBER LANE COMMONLY
          KNOWN AS 1095 E. TIMBER LANE IN GARDENALE ACRE
          TRACTS

APPLICANT / OWNER:
Richard & Susan Bennett
1095 E. Timber Lane
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815

DECISION POINT:
Richard & Susan Bennett are requesting a zone change of property within in city limits.
The request is to allow a change of zoning from R-3 (Residential at 3 units/acre) to R-8
(Residential at 8 units/acre).

AERIAL PHOTO (NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT):
AERIAL PHOTO (SITE CONTEXT):

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Richard and Susan Bennett are the owners of the property and applicant for the requested zone change. The applicant has indicated that they are requesting the R-8 zoning to make the use more compatible with the neighborhood land use. If the zone change is approved, the applicant is proposing to remove all structures, proceed with a minor subdivision to create two lots – a single-family lot and a duplex lot. The applicant’s narrative states that they would like to build a single-family home on a future lot 1 on the western half of the property and a duplex on a future lot 2 on the east side with a shop in the rear with access off of Violet Lane. The subject property has all utilities available on Timber Lane for proposed development. The current property has a frontage of 130 feet and the lot depth is 320 feet.

It should be noted, that all allowable uses would be permitted in the R-8 zoning district if the zone change is approved. This request is not a conditional zoning and the applicant/owner would not be limited to the one single-family home and duplex
with a shop that are indicated in the application. See page 18 for the list of currently allowable uses in the R-8 zoning district.

HISTORY:
The subject property was one of seven areas the City of Coeur d'Alene annexed into city limits in October of 1982 (hearing: ZC-7-82-A). This particular area was known as “AREA #7” which totaled 466+/- acres according to the staff report.

**Mailing Map for Annexation in Conjunction with Zoning (September 1982):**
Approximately two months later, a zone change application was received from sixteen neighbors totalling approximately 14.5 acres. At that time, the justification provided read as follow, “I and my surrounding neighbors would like to keep the area in question as a one family unit are we all have large wooded lots now. The two adjacent sub divisions, Forrest Park & Hoffman Estates are already R-3.” The request was approved for a down zone from R-8 to R-3 (hearing: ZC-14-82). The subject property was one of the down zoned parcels (highlighted below).

Mailing Map for Rezone Request (Commission hearing held February 1983):
PRIOR ZONE CHANGE REQUESTS:

Hearing Request City Council
ZC-14-82 R-8 to R-3 Approved
ZC-2-15 R-3 to R-8 Denied

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 city limits.
2. The City’s 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this parcel as Compact Neighborhood Place Type.
Place Types

Place Types represent the form of future development, as envisioned by the residents of Coeur d’Alene. These Place Types provide the policy-level guidance that will inform the City’s Development Ordinance. Each Place Type corresponds to multiple zoning districts that will provide a high-level of detail and regulatory guidance on items such as height, lot size, setbacks, adjacencies, and allowed uses.

Compact Neighborhood

Compact Neighborhood places are medium density residential areas located primarily in older locations of Coeur d’Alene where there is an established street grid with bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Development is typically single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, townhomes, green courts, and auto-courts. Supporting uses typically include neighborhood parks, recreation facilities, and parking areas.

Compatible Zoning: R-12 and R-17; MH-8; NC and CC
Transportation

Existing and Planned Bicycle Network:
Existing and Planned Walking Network:
Existing Transit Network:
Comprehensive Plan Policy Framework:

Community & Identity

**Goal CI 1:** Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.

**Objective CI 1.1:** Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

**Goal CI 3:** Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households.

**Objective CI 3.1:** Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing.

Growth & Development

**Goal GD 1:** Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.

**Objective GD 1.1:** Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

**Objective GD 1.5:** Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

**Goal GD 2:** Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.

**Objective GD 2.1:** Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

**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.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**STREETS:**

The subject property is bordered by Timber Lane to the south. No street improvements are necessary for this requested zone change. No development shall impede access to or through Violet Lane to property owners with legal access to use the roadway and those using the roadway as their sole access.
Violet Lane exists to the rear of the property as a private roadway that provides access to the subject property and surrounding properties. Instrument Number 823799 in Book 302 of Deeds at Page 852, records of Kootenai County, Idaho may outline the easement on Violet Lane as a roadway. It was recorded on October 26, 1979. However, City staff could not find the necessary easement documentation to verify that it is for this property or how many easements exist to provide allow through Violet Lane. Staff will condition any future approval of a subdivision to ensure access.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

WATER:
The subject property is served by Hoffman Water. The applicant inquired about having the City of Coeur d’Alene as the water provider. But a release from the water supplier and the Public Utilities Commission would be required, which is unlikely.

-Submitted by Terry Pickel, Water Superintendent

WASTEWATER:
This property is connected to the City sewer in Timber Ln. Appropriate sewer cap fees may be due at the time of building permit. In accordance with the 2013 Sewer Master Plan, the City’s Wastewater Utility presently has the wastewater system capacity and willingness to serve this Zone Change as proposed.

-Submitted by Larry Parsons, 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/IAAI - CFI

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 property has two single-family homes, detached garage/shop structures, and some mature trees. Both homes are accessed off of Timber Lane. The second home is mostly hidden from view by the detached garage structure and does not have direct access off of the street. There is adequate parking for the two existing
homes with the existing garage and driveways. There is an additional garage/shop structure on the rear of the property that is accessed off of Violet Lane. Violet Lane is not platted or dedicated in this location and is unimproved. The site is generally flat. The property is largely fenced around the perimeter. There are no topographical or other physical constraints that would make the subject property unsuitable for the request.

SITE PHOTOS:
Photo of Timber Ln. looking west near the southeast corner of the subject property with Timber Lane Estate Condos shown on the south side of the right-of-way:

Photo of Timber Ln. looking east near the southwest corner of the subject property:
Photo of Violet Ave. looking southwest near the northeast corner of the subject property:

Photo of Violet Ave. looking southwest showing access to the shop on the subject property:

**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 itself would not adversely affect the surrounding area with regard to traffic, as no traffic is generated from a zone change alone. However, the applicant states that the subject property will be divided into two lots with a single-family home and a duplex. The addition of the duplex is expected to generate less than six additional trips per day on Timber Lane. The Streets & Engineering Department has no objection to the proposed zone change.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:
The subject property is located in a residential area with large single-family residential lots and some detached pocket housing/cluster housing projects on the south side of Timber Lane to the east and west of the subject property. There are some duplexes to the west of the property off of Timber Lane, Violet Lane, and Honeysuckle Drive. Timber Lane is paved, but does not have curb, gutter or sidewalk. Violet Lane exists at the rear and across the subject property. It is unimproved and functions as a private roadway. There is also a gas line that runs through the subject property.

The Planning Commission recently approved the Honeysuckle Commons Planned Unit Development project to the northwest of the property off of Honeysuckle Drive and Margaret Avenue, with Violet Lane along the southern boundary of the project. The project is currently under construction.

The Church of the Nazarene is located west of the property off of Timber Lane and 4th Street. They have a ball field at the northwest corner of the property. A City-owned well site is near the property to the northeast of the roundabout on Margaret Avenue and 4th Street. The Kootenai County Fairgrounds are located on the northwest corner of Kathleen Avenue and 4th Street, extending west to Government Way and north to Dalton Avenue. Coeur d’Alene High School is located further north along 4th Street.
GENERALIZED LAND USE PATTERN:

ZONING:

Subject Property

Kootenai County
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Existing R-3 Zoning District:

17.05.010: GENERALLY:
A. The R-3 District is intended as a residential area that permits single-family detached housing at a density of three (3) units per gross acre (i.e., the density for an acre of unsubdivided land, regardless of where streets, etc., may or may not be located, will be calculated at a minimum of 3 units).
B. The gross acre calculation is intended to provide the subdivider flexibility, so when dedicating land for public use, the density may be made up elsewhere in the subdivision as long as the other site performance standards are met.
C. This district is intended for those areas of the City that are developed at this density because of factors such as vehicular access, topography, flood hazard and landslide hazard.
D. A maximum of two (2) dwelling units are allowed per lot provided the lot meets the minimum lot square footage for two (2) units and each dwelling unit meets the minimum yard (setback) requirements.

1. For the purposes of this section, the term "two (2) dwelling units" shall mean two (2) single family dwelling units or one single family dwelling unit and one accessory dwelling unit.

17.05.020: PERMITTED USES; PRINCIPAL:
Principal permitted uses in an R-3 District shall be as follows:
- Administrative
- Essential service (underground)
- "Home occupation", as defined in this title
- Neighborhood recreation
- Public recreation
- Single-family detached housing

17.05.030: PERMITTED USES; ACCESSORY:
Accessory permitted uses in an R-3 District shall be as follows:
- Accessory dwelling units
- Garage or carport (attached or detached)
- Private recreation facility (enclosed or unenclosed)

17.05.040: PERMITTED USES; SPECIAL USE PERMIT:
Permitted uses by special use permit in an R-3 District shall be as follows:
- Commercial film production
- Community assembly
- Community education
- Community organization
- Convenience sales
- Essential service (aboveground)
- Noncommercial kennel
- Religious assembly
Proposed R-8 Zoning District:

17.05.090: GENERALLY:

A. The R-8 District is intended as a residential area that permits a mix of housing types at a density not greater than eight (8) units per gross acre.

B. In this district a special use permit, as prescribed in section 17.09.205 of this title may be requested by neighborhood sponsor to restrict development for a specific area to single-family detached housing only at eight (8) units per gross acre. To constitute neighborhood sponsor, at least sixty six percent (66%) of the people who own at least sixty six percent (66%) of the property involved must be party to the request. The area of the request must be at least one and one-half (1 1/2) acres bounded by streets, alleys, rear lot lines, or other recognized boundary. Side lot lines may be used for the boundary only if it is also the rear lot line of the adjacent property.

C. Project review (see sections 17.07.305 through 17.07.330 of this title) is required for all subdivisions and for all residential, civic, commercial, service and industry uses, except residential uses for four (4) or fewer dwellings.

D. A maximum of two (2) dwelling units are allowed per lot provided the lot meets the minimum lot square footage for two (2) units and each dwelling unit meets the minimum yard (setback) requirements.

1. For the purposes of this section, the term "two (2) dwelling units" shall mean two (2) single family dwelling units, one single family dwelling unit and one accessory dwelling unit (ADU), or one duplex.

17.05.100: PERMITTED USES; PRINCIPAL:
Principal permitted uses in an R-8 District shall be as follows:

- Administrative
- Duplex housing
- Essential service (underground)
- "Home occupation", as defined in this title
- Neighborhood recreation
- Public recreation
- Single-family detached housing

17.05.110: PERMITTED USES; ACCESSORY:
Accessory permitted uses in an R-8 District shall be as follows:

- Accessory dwelling units
- Garage or carport
- Private recreation facility (enclosed or unenclosed)

17.05.120: PERMITTED USES; SPECIAL USE PERMIT:
Permitted uses by special use permit in an R-8 District shall be as follows:

- A two (2) unit per gross acre density increase
- Boarding house
- Childcare facility
- Commercial film production
- Community assembly
- Community education
- Community organization
- Convenience sales
- Essential service (aboveground)
- Group dwelling - detached housing
- Handicapped or minimal care facility
- Juvenile offenders facility
- Noncommercial kennel
- Religious assembly
- Restriction to single-family only
Approval of this zone change request in conjunction with a future subdivision could intensify the potential of the property by increasing the allowable density by right from R-3 to R-8. Theoretically, the following density would be allowed under each zoning district:

**R-3 (current zone):** 2 single-family homes or 1 single-family home with an ADU (the required lot size per dwelling unit is 11,500 square feet with a maximum of two units per parcel).

**R-8 (proposed zone):** If a short subdivision splitting the parcel in half is approved in the future, a total of four single-family homes (two per lot), or, two duplexes (one each per lot), would be allowed if the lots fronted on Timber Lane. Each unit would require 5,500 square feet regardless of construction type in R-8 (maximum of two units per parcel).

**Note:** Theoretical density allowed with R-8 zoning using total lot size divided by 5,500 square feet could allow 7 single-family units; however, each R-8 lot is required to have a minimum of 5,500 square feet and 50 feet of frontage on a public street. Remember, current code limits a maximum of two units per parcel unless zoning is at least R-17 or a PUD is approved. Due to the existing frontage limitation, only two lots could be created off of Timber Lane and meet the dimensional requirements. A public roadway would have to be built that extends into the property and lots would need to be subdivided to front the new public roadway. It is a diminishing return since the square footage of a public roadway would be removed from the density calculation. Additionally, an existing gas line easement would create challenges with setbacks and private utilities under this hypothetical scenario.

**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.

**ORDINANCES & STANDARDS USED FOR EVALUATION:**
- 2022-2042 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
- 2021 Parks Master Plan
- 2017 Trails and Bikeways Master Plan
PROPOSED CONDITIONS:
None.

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
ZONE CHANGE NARRATIVE

BENNETT PROPERTY
1095 E TIMBER LANE

ZONE CHANGE NARRATIVE FOR BENNETT PROPERTY 1095 E TIMBER LANE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Richard and Susan Bennett are requesting a re-zone of the subject parcel. The parcel is approximately 0.91 acres, located to the west of 15th and to the East of Honeysuckle Dr. The parcel is currently developed and zoned R-3. We are requesting an R-8 zoning in order to make the use more compatible with the neighborhood land use. The property currently has two single family homes, generally level, and contains a few mature trees. All utilities are available on Timber Lane for development of the property.

EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USE

The surrounding zoning consists of R-3, and R-8. Timber Lane to the east city boundary and to the west Honeysuckle Dr there are 5 single family homes, 3 duplexes, 3 mobile homes, 16 condo units and 7 apartment units.

Our property is almost entirely surrounded by R-8.
PROPOSED FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
All existing structures will be removed. Lot 2 “the one to the east” will have a duplex in the front of the property facing Timber Lane and a shop in the back of the property. Lot 1 “the one to the west” will have a single-family home in the front of the property facing Timber Lane.

Please see attached proposed Site map

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
This request provides for the development of the property in a manner consistent with abutting and surrounding higher density land uses. It is consistent with relevant goals in the Comprehensive plan, as outlined below.

GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT

Goal GD 1
Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live

Objective GD 1.1
Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

Action GD 1.1.C01
Address local worker housing needs by updating the Short-Term Rental Code and amending the Zoning Code and create standards to allow for additional types of housing in appropriate areas of the community, such as infill, live-work units, duplex, triplex, rowhouse, cottage cluster development and “Missing Middle” housing options, especially near services, transit, and employment centers.

Action GD 1.1.C02
Evaluate the existing infill overlay zoning district standards for neighborhood character to ensure that they are meeting city and neighborhood goals related to compatibility, historic context, and parking.
COMMUNITY & IDENTITY

Goal CI 3 Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households. OBJECTIVE CI 3.1 Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing

SINGLE FAMILY NEIGHBORHOOD

Places that are the lower density housing areas across Coeur d’Alene where most of the city’s residents live, primarily in single-family homes on larger lots. Supporting uses typically include neighborhood parks and recreation facilities. Compatible Zoning: R-1, R-3, R-5, and R-8; MH-8

Future Land Map

The Future land use is Compact Neighborhood
CONCLUSION
Based on the evaluation outlined above, the proposed re-zone is in keeping with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive plan. It would preserve the character of the existing neighborhood land use while facilitating development of affordable housing within walking distance of numerous businesses. For this reason, and those outlined above, we respectfully request approval of this request.

Respectfully submitted

Richard and Susan Bennett
108' x 30'
SINGLE FAMILY HOME

60' x 30'
DUPLEX

50' x 30'
SHOP

ADDRESS:
1095 E. TIMBERLANE
FROM: TAMI STROUD, ASSOCIATE PLANNER
DATE: NOVEMBER 8, 2022
SUBJECT: SP-3-22 – STORAGE AND WAREHOUSING SPECIAL USE PERMIT
LOCATION: A +/- .79 ACRE PARCEL ASSOCIATED WITH 601, 603 AND 609 E. BEST AVENUE, KNOWN AS TX #4558, TX #4559 AND TX #6155

APPLICANT/OWNER: RC Worst and Company Inc.
625 E. Best Avenue
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83814

ENGINEER/CONSULTANT: Olson Engineering
PO Box 1894
Post Falls, ID 83854

DECISION POINT:
Olson Engineering on behalf of RC Worst and Company Inc., are requesting a Warehouse/Storage Special Use Permit in the C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre) zoning district to allow for the expansion of their storage yard on a +/- 0.79-acre parcel.

LOCATION:
From the applicant’s Narrative:

RC Worst and Company is planning to expand their storage yard that is located on 609 E Best Avenue in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho. They also own the lots to the west of their existing storage yard: 601 and 603 E Best Avenue Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, which have been cleared in preparation for the storage yard expansion.

If the storage yard were located on the same property as the store, then it would be considered incidental to the principal use. The city is requiring the client to go through a Special Use Permit (SUP) process because their lots are separated by 6th Place, and therefore the storage yard cannot be considered as incidental. The current storage yard area on 609 Best Ave is considered a non-conforming use, and expansion of a non-conforming use can only happen through an SUP. Along with the SUP, the City is requiring that the lots be consolidated, which the client has agreed to conditioned upon SUP approval.
RC Worst is a plumbing supply company, and they are proposing to store related supplies and equipment in the storage yard such as pipes, pumps, and other related items. There are no proposed structures on this property other than the existing storage containers, which will be retained and moved to a different location on the lot. These containers will be used for storing equipment and supplies that require shelter from the elements.

The 2024 Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as “Retail Center/Corridor.” There are several businesses and shops located along Best Avenue. Expansion of RC Worst’s storage yard in this area is consistent with the future land use map. The area that is already being used as a storage yard has an existing approach off 6th Place. The west parcel has frontage along 6th Street where a new access is being proposed in alignment with the existing access off 6th Place. There are no proposed connections to water and sewer. However, there are water and sewer services existing onsite.

REQUIRED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS:

Finding #B8A: That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

2022-2042 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN- LAND USE CATEGORY:

- The subject property is within city limits.
- The City’s 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as Retail Center/Corridor Type.

Future Land Use Map (City Context):
Place Types

Place Types represent the form of future development, as envisioned by the residents of Coeur d’Alene. These Place Types provide the policy-level guidance that will inform the City’s Development Ordinance. Each Place Type corresponds to multiple zoning districts that will provide a high-level of detail and regulatory guidance on items such as height, lot size, setbacks, adjacencies, and allowed uses.
**Retail Center/Corridor**

Retail Center/Corridor Retail Center/Corridor places are primarily car-oriented destinations for retail, services, hotels and motels, and restaurants along major streets. These locations are often developed with large format retail uses with some infill commercial development, typically one to three stories. These places are typically not easily walkable and generally have limited civic or other public uses, but because they are often located along major arterials, they may be served by transit. **Compatible Zoning: C17 and C17L**
Transportation
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network:
Existing and Planned Walking Network:
Existing Transit Network:

[Map showing transit network with various routes and stops labeled.]
Comprehensive Plan Policy Framework:

**Community & Identity**

**Goal CI 1:** Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.

**Objective CI 1.1:** Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

**Goal CI 2:** Maintain a high quality of life for residents and businesses that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live and visit.

**Objective CI 2.1** Maintain the community’s friendly, welcoming atmosphere and its smalltown feel.

**Growth & Development**

**Goal GD 1:** Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.

**Objective GD 1.5:** Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

**Objective GD 1.6** Revitalize existing and create new business districts to promote opportunities for jobs, services, and housing, and ensure maximum economic development potential throughout the community.

**Goal GD 2:** Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.

**Objective GD 2.1:** Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

**Goal GD 5** Implement principles of environmental design in planning projects.

**Objective GD 5.1** Minimize glare, light trespass, and skyglow from outdoor lighting.

**Jobs & Economy**

**Goal JE 1:** Retain, grow, and attract businesses.

**Objective JE 1.2:** Foster a pro-business culture that supports economic growth.

**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 #B8B:** The design and planning of the site (is) (is not) compatible with the location, setting, and existing uses on adjacent properties.

The subject properties are owned by RC Worst and Company Inc. and located on Best Avenue. The proposed SUP request is comprised of three (3) lots: 601, 603 and 609 E. Best. 609 E. Best is currently being use as the existing storage yard for the RC Worst and Company plumbing business which is located directly to the east. 601 and 603 E. Best Avenue have been cleared in preparation for the yard expansion. The subject property is generally flat.
Land uses in the area are single-family residential uses to the north of the subject parcels, as well as single-family dwellings to the east and west. There are commercial uses (Lyle’s Enterprises) and a food truck court on the south side of Best Avenue along with other established commercial businesses. Bestland Senior Living Community (senior apartments) is located northwest of the subject property along Best Avenue.

**PROPOSED CONCEPT PLAN:**

The requested Storage and Warehousing Special Use Permit, as described below (Per Municipal Code Section 17.03.070), is requested in order to expand the storage yard use. This use is only allowed with the approval of a SUP in the C-17 zone. In addition, per the C-17/C17L Design Guidelines and Standards, a buffer yard will be required:

**Storage and Warehousing:** Activities that include the provision of warehousing, storage, freight handling, shipping, weighing, and trucking services; except for the storage of live animals. Typical activities include moving and storage services, public warehouses, trucking firms, and recycling centers.
17.06.830: BUFFER YARD REGULATIONS:

A. Definition: A "buffer yard" is a landscape area which serves to physically and/or visually separate land uses having incompatible facilities, activities, or differing intensities of use. For the purposes of buffer yard regulations, a display lot as defined in section 17.44.020 of this title shall not be construed to be a parking lot.

B. Applicability: A buffer yard is required as follows:

1. **When a commercial, civic, or manufacturing use abuts a residential use or a residential zone.**
2. Between a parking lot not associated with a residential activity, and a residential activity or a residential zone.
3. Where a parking lot abuts a public street right of way.
4. **To conceal outdoor storage areas**, trash receptacles, and exposed machinery associated with any commercial activity when adjacent to a residential activity or a public street right of way.
5. As established in subsection 17.44.250D of this title for loading berth adjacent to a residential activity or a residential zone.
6. For planting screen easements required by section 16.15.180 of this code.

C. Minimum Required: The following buffer yard is required according to the application above:

**Materials For Buffer Yards:**

1. All buffer yards shall be comprised of, but not limited to, a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees, shrubs, and ground cover in which evergreen plant materials comprise a minimum of seventy five percent (75%) of the total plant material used.
2. The required buffer yard shall result in an effective barrier within three (3) years and be maintained such that fifty percent (50%) or more of the vertical surface is closed and prevents the passage of vision through it, as determined by the planning department.

- The nature of any outdoor storage close to a street has visual impacts to the public rights-of-way and abutting neighborhoods. The applicant and the design team have been good to work with as this site has three street frontages, a portion of an alley, and an abutting residential use on the northeast corner of the subject property. They have been sensitive through their design to provide "green & growing" treatment as well as a sight occurring fence to soften the storage yard while retaining functionality of the business. A condition to buffer the use as proposed in the site plan (with Planning Director flexibility as highlighted on page 12) is included at the end of the staff report for Planning Commission review.

- Rather than just a site obscuring fence at the back of sidewalk (chain link w/ slats), the applicant and staff propose the following which will also handle stormwater onsite with an improvement to the appearance of the storage yard from the public ROW and neighboring properties:
F. Residential/Parking Lot Screening

Intent: To diminish the amount of asphalt and parked cars visible from the street and abutting residential by buffering it from less intensive uses.

1. Along any street frontage, parking lots shall be separated from the sidewalk by a planting strip, a minimum of 6 feet wide. This strip shall be planted with trees having a minimum caliper of 1.5” and equivalent in number to that produced by one tree every 35 feet. Not less than 20% of the trees shall be a native evergreen variety. However, trees may be grouped. In addition, there shall be evergreen shrubs at least 30” in height at time of planting, no less than 48” on center. A masonry wall, 24”- 42” in height, with ground cover, may be substituted for the shrubs. A combination of all of the above, i.e., trees, shrubs, wall and ground cover, are encouraged.

2. Where a site abuts a residential district, there shall be a planting strip, at least 10 feet in width containing evergreen trees along the area bordering the two districts. This strip shall be planted with trees 8 to 12 feet tall spaced no more than 25 feet apart. In addition, there shall be evergreen shrubs at least 30” in height at time of planting, no less than 48” on center as approved by the urban forester.

3. The Planning Director may approve other approaches to screening, so long as the intent is satisfied.
Zoning:

Generalized Land Use:
Natural Features & Adjoining Properties (5’ Contours in Green):

Site Photos:
Best Avenue looking south toward the subject property:
Looking northeast at the subject property from Best Avenue (comprised of 3 lots)

N. 6th Street looking toward the subject properties with the existing storage yard furthest away:
View of the existing storage yard looking north from Best Avenue:

View of the existing storage yard looking west from 6th Place:
Looking northwest at the single-family dwelling located directly behind the existing storage yard:

Looking west at the subject properties (2-lots) from Best Avenue:
View looking north from Best Avenue looking at the existing storage yard on the left and RC Worst plumbing company on the right:

RC Worst and Company plumbing business located east of the subject properties:
View looking south from the subject property at the food truck court:

View from the south side of Best Avenue looking north at Lyle’s Enterprises, a commercial business to the north of the subject property:
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the design and planning of the site is or is not compatible with the location, setting, and existing uses on adjacent properties. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.

**Finding #B8C:** The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development (will) (will not) be adequately served by existing streets, public facilities and services.

**WATER**
The Water Department has no comments or concerns with the requested Special Use Permit.

-Submitted by Terry Pickel, Water Superintendent

**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 with the corrections to the below conditions

-Submitted by Bobby Gonder, Fire Inspector/Investigator

**WASTEWATER**
This proposed Special Use is not showing connection to City sewer in the alley to the north.

Assessment:
The two (2) abandoned sewer laterals from 601 Best Avenue and 603 Best Ave must be abandoned at the City sewer main.
芦 Alley access must be maintained and sewer manholes to the north of the subject property need to be brought up to finish grade.

-Submitted by Larry Parsons, Utility Project Manager

**STORMWATER**
City Code requires stormwater to remain on site and for a stormwater management plan to be submitted and approved prior to any construction activity on the site.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**TRAFFIC**
Using the ITE Trip Generation Manual with Land Use Code 150 – Warehousing, it is estimated that the proposed 0.43-acre addition to the existing storage yard could generate approximately 23 trips per day. Due to the small sample size used to forecast traffic, ITE cautions to use care. With the east parcel already being used for storage, the additional area for storage is not expected to result in a substantial increase in traffic. And, with the business located across 6th
Place from the site, trips will likely be short with minimal impact to the traveling public. Streets and Engineering has no objections to the proposed SUP.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

STREETS
The subject property is bordered by Best Ave to the south, 6th Street to the west, and 6th Place to the east. Sidewalk will be required as shown in the application, and must be installed along the property frontage on Best Avenue and 6th Street. Any cracked and broken sidewalk shall be replaced.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development will or will not be adequately served by existing streets, public facilities and services. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Planning:
1. Per the C-17/C-17L Commercial Design Standards, the buffer yard requirements must be met as provided in the staff report, the site plan, provided flexibility may be necessary as allowed in SITE DESIGN F#3, “The Planning Director may approve other approaches to screening, so long as the intent is satisfied.” with the goal to:
   - Provide parking lot screening along all frontages with a minimum 6’ wide planting strip planted.
   - A 10’ wide planting strip shall be planted where the subject property abuts a residential district.
   - Buffer along the alley for additional screening for the residential uses to the north.
2. A Site Development Permit will be required to ensure the Buffer Yard Regulations have been met.
3. A lot consolidation will be required prior to issuance of a Site Development permit. A copy of the Lot Consolidation must be submitted at the time of Site Development permit submittal.

Engineering
4. Sidewalks must be installed along the property frontage on Best Avenue and 6th Street.
5. Curb ramp(s) must be installed on Best Avenue and 6th Place and brought into compliance with current City standards.
6. Existing curb ramp on Best Avenue and 6th Place must be brought into compliance with ADA standards.
Urban Forestry
7. Trees will be required to be planted in the public right of way abutting the entire street frontage abutting 6th place, 6th Street and Best Ave.
8. The proposed swale along Best Avenue can accommodate the required street trees within swale and a street tree easement shall be recorded.
9. All trees must be selected from the approved street tree list and spaced/planted per code.

Wastewater:
10. Alley access must be maintained and sewer manholes to the north of the subject property need to be brought up to finish grade.
11. The two (2) abandoned sewer laterals from 601 Best Avenue and 603 Best Avenue must be abandoned at the City sewer main.

*The Planning Commission may, as a condition of approval, establish reasonable requirements to mitigate any impacts that would adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood. Please be specific, when adding conditions to the motion.*

**ORDINANCES AND STANDARDS USED IN ASSESSMENT:**
- 2022-2042 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
- 2021 Parks Master Plan
- 2017 Trails and Bikeways Master Plan

**ACTION ALTERNATIVES:**
The Planning Commission must consider this request and make appropriate findings to approve, deny or deny without prejudice. The findings worksheet is attached.
APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE
RC WORST STORAGE YARD – SPECIAL USE PERMIT NARRATIVE

RC Worst and Company is planning to expand their storage yard that is located on 609 E Best Avenue in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho. They also own the lots to the west of their existing storage yard: 601 and 603 E Best Avenue Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, which have been cleared in preparation for the storage yard expansion. If the storage yard were located on the same property as the store, then it would be considered incidental to the principal use. The City is requiring the client to go through a Special Use Permit (SUP) process because their lots are separated by 6th Place, and therefore the storage yard cannot be considered as incidental. The current storage yard area on 609 Best Ave is considered a non-conforming use, and expansion of a non-conforming use can only happen through an SUP. Along with the SUP, the City is requiring that the lots be consolidated, which the client has agreed to conditioned upon SUP approval.

RC Worst is a plumbing supply company, and they are proposing to store related supplies and equipment in the storage yard such as pipes, pumps, and other related items. There are no proposed structures on this property other than the existing storage containers, which will be retained and moved to a different location on the lot. These containers will be used for storing equipment and supplies that require shelter from the elements.

The 2024 Comprehensive Plan identifies this area as “Retail Center/Corridor.” There are several businesses and shops located along Best Avenue. Expansion of RC Worst’s storage yard in this area is consistent with the future land use map. The area that is already being used as a storage yard has an existing approach off 6th Place. The west parcel has frontage along 6th Street where a new access is being proposed in alignment with the existing access off 6th Place. There are no proposed connections to water and sewer. However, there are water and sewer services existing onsite.
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

FROM: MIKE BEHARY, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 8, 2022

SUBJECT: PUD-3-19m1 MODIFICATION OF “THE UNION” PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT.

          S-4-19m1 MODIFICATION AND REPLAT OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT OF THE UNION PUD SUBDIVISION.

LOCATION: 0.67 ACRES LOCATED IMMEDIATELY EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF BEEBE BOULEVARD AND UNION DRIVE.

APPLICANT/OWNER:
Active West, LLC
PO BOX 3398
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83816

REPRESENTATIVE/ENGINEER:
HMH Engineering
3882 Schreiber Way, Suite 104
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815

DECISION POINT:
A proposed modification request is to allow Lot 24 of The Union PUD to split into 10 residential, and 1 mixed-use lot.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
In 2019 the applicant was approved for a residential and mixed use planned unit development (PUD). The 2019 PUD was originally approved on 3.6 acres that allowed 23 residential lots and one commercial mixed use lot to be known as “The Union” in the C-17 zoning district. The proposed modification request pertains to the commercial mixed use lot (Lot 24). The proposed modification request is to have Lot 24 of the Union split into 10 residential lots, and 1 mixed-use lot. This will add 11 dwelling units to the PUD and will reduce the commercial lot from 29,482 SF to 5,366 SF.

The proposed PUD amendment will use the existing public street that was approved in the original PUD in 2019. The lots will all have access off of Union Drive. The applicant has indicated that the proposed commercial mixed use development is proposed to be a three story structure. The first floor will consist of two entry lobby areas with elevators, garage space, and a shop/storage area. The second floor will be used for commercial use. The third floor will consist of one residential unit. All of the required parking for this mixed use will be provided on the commercial mixed use lot.

The 10 additional residential lots will have single family attached houses on them. Attached single family dwellings share a common wall with another home that is separated by a property line. The applicant has submitted building elevations of the proposed mixed use facility and the proposed residential dwellings. (See building elevations on pages 16 thru 18).
The applicant has also submitted a PUD site plan that shows the proposed site layout and the building locations on the proposed PUD. (See site plan on page 11). The applicant has indicated a five foot building setback from the side property lines for the residential lots, which will equate to a ten foot setback from structures, this is consistent with what was approved in the original PUD in 2019.

The open space requirement for a PUD is no less than 10% of the gross land area. The applicant’s proposed PUD modification won’t change the open space for the project. It will still have a total of 10% of the total gross land area dedicated toward public open space. The proposed open space is consistent with what was approved in the original PUD, with a total of three open spaces areas placed in separate locations across the whole PUD development.

One of the open space areas will be located at the northwest end of the property and is part of the mixed use development. This public open space area will be a patio area that can be accessed by the public directly off of Centennial Trail and off of Beebe Boulevard.

The second open space area is a 10 foot trail connection and grass area that will provide trail connectivity to Centennial Trail to the trail that access north to Riverstone. The third open space area is located on the southeast part of the property and can be accessed by the public directly off of Centennial Trail. This open space is proposed to have picnic tables, turf grass, box planters, native grasses with boulder and wildflower plantings. This public open space area will also have a public sidewalk connection to Lakewood Drive’s sidewalk to the north. (See Open Space Plans on Pages 20 & 21). These two public open space areas are currently under construction and close to completion.

The applicant has indicted that if the PUD modification is approved then site improvement and site infrastructure work would begin Spring 2023. The proposed PUD modification will increase the overall density from 7.2 units per acre to 9.4 units per acres which is less than the 17 units per acre that is allowed in the C-17 zoning district.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT MODIFICATION REQUESTS:

The applicant is requesting the following deviations from existing standards:

- Front Setback: 10’ rather than 20’ Same request as was approved in the original PUD
- Rear Setback: 8’ rather than 25’ Same request as was approved in the original PUD
- Side Yard Setback: 5’ and 5’ rather than the 5’ and 10’ as required for lots without alley access. Same request as was approved in the original PUD
- Unit Types: (Twin Homes) zero (0’) feet/shared wall rather than 5 feet. Same request as was approved in the original PUD
- Minimum Lot Area: 1,730 SF rather than 2,175 SF that was approved in the original PUD
- Minimum Lot Width/Frontage: 21’ rather than 27’ that was approved in the original PUD
- Right-of-Way width: 34’ rather than 55’ Same request as was approved in the original PUD
- Sidewalk on only one side of the street. Same request as was approved in the original PUD
• Minimum Building Height - Single Family and Duplex: 40’ rather than 32’. *This modification was not requested in the Original PUD*

• Mixed-Use Lot (Lot 35):
  o Rear Yard Setback 5’ rather than 8’ *that was approved in the original PUD*
  o Side Yard Setback 3’ rather than 5’ *that was approved in the original PUD*
AERIAL MAP:

BIRDS EYE AERIAL PHOTO:
PUD FINDINGS:

17.07.230: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW CRITERIA:

A planned unit development may be approved only if the proposal conforms to the following criteria, to the satisfaction of the commission:

REQUIRED FINDINGS (PUD):

Finding #B8A: The proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

2007 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN- LAND USE CATEGORIES:

- The subject property is within the existing city limits.
- The City Comprehensive Plan Map designates this “Place Type” as: Planned Development
- The subject property is located in the City’s Area of Impact

2042 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP:

[Image of the Comprehensive Plan Map showing the subject property]
**PLACE TYPE: Planned Development**

Planned Development places are locations that have completed the planned unit development application process. As part of that process, the City and the applicant have agreed to a determined set of complementary land uses that can include a number of Place Types. Planned development also often has a determined phasing and development plan and can include land uses such as housing, recreation, commercial centers, and industrial parks, all within one contained development or subdivision. Building design and scale, and transportation, public space and other elements are determined by the City of Coeur d’Alene’s PUD evaluation process.

**Transportation**
- Dependent on PUD approvals it large lots. Access should include pedestrian and bicycle facilities

**Typical Uses**
- Primary: Dependant on PUD approval agreements
- Secondary: Not applicable

**Building Types**
- Varies by PUD

**Compatible Zoning**
- Not applicable. Planned Development may occur within any Place Type (1.5 acre minimum).
2042 Comprehensive Goals and Objectives that apply:

**Community & Identity**

**Goal CI 1**
Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.

**OBJECTIVE CI 1.1**
Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

**Goal CI 3**
Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households.

**OBJECTIVE CI 3.1**
Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing.

**Environment & Recreation**

**Goal ER 1**
Preserve and enhance the beauty and health of Coeur d’Alene’s natural environment.

**OBJECTIVE ER 1.4**
Reduce water consumption for landscaping throughout the city.

**Goal ER 2**
Provide diverse recreation options.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.2**
Encourage publicly-owned and/or private recreation facilities for citizens of all ages. This includes sports fields and facilities (both outdoor and indoor), hiking and biking pathways, open space, passive recreation, and water access for people and motorized and non-motorized watercraft.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.3**
Encourage and maintain public access to mountains, natural areas, parks, and trails that are easily accessible by walking and biking.

**Growth & Development**

**Goal GD 1**
Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.

**OBJECTIVE GD 1.1**
Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

**OBJECTIVE GD 1.3**
P promote mixed use development and small-scale commercial uses to ensure that neighborhoods have services within walking and biking distance.
OBJECTIVE GD 1.5
Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

Goal GD 2
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.

OBJECTIVE GD 2.1
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

OBJECTIVE GD 2.2
Ensure that City and technology services meet the needs of the community.

Goal GD 3
Support the development of a multimodal transportation system for all users.

OBJECTIVE GD 3.1
Provide accessible, safe, and efficient traffic circulation for motorized, bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.

**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 #B8B:** The design and planning of the site (is) (is not) compatible with the location, setting, and existing uses on adjacent properties.

**LOCATION, SETTING, AND EXISTING USES:**
The site is relatively flat and is currently vacant. There are no topographical or other physical constraints that would make the subject property unsuitable for the proposed modification to the planned unit development.

There are existing residential uses to the south and southwest of the subject property. To the west are Centennial Trail and a parking lot. Centennial Trail is also located south and adjacent to the subject site. To the east are single family detached and single family attached houses that are part of The Union PUD project.
PUD SITE PLAN MAP:

PUD LOTS – Typical Lot Layout with Setbacks

MIXED-USE BUILDING PLAN

BUILDING PLAN 1

BUILDING PLAN 2

MIXED-USE LOT SETBACK DETAIL
SCALE 1" = 20'

RESIDENTIAL LOT SETBACK DETAIL
SCALE 1" = 20'

PUD-3-19m1 and S-4-19m1
November 8, 2022
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SITE PHOTO - 1: View from Beebe Blvd looking southeast.

SITE PHOTO - 2: View from Beebe Blvd looking northeast.
SITE PHOTO - 3: View from the intersection of Beebe Blvd and Union Drive looking southeast.

SITE PHOTO - 4: View from the central portion of property looking north.
SITE PHOTO - 5: View from the southeast corner of property looking northwest.

SITE PHOTO - 6: View from the central portion of property looking northwest.
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the design and planning of the site is compatible with the location, setting and existing uses on adjacent properties.

**Finding #B8C:** The proposal (is) (is not) compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties.

The subject property is relatively flat with Beebe Boulevard to the west. The natural features of the site are consistent with the natural features of the surrounding properties, including the residential subdivision to the south (Bellerive) and the commercial uses to the north. The following images reflect the proposed building elevations.

**APPLICANT’S MIXED USE BUILDING ELEVATION - 1:**
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal is compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties.

**Finding #B8D:** The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development (will) (will not) be adequately served by existing public facilities and services.

**STORMWATER:**
City Code requires a stormwater management plan to be submitted and approved prior to any construction activity on the site. Development of the subject property will require that all new storm drainage be retained on site. This issue will be addressed at the time of plan review and site development of the subject property.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer
STREETS:
The subject property is bordered by Beebe Boulevard to the west and Union Drive to the north. Both streets were developed to City standards and/or an approved PUD and no alterations will be required. However, the existing street width will not allow for on-street parking, potentially creating an enforcement issue or pushing overflow parking problems to other areas. Streets & Engineering has concerns over parking but has no objections to the proposed PUD.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

TRAFFIC:
With the addition of 10 residential units, 58 trips per day or 5 PM Peak Hour trips can be expected based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Use Code 230 – Residential Condominium/Townhouse. These trips would replace trips that would have been generated by the previously approved commercial property. Although traffic generated from the that commercial property could not be estimated at the time since the use had not been defined, it can be assumed that the proposed residential units will generate less traffic than the commercial space. The mixed use building proposed is not likely to generate a significant amount of traffic since it will likely be used as an office space due it’s second story location and modest size. The Streets & Engineering Department has no objection to the subdivision plat and planned unit development as proposed.

-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 PUD.

-Submitted by Terry Pickel, Water Department Director

WASTEWATER:
The Subject Property is within the City of Coeur d’Alene 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 PUD 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, turning radiuses, no parking-fire lanes, snow storage and gate access), 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 / IAAI – CFI
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development will be adequately served by existing public facilities and services.

**Finding #B8E:** The proposal (does) (does not) provide adequate private common open space area, as determined by the Commission, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and usable for open space and recreational purposes.

The applicant is proposing 10 percent (10%) open space that can be accessed by the public and residents of the proposed development. The proposed open space will consist of three public open space areas.

One of the open space areas will be located at the northwest end of the property and is part of the mixed use development. This public open space area will be a patio area that can be accessed by the public directly off of Centennial Trail and off of Beebe Boulevard.

The second open space area is a 10 foot trail connection and grass area that will provide trail connectivity to Centennial Trail to the trail that provides access northeast to Riverstone.

The third open space area is located on the southeast end of the property and can be accessed by the public directly off of Centennial Trail. This open space is proposed to have picnic tables, turf grass, box planters, native grasses with boulder and wildflower plantings. This public open space area will also have a public sidewalk connection to Lakewood Drive’s sidewalk to the northeast. These two public open space areas are currently under construction and close to completion.

**OPEN SPACE – SITE PLAN MAP:**
In February of 2016, the Planning Commission held a workshop to discuss and better define the intent, functionality, use, types, required improvements, and other components of open space that is part of Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects. The workshop discussion was necessary due to a number of requested PUD’s and the Planning Commission being asked to approve “usable” open space within a proposed development.

Per the Planning Commission Interpretation (Workshop Item I-1-16 Open Space) the below list outlines what qualifies as Open Space.

- ≥ 15 FT wide, landscaped, improved, irrigated, maintained, accessible, usable, and include amenities
- Passive and Active Parks (including dog parks)
- Community Gardens
- Natural ok if enhanced and in addition to 10% improved
- Local trails

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal provides adequate private common open space area, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and usable for open space and recreational purposes.

**Finding #B8F:** Off-street parking (does) (does not) provide parking sufficient for users of the development.

There was no request made to change the City’s off-street parking requirements through the PUD process. Single family homes would be required to provide two (2) off-street paved parking spaces per unit, which is consistent with code requirements for single-family residential. The mixed use development will meet all the off-street parking requirements for the proposed commercial and residential uses. The applicant will meet the minimum requirements for parking for the proposed PUD modification.

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the off-street parking provides parking sufficient for users of the development.
Finding #B8G: That the proposal (does) (does not) provide for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property.

Active West and the design team will work with the City of Coeur d'Alene legal department on all required language for the CC&Rs, Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws, and any language that will be required to be placed on the final subdivision plat in regard to maintenance of all private infrastructure.

From the applicant’s narrative:
The Union subdivision has incorporated CC&R’s which have placed the duty of maintaining the common area, landscape buffers, retaining walls, and any open space amenities on the Union Homeowners Association.

The developer will be responsible for the installation of any required street and traffic signage/signalization per MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices) and City of Coeur d'Alene standards and requirements. The HOA will be responsible for continued maintenance of all street and traffic signage and required signalization.

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal provides for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property.
SUBDIVISION FINDINGS:

REQUIRED FINDINGS (Subdivision):

Finding #B7A: That all of the general preliminary plat requirements (have) (have not) been met as attested to by the City Engineer.

Per Chris Bosley, City Engineer, the preliminary plat submitted contains all of the general preliminary plat elements required by the Municipal Code. Please note, the Planning Commission approved deviations to the Subdivision Code through the approval of the planned unit development for this project (PUD-3-19). Requested deviations from the Subdivision Code include:

- Reduction of required street width
- Sidewalk on ONLY one side of the street.

PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR “THE UNION”:

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not all of the general preliminary plat requirements have been met as attested to by the City Engineer.
Finding #B7B: That the provisions for sidewalks, streets, alleys, rights-of-way, easements, street lighting, fire protection, planting, drainage, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and utilities (are) (are not) adequate.

See staff’s comments above on pages 18 and 19.

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 #B7C: That the proposed preliminary plat (does) (does not) comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15) and all of the subdivision improvement standards (contained in chapter 16.40) requirements.

Per engineering review, for the purposes of the preliminary plat, both subdivision design standards (chapter 16.15) and improvement standards (chapter 16.40) have been vetted for compliance. Streets and Engineering has no objections to the proposed Subdivision.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the proposed preliminary plat does or does not comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15) and all of the subdivision improvement standards (contained in chapter 16.40) requirements. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.
Finding #B7D: The lots proposed in the preliminary plat (do) (do not) meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district.

The gross area of the subject property is 0.67 acres. The overall total number of single family attached units requested is 10 with one additional residential unit proposed as part of the mixed use development. The proposed subdivision will bring the total number of units over the whole development to 34 units. The result for the whole development is an overall density of 9.4 units per acre. The existing zoning is C-17, which allows a mix of housing types at a density of 17 units per acre. The existing zoning allows for a maximum of 61 units that could be built on the subject property. The proposed density is less than what is allowed under the current zoning district.

The proposed subdivision is in conformance with the modifications that were requested in PUD item PUD-3-19M.1 associated with this subdivision request.

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the lots proposed in the preliminary plat do or do not meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district.

APPLICABLE CODES AND POLICIES:
Utilities:
1. All proposed utilities within the project shall be installed underground.
2. All water and sewer facilities shall be designed and constructed to the requirements of the City of Coeur d'Alene. Improvement plans conforming to City guidelines shall be submitted and approved by the City Engineer prior to construction.
3. All water and sewer facilities servicing the project shall be installed and approved prior to issuance of building permits.
4. All required utility easements shall be dedicated on the final plat.

Streets:
5. All new streets shall be dedicated and constructed to City of Coeur d’Alene standards.
6. Street improvement plans conforming to City guidelines shall be submitted and approved by the City Engineer prior to construction.
7. All required street improvements shall be constructed prior to issuance of building permits.
8. An encroachment permit shall be obtained prior to any work being performed in the existing right-of-way.

Stormwater:
9. A stormwater management plan shall be submitted and approved prior to start of any construction. The plan shall conform to all requirements of the City.

Fire Protection:
10. Fire hydrant(s) shall be installed at all locations as determined by the City Fire
Inspectors.

General:
11. The final plat shall conform to the requirements of the City.
12. Prior to approval of the final plat, all required improvements must be installed and accepted by the City. The developer may enter into an agreement with the City guaranteeing installation of the improvements and shall provide security acceptable to the City in an amount equal to 150 percent of the cost of installation of the improvements as determined by the City Engineer. The agreement and security shall be approved by the City Council prior to recording the final plat.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Planning:
1. The incorporation of the newly created lots into the existing homeowners association will be required to ensure the perpetual maintenance of the open space and other common areas.

Water:
2. Any additional main extensions and/or fire hydrants and services will be the responsibility of the developer at their expense.
3. Any additional service will have cap fees due at building permits.

Wastewater:
4. Sewer Policy #719 requires a 20’ wide utility easement (30’ if shared with Public Water) to be dedicated to the City for all City sewers if private roadway.
5. An unobstructed City approved “all-weather” access shall be required over all City sewers.
6. This PUD shall be required to comply with Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to be assigned with a single (1) sewer connection.
7. Idaho Code §39-118 requires IDEQ or QLPE to review and approve public infrastructure plans for construction.
8. Cap any unused sewer laterals at the public main.
ORDINANCES & STANDARDS USED FOR EVALUATION:

- 2042 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 these two requests and make separate findings to approve, deny, or deny without prejudice.

Attachments:

Applicant’s Narrative
APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE
PROJECT NARRATIVE
FOR
“The Union” Subdivision
A Planned Unit Development
Amendment Request

October 2022

Project Overview

The Union is a Planned Unit Development located within Riverstone, in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho. The Union is zoned as C-17PUD. As previously approved, it consists of 23 residential lots, and 1 mixed use lot. An amendment to the initial PUD is requested. This amendment would include the split of Lot 24, defined in the Union Final Plat, into 10 residential lots, and one mixed-use lot. These residential lots would contain attached single-family dwellings as shown in the conceptual site plan. Attached single-family dwellings share a common wall with another home that is separated by a property line. The mixed-use building contains over 50% commercial space, with one residential dwelling unit. With these additions, the Union PUD would contain 34 dwelling units. The previously approved lot details and proposed deviations are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density*</td>
<td>7.2 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>2,175 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width/Frontage</td>
<td>27 FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C-17 zoning district allows a density up to 17 units per acre.

Residential Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Setback</th>
<th>10 FT, 20 FT to Garage</th>
<th>10 FT, 20 FT to Garage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>8 FT</td>
<td>8 FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>5 FT</td>
<td>5 FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Structure Max. Height</td>
<td>Single Family &amp; Duplex: 32 FT</td>
<td>Single Family &amp; Duplex: 40 FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixed-Use Lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Setback</th>
<th>10 FT</th>
<th>10 FT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>8 FT</td>
<td>5 FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>5 FT</td>
<td>3 FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Structure Max. Height</td>
<td>No Height Limit</td>
<td>No Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Utility Improvements

Utilities to the project have been provided by the following utility companies. AVISTA Utilities has extended gas and electric lines along the frontage of all Union lots. New services will be provided for the new lots.
The City of Coeur d’Alene serves the existing lots with public sanitary sewer and water services. For sanitary sewer to reach the new lots, the 8 in. sewer main will need to be extended approximately 70 ft., and a new manhole constructed. There is an existing 12” water main that runs through the length of The Union PUD, which had previously been constructed as part of the Union PUD improvements. Each proposed lot with the amended PUD will have sewer and water services that are proposed, or are existing that will be adjusted to serve them.

Adequate stormwater storage for Union Dr. has already been put in place, with swales and a drywell located at the corner of Union Dr. and Beebe Blvd. No proposed improvements will create additional impervious area within the public right-of-way, therefore providing additional stormwater storage/treatment storage will be unnecessary. All proposed lot development will be responsible for stormwater controls at the time each individual lot is developed.

**Common Space Ownership & Management**

The Union subdivision has incorporated CC&R’s which have placed the duty of maintaining the common area, landscape buffers, retaining walls, and any open space amenities on The Union Homeowners Association.

The developer will be responsible for the installation of any further required street and traffic signage/signalization per MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices) and City of Coeur d’Alene standards and requirements. The HOA will continue to be responsible for the maintenance of all street and traffic signage and required signalization.

**Open Space Requirements**

The Union contains three open space tracts – Existing Tracts A & B, and a proposed Tract E. No changes are requested within Tracts A & B. Tract A contains a public picnic area surrounded by turf and landscaping, as well as a trail connection to the Centennial Trail. Tract B also contains a connection to the Centennial trail, as well as landscaping. The proposed Tract E open space will include patio area that can be accessed by the public directly off the Centennial Trail, Union Dr., and Beebe Blvd. The open space will include outdoor seating, colored concrete patio space, and landscaping. Landscaping throughout the Union PUD includes street trees, lawn, and planting areas in all community areas as well as individual home site landscaping.

The development will contain all open space as was required during the initial PUD approval. The Union PUD contains no less than 10% of the gross land area of 3.6 acres (156,816 SF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Required Open Space: 15,682 SF</td>
<td>Total Open Space Provided: 15,682 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract A: 11,722 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract B: 1,523 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Tract E: 2,437 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary Development Schedule**

It is anticipated that the site improvement and site infrastructure work will begin Spring 2023 and continue through Summer 2023.
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

FROM: MIKE BEHARY, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

DATE: NOVEMBER 8, 2022

SUBJECT: PUD-4-22: A RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD)
TO BE KNOWN AS “BIRKDALE COMMONS PUD”

S-3-22: A 10 LOT, TWO TRACT PRELIMINARY PLAT REQUEST FOR
“BIRKDALE COMMONS”

LOCATION: 1.6 ACRE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3525 N 15TH STREET

APPLICANT: 15th Street Investments, LLC
PO BOX 949
Hayden, ID 83835

ENGINEER: Lake City Engineering
126 Poplar Avenue
Coeur d’Alene, ID 83815

DECISION POINT:
The applicant is requesting approval of the following two decision points that will require separate
findings to be made for each item.

1. A residential planned unit development (PUD) that will allow for 10 lots and two tracts with
the following modifications.
   a. Lots fronting on a private street rather than a public street.
   b. Minimum Lot Width of 35’ rather than 50’ as required.
   c. Minimum Lot Area of 2,810 SF for a single family dwelling lot rather than 5,500 SF.
   d. Minimum Lot Area of 4,125 SF for a duplex lot rather than 7,000 SF.
   e. Front Setback of 15’ rather than 20’ (dwelling unit).
      (Garages required to maintain the 20’ setback for parking)
   f. Side Setback (interior) of 5’ rather than 5’ on one side and 10’ on the other.
   g. Street Side Setback of 5’ rather than 10’
   h. Rear Setback of 15’ rather than 25’
   i. Sidewalk on one side of street rather than sidewalks on both sides of street.

2. A 10 lot, two tract preliminary plat to be known as Birkdale Commons.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
The subject property along with the adjacent parcel to the south was annexed into the City in May of this year in item A-3-22. At the time of the annexation request, both parcels were intending to be part of a future residential planned unit development (PUD). However, since then, the southern adjacent parcel is no longer intending to be part of PUD with the subject site.

Currently the subject property has a single family dwelling and several out buildings located on it. The subject site is 1.6 acres in area and is relatively flat. The site is adjacent to 15th Street along its east property line. The property is currently zoned R-12.

The PUD will consist of 10 lots, one open space tract, and one tract that will contain the private road. The applicant has indicated that the 9 lots are designed for duplex units and one lot for a single family dwelling (see proposed building elevations on page 16). The 10 proposed buildable lots will have access to a private road within the development and the private road will have a single access connection to 15th Street (see PUD Site Plan on page 10).

The applicant is proposing 10.6 percent of public open space that will be located in one tract. The open space amenities will include a park bench, picnic table, barbecue, and a fenced in dog run with a pet waste supply station (see Open Space map and images on pages 20 -21). The applicant has indicated that the open space area will be landscaped and maintained by the HOA.

The applicant has indicated that this project will be completed in one phase with construction beginning in spring of 2023. See the attached Narrative by the applicant at the end of this report for a complete overview of their PUD and subdivision request (Attachment).

PROPERTY LOCATION MAP:
PUD-4-22: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FINDINGS:

17.07.230: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW CRITERIA:
A planned unit development may be approved only if the proposal conforms to the following criteria, to the satisfaction of the commission:

REQUIRED FINDINGS (PUD):

Finding #B8A: The proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

2042 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE:

- The subject property is within the existing city limits.
- The City’s Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property within the Compact Neighborhood place type.

2042 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE MAP:
2042 Comprehensive Plan Place Types:
The Place Types in this plan represent the form of future development, as envisioned by the residents of Coeur d’Alene. These Place Types will in turn provide the policy level guidance that will inform the City’s Development Ordinance. Each Place Type corresponds to multiple zoning districts that will provide a high-level of detail and regulatory guidance on items such as height, lot size, setbacks, adjacencies, and allowed use.

Place Type -1: Compact Neighborhood
Compact Neighborhood places are medium density residential areas located primarily in older locations of Coeur d’Alene where there is an established street grid with bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Development is typically single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, townhomes, green courts, and auto-courts. Supporting uses typically include neighborhood parks, recreation facilities, and parking areas.

Compatible Zoning Districts within the “Compact Neighborhood” Place Type:
- R-12, R-17, MH-8, NC and CC Zoning Districts.

Key Characteristics of “Compact Neighborhood” Place Type:

- **Compact Neighborhood**
  - Places are medium density residential areas located primarily in older locations of Coeur d’Alene where there is an established street grid with bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
  - Development is typically single-family, duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, townhomes, green courts, and auto-courts.
  - Supporting uses typically include neighborhood parks, recreation facilities, and parking areas.

- **Transportation**
  - Gridded street pattern with pedestrian and bicycle facilities

- **Typical Uses**
  - Primary: Single and mixed residential
  - Secondary: Neighborhood parks and recreation facilities, parking

- **Building Types**
  - Single-family, duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, townhomes, green courts, and auto-courts

- **Compatible Zoning**
  - R-12 and R-17: MH-8: NC and CC
2042 Comprehensive Goals and Objectives that apply:

**Community & Identity**

Goal CI 1
Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.

**OBJECTIVE CI 1.1**
Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

Goal CI 3
Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households.

**OBJECTIVE CI 3.1**
Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing.

**Environment & Recreation**

Goal ER 1
Preserve and enhance the beauty and health of Coeur d’Alene’s natural environment.

**OBJECTIVE ER 1.4**
Reduce water consumption for landscaping throughout the city.

Goal ER 2
Provide diverse recreation options.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.2**
Encourage publicly-owned and/or private recreation facilities for citizens of all ages. This includes sports fields and facilities (both outdoor and indoor), hiking and biking pathways, open space, passive recreation, and water access for people and motorized and non-motorized watercraft.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.3**
Encourage and maintain public access to mountains, natural areas, parks, and trails that are easily accessible by walking and biking.
**Growth & Development**

**Goal GD 1**
Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.

**OBJECTIVE GD 1.1**
Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

**OBJECTIVE GD 1.3**
Promote mixed use development and small-scale commercial uses to ensure that neighborhoods have services within walking and biking distance.

**OBJECTIVE GD 1.5**
Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

**Goal GD 2**
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.

**OBJECTIVE GD 2.1**
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

**OBJECTIVE GD 2.2**
Ensure that City and technology services meet the needs of the community.

**Goal GD 3**
Support the development of a multimodal transportation system for all users.

**OBJECTIVE GD 3.1**
Provide accessible, safe, and efficient traffic circulation for motorized, bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.

**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 #B8B: The design and planning of the site (is) (is not) compatible with the location, setting, and existing uses on adjacent properties.

LOCATION, SETTING, AND EXISTING USES:
The site is generally flat and the western portion of the lot is covered with trees. There is a single-family dwelling on the subject site. To the east are multi-family apartments and duplex housing units. To the south are four multi-family units as well as single family dwellings. To the west are single family dwellings. There are existing residential uses that surround the subject site on all sides.

There are no topographical or other physical constraints that would make the subject property unsuitable for the proposed planned unit development.

PUD SITE PLAN MAP:
SETBACKS PROPOSED:

PROPOSED LOT SETBACKS
SCALE 1" = 20'

GENERALIZED LAND USE MAP:

Subject Property
EXISTING ZONING:

SITE PHOTO - 1: View from the eastern part of property looking northwest.
SITE PHOTO - 2: View from the driveway entrance of property looking north along 15th Street.

SITE PHOTO - 3: View from the central part of property looking southwest.
SITE PHOTO - 4: View from the central part of property looking west.

SITE PHOTO - 5: View from the central part of property looking north.
Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the design and planning of the site is compatible with the location, setting and existing uses on adjacent properties.

Finding #B8C: The proposal (is) (is not) compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties.

The property is flat and a multitude of residential housing types that are located within the vicinity of the subject site. The surrounding properties that contain residential uses are also relatively flat. The natural features of the site are consistent with the natural features of the surrounding properties, including the residential subdivision to the west and east. The following images reflect the proposed building elevations of the duplex residential homes.
APPLICANT’S BUILDING ELEVATION – 1 (duplex residential): Front Elevation

APPLICANT’S BUILDING ELEVATION – 1 (duplex residential): Rear Elevation
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal is compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties.

**Finding #B8D:** The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development (will) (will not) be adequately served by existing public facilities and services.

**STORMWATER:**
Stormwater will be addressed with project development. All stormwater must be contained on-site. A stormwater management plan, conforming to all requirements of the City, shall be submitted and approved prior to the start of any construction.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**STREETS:**
The site has frontage on 15th Street. Any necessary improvements to the frontages, including the required addition of sidewalk, would be addressed during construction. Ten feet of right-of-way along 15th Street shall be deeded to the City. The narrow streets, limited on-street parking, and limited snow storage areas, and long drainage route (which equals deeper flow) for stormwater are expected to cause complaints for future residents. However, since the streets are proposed to be private, the impacts will likely be isolated to the residents.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**Private Roadway Section:**

![Diagram of Birkdale Lane Private Road Section](image)

**BIRKDALE LANE PRIVATE ROAD SECTION**

NOT TO SCALE

**DRIVEWAY 20' MINIMUM LENGTH**
TRAFFIC:
As noted above, the subject property is bordered by 15th Street, which is a major collector street. Traffic from the proposed residential development is estimated to generate approximately 13 AM peak hour and 15 PM peak hour trips per day. The estimated traffic was derived from Land Use Code 231 – Low-Rise Residential Condominium/Townhouse in the ITE Trip Generation Manual. 2018 traffic counts indicate 15th Street experiences an average of 770 PM peak hour trips. The Streets and Engineering Department is concerned that if each of the comparable, neighboring four lots are developed similar to this proposed development, traffic would be impacted by a series of five closely spaced intersections serving dead-end streets. Additionally, the proposed street located at the north property line may cause left turn conflicts with the approach to Canfield Estates.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

WATER:
There is adequate capacity in the public water system to provide adequate domestic service, irrigation, and fire flow service to the subject parcel.

-Submitted by Terry Pickel, Water Department Director

WASTEWATER:
1. Sewer Policy #719 requires an “All-Weather” surface permitting unobstructed O&M access to the public sewer.
2. Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to be assigned with a single (1) public sewer connection.
3. Idaho Code §39-118 requires IDEQ or QLPE to review and approve public infrastructure plans for construction.
4. Sewer Policy #719 requires a 20’ wide utility easement (30’ if shared with Public Water) to be dedicated to the City for all public sewers.
5. Cap any unused sewer laterals at the public main.

-Submitted by Larry Parsons, 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. The Fire Department has no objection to the proposed annexation and development.

-Submitted by Bobby Gonder, Fire Inspector / MIAAI – CFI
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development will be adequately served by existing public facilities and services.

**Finding #B8E:** The proposal (does) (does not) provide adequate private common open space area, as determined by the Commission, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and usable for open space and recreational purposes.

The applicant is proposing 10.6% open space. The applicant has indicated that the open space will be located on one tract located at the west end of the proposed PUD (See open space exhibits on pages 20-21). Below is an exert from the applicant’s narrative in regards to the proposed open space.

“This area will contain a patio with a picnic table and BBQ, thus providing an opportunity for gatherings, picnics and outdoor recreation as well as promote a sense of neighborhood. We will also provide a walking trail and a fenced dog run as we know this is a popular feature in other similar projects. This open space will be landscaped and maintained by the HOA to provide continuity with other landscape elements within Birkdale Commons”.
OPEN SPACE – 2: Fenced Dog Run with a pet waste supplies station.

OPEN SPACE – 3: Bench and Picnic Table with Barbeque Grill.
In February of 2016, the Planning Commission held a workshop to discuss and better define the intent, functionality, use, types, required improvements, and other components of open space that is part of Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects. The workshop discussion was necessary due to a number of requested PUD’s and the Planning Commission being asked to approve “usable” open space within a proposed development.

Per the Planning Commission Interpretation (Workshop Item I-1-16 Open Space) the below list outlines what qualifies as Open Space.

- ≥ 15 FT wide, landscaped, improved, irrigated, maintained, accessible, usable, and include amenities
- Passive and Active Parks (including dog parks)
- Community Gardens
- Natural ok if enhanced and in addition to 10% improved
- Local trails

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal provides adequate private common open space area, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and usable for open space and recreational purposes.

**Finding #B8F:** Off-street parking (does) (does not) provide parking sufficient for users of the development.

There was no request made to change the City’s off-street parking requirements through the PUD process. Single family and duplex homes would be required to provide two (2) off-street paved parking spaces per unit, which is consistent with code requirements for single-family and duplex residential. Due to the narrow width of the private road, there will be limited on-street parking. The single-family home appears to provide four parking spaces, two in the garage and two in the driveway. The proposed duplexes appear to have a 1-car garage and one parking space in the driveway in front of the garage. Parking may be an issue if there are any private events in the neighborhood, as the on-street parking is limited and 15th Street does not have on-street parking.

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the off-street parking provides parking sufficient for users of the development.
Finding #B8G: That the proposal (does) (does not) provide for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property.

The applicant/owner and their design team will be required to work with the City of Coeur d'Alene legal department on all required language for the CC&Rs, Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and any language that will be required to be placed on the final subdivision plat in regard to maintenance of all private infrastructure.

The HOA will be responsible for continued maintenance of the private infrastructure, roads, and all open space areas that serve the residential lots of this PUD.

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the proposal provides for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property.
REQUIRED FINDINGS (Subdivision):

**Finding #B7A:** That all of the general preliminary plat requirements (have) (have not) been met as attested to by the City Engineer.

The preliminary plans submitted contains all of the general preliminary plat elements required by the Municipal Code.

- Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not all of the general preliminary plat requirements have been met as attested to by the City Engineer.
Finding #B7B: That the provisions for sidewalks, streets, alleys, rights-of-way, easements, street lighting, fire protection, planting, drainage, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and utilities (are) (are not) adequate.

See staff comments which can be found above in PUD Finding B8D (pages 17-18).

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 #B7C: That the proposed preliminary plat (does) (does not) comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15) and all of the subdivision improvement standards (contained in chapter 16.40) requirements.

Per engineering review, for the purposes of the preliminary plans, both subdivision design standards (Chapter 16.15) and improvement standards (Chapter 16.40) have been vetted for compliance.

-Submitted by Chris Bosley, City Engineer

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether the proposed preliminary plat does or does not comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15) and all of the subdivision improvement standards (contained in chapter 16.40) requirements. Specific ways in which the policy is or is not supported by this request should be stated in the finding.

Finding #B7D: The lots proposed in the preliminary plat (do) (do not) meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district.

The R-12 zoning district requires that each lot have a minimum of 5,500 square feet of area for a single family dwelling unit and 7,000 SF minimum lot area for duplex housing. The proposed lots range from 2,812 SF to 4,943 SF in area. The minimum lot frontage for R-12 lots is 50 feet and the applicant is requesting 35 feet. The applicant has requested the reductions in lot area and lot width to allow duplex and single family housing units on these lots through the PUD process.
The subject property is 1.61 acres and the R-12 zoning district would allow up to a maximum of 19 units on this site. The applicant is proposing 19 dwelling units on 10 lots. The R-12 zoning district allows for a maximum density of 12 units per acre and this development proposed at a density of 11.8 units per acre. The proposed density is less than what is allowed under the current zoning district.

The proposed subdivision is in conformance with the requested modifications that were approved in item PUD-3-19.

**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, whether or not the lots proposed in the preliminary plat do or do not meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district.

**ORDINANCES & STANDARDS USED FOR EVALUATION:**

- 2042 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
- 2018 Coeur d'Alene Trails Master Plan

**PUD AND SUBDIVISION CONDITIONS:**

1. The creation of a homeowner’s association will be required to ensure the perpetual maintenance of the open space, all other common areas, stormwater maintenance and snow removal.

2. The applicant’s requests for subdivision, and PUD run concurrently. The subdivision and PUD designs are reliant upon one another. Additionally, approval of the requested PUD is only valid once the Final Development Plan has been approved by the Planning Department.

3. The Open Space must be installed and completed prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. The open space areas shall be consistent with this approval and include the same or better amenities and features.
4. Since annexation has occurred, the designated parcel is eligible for a water main extension. A single service currently exists for the proposed lot #1 which will not require cap fees. All other lots will require individual services with cap fees due at time of building permits. As this will be a private street, a 20’ public utility easement centered on the water main, (30’ if combined with public sewer), must be granted where no permanent structures such as building footings, car ports or garages are allowed. All improvements will be at the developer’s expense and will be conveyed to the City upon final acceptance. Applicable fire hydrants must be operational prior to granting building permits.

5. An unobstructed City approved “all-weather” access shall be required over all public sewers.

6. All public sewer plans require IDEQ or QLPE Approval prior to construction.

7. Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to individually connect and discharge into (1) public sewer connection.

8. A utility easement for the public sewer shall be dedicated to the City prior to building permits.

9. Public sewer shall be run to and through this project and installed to all city specifications and standards.

10. A public access easement shall be granted to allow the dead-end road/fire turnaround to the south to be extended in the future, if the lot to the south desires to develop.

**ACTION ALTERNATIVES:**

Planning Commission will need to consider these three requests and make separate findings to approve, deny or deny without prejudice. The findings worksheet is attached.

**Attachment:** Applicant’s Narrative
APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE
PROJECT SUMMARY

*Birkdale Commons* is a proposal for 10 residential lots situated on the West side of 15th Street, 0.1 miles North of Lunceford Lane. A Subdivision and Planned Unit Development Application is submitted herewith. The subject property has been approved for annexation into the City of Coeur d’Alene and lies within the northeast quarter of Section 25, Township 51 North, Range 5 West, Boise Meridian, Kootenai County, Idaho. An Annexation application and package has been submitted concurrently with the Subdivision and Planned Unit Development Applications.

SUBJECT PROPERTY

The property under consideration is as follows:

- **Parcel #s:** 50N04W-01-2270
- **AINs:** 135371
- **Total Area:** 1.61 acres

*Figure 1: Vicinity Map – Annexation Boundary*
LAND USE

The subject property has recently been annexed into the City of Coeur d’Alene, and zoned as R-12. As recommended by the City Planning Staff, a Planned Unit Development application is being concurrently submitted with this Subdivision.

The new Land Use and Design document associated with the Envision Coeur d’Alene Comprehensive Plan Update through 2040 designates this parcel as Compact Neighborhood. The proposed uses for the subject property are consistent with the surrounding nearby medium-density residential uses and will provide much-needed additional housing options for existing and incoming residents to the City of Coeur d’Alene, including worker housing. A brief summary of the project and the proposed design deviations is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning:</th>
<th>R-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Designation:</td>
<td>Residential – Compact Neighborhood &amp; Mixed-Use Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area:</td>
<td>1.61 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Lots:</td>
<td>10 lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density:</td>
<td>11.8 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Lot Size:</td>
<td>+/- 4,163 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-12 Setback or Provision</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>35’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>5,500 sf /7,000 sf</td>
<td>2,860 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>15’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback (interior)</td>
<td>5’ / 10’</td>
<td>5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanking Setback</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>15’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Setback</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>20’ driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Height</td>
<td>32’</td>
<td>32’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the proposed residential lots is designed to allow for a duplex to be constructed, with the exception of proposed Lot 9. This lot is designed for a cottage style single-family home. Preliminary architectural plans and elevations for the duplexes are contained within this submittal as Appendix A, however the owner reserves the right to make changes to the proposed building plans. Below, shown as Figure 2, are depictions of the proposed setbacks and duplexes.
PRE-DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS

The subject parcel currently contains a residence and several outbuildings (see Figure 1 above). As part of the development process, all structures on the subject parcel will be removed. The topography is flat, and there are no topographical constraints to develop the property as proposed. The western portion of the property contains several deciduous trees and native grasses.

POST-DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS

The following are the proposed subdivision parameters related to Birkdale Commons:

- Total # of Lots: 10 Residential Lots (19 units)
- Min Lot Size (net): 2,812 SF
- Max Lot Size (net): 4,943 SF
- Project Area: 1.61 ac
- Developable Area: 1.58 ac
- Open Space: 8,859 SF (Tract A) (12.8%)
- Swale Area: 1,520 sf
- Open Space (Net): 7,339 sf (10.6%)
- Private Road Tract: 18,733 SF (Tract B)

Figure 3 below shows the proposed Subdivision.
The proposed development will be built in accordance with City of Coeur d’Alene Standards and commonly accepted construction practices. All utilities are existing and near the subject property boundaries located in 15th Street and will be used to serve this project.

**Transportation and Roads**

A single access point off 15th Street is planned for entry into this project and will be constructed as Birkdale Lane, a new private road. Frontage improvements on 15th Street, as required, will be completed in conjunction with the construction of Birkdale Lane into the subdivision. There will be an additional 10’ R/W dedication on the West side of 15th Street that will run the length of the project.

Birkdale Lane will be constructed as a private road with a paved street section of 26’ from curb-curb, including rolled curb and gutter, a 5’ concrete sidewalk on the South side, together with 10’ utility easements. A 24’ wide hammerhead turnaround at the western terminus of Birkdale Lane will provide emergency vehicle access and maneuvering, and will be constructed per the requirements of the CDA Fire Department. No on street parking will be allowed on the private road, however, additional parking will be provided with oversized driveways in front of each unit. We are proposing to provide 3 off-street parking spots per unit, 1 in the garage and 2 on the driveway. This is well above and beyond the required minimum parking requirements per City Code.

**Fire Protection**

The subject property is within the Coeur d’Alene Fire Department boundaries. Fire Station #3, located at 1500 N. 15th Street, is within 1.3 miles of the project development. New fire hydrants will be installed along Birkdale Lane and at internal locations as designated by the Coeur d’Alene
Fire Department throughout the proposed development. Emergency access is not anticipated to be a problem, as the project includes a hammerhead turnaround that will meet Fire Department standards.

**Stormwater**
Stormwater will be handled via permanent grassy swale system that will collect and mitigate stormwater runoff generated from the subdivision. Excess runoff will be direct injected into the ground through the use of drywells. A stormwater management plan shall use best management practices (BMP) during and after construction in accordance with accepted standard construction practices. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the area’s soils consist entirely of McGuire-Marble association. This soil is well-draining and suitable for this type of stormwater management system, which is commonly used throughout the City of Coeur d’Alene. Maintenance of the storm system will be the responsibility of the adjacent property owner.

**Water**
Domestic and irrigation water will be provided by the City of Coeur d’Alene. A new 8” water main that ties into the existing 12” water main located in 15th Street will be constructed in Birkdale Lane. An 8” water main will be extended to the South in the hammerhead to the adjacent property boundary for future extension as may be required. All public water infrastructure will be located in an easement dedicated to the City of CDA Water Department for operation and maintenance.

**Sewer**
Sanitary Sewer service will be provided by the City of Coeur d’Alene. A new 8” gravity sewer main will be constructed in Birkdale Lane and will tie into the existing 10” gravity sewer main in 15th Street. Infrastructure will be required to be extended throughout the subject property in accordance with City of Coeur d’Alene standards. Sanitary sewer flows generated from this site will be treated at the Coeur d’Alene Wastewater Treatment Plant, which currently has capacity to serve this project. A sewer easement will be dedicated to the City of CDA as is required for operation and maintenance of the proposed sewer infrastructure.

**Open Space**
This project contains 7,359 sf of net useable open space that will exist as a private tract owned by the HOA. The project proponent is a local experienced developer, with several projects containing open space. We have consulted with our property manager to discuss the most practical and useful open space amenities based on their experience with other projects. Passive amenities that don’t create attractive nuisances are preferred. This area will contain a patio with a picnic table and BBQ, thus providing an opportunity for gatherings, picnics and outdoor recreation as well as promote a sense of neighborhood. We will also provide a walking trail and a fenced dog run as we know this is a popular feature in other similar projects. This open space will be landscaped and maintained by the HOA to provide continuity with other landscape elements within Birkdale Commons.
**Other Utilities**

All dry utilities are currently available to serve the proposed project and are located in 15th Street. Dry utilities will be extended through Birkdale Lane as it is constructed to serve the proposed project as required. Kootenai Electric Cooperative will provide power and Avista will provide natural gas. Spectrum/Charter will provide communications and internet until such time that Ziply Fiber brings their services to this area and provides another option for residents. All dry utility companies will be notified at the appropriate time. Agreements to provide service will be finalized between the Developer and the respective utility.

**DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE**

Construction on this project is anticipated to begin in the Spring of 2023 and be completed in 1 phase.
APPENDIX A

Architectural Plans and Elevations
ABOVE PLAN PROVIDED FOR TRUSS PLACEMENT ONLY. REFER TO TRUSS CALCULATIONS AND ENGINEERED STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ALL FURTHER INFORMATION. BUILDING DESIGNER/ENGINEER OF RECORD RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL NON-TRUSS TO TRUSS CONNECTIONS. BUILDING DESIGNER/ENGINEER OF RECORD TO REVIEW AND APPROVE ALL DESIGNS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

All designs are property of Coeur d'Alene Builders Supply. All designs are null and void if not fabricated by Coeur d'Alene Builders Supply.
### Load Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PlotID</th>
<th>Net Qty</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Pies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11-7/8&quot; BCI 5000-1.7 DF</td>
<td>40' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11-7/8&quot; BCI 5000-1.7 DF</td>
<td>24' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11-7/8&quot; BCI 5000-1.7 DF</td>
<td>20' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-7/8&quot; BCI 5000-1.7 DF</td>
<td>16' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11-7/8&quot; BCI 5000-1.7 DF</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11-7/8&quot; BCI 5000-1.7 DF</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-3/4&quot; x 11-7/8&quot; VERSA-LAM® 2.0 2800 DF</td>
<td>5' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-1/8&quot; x 12&quot; BOISE GLULAM® 24F-V4/DF</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-1/8&quot; x 12&quot; BOISE GLULAM® 24F-V4/DF</td>
<td>14' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-1/8&quot; x 12&quot; BOISE GLULAM® 24F-V4/DF</td>
<td>12' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-3/8&quot; x 11-7/8&quot; BC RIM BOARD 08S</td>
<td>24' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Connected Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PlotID</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Manuf.</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Web Size</th>
<th>Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>ITS 2.09/11.88</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>ITS 2.09/11.88</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>ITS 2.09/11.88</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level and Floor Container Notes

- **Date:** 1/30/2017
- **File:** 19347

**File Check:**
- **Contact:** LB

**Notes:**
- Boise joist hole chart. Minimum distance per cut holes near bearing support centered at cut. Boise Joist Blocking required for cantilever. BCI joist blocking.
- Treated Ledger - Use only fasteners that are approved for use with corresponding wood treatment.
- Vertical load capacity.
- Revisions:
  - F05
  - SAE J429 350 lb capacity penetration) lag screws (full nuts or 1/2" dia washers and or higher) with Grades 1 or 2, per fastener.

**Support:**
- No structural or dimensional check has been made of this design drawings of the building, therefore purchaser is to check and approve all dimensions, quantities, loads, and details carefully. This drawing has not been checked by Boise Engineering.

**Moisture Control:**
- Boise Rimboard (only structural components shown above) Design of moisture control by others.

**Scale:** 1/8"=1'-0"
We want to go on record opposing the requested PUD modification. Housing density on Union Drive is already too high. Parking is a real problem, driveways are so short automobiles barely fit.

Mark and Anne Hall
1486 W Bellerive Ln
Hi Shana,

I'm responding to the zoning change proposal from R3 to R8 for this property. Public hearing is scheduled on Tues. 11/8, 5:30p, but I'm unable to attend.

I'm a neighbor in the immediate vicinity of this property, and I'm unclear what the owners want to do with rezoning at R8...but from the zoning sheets, it sounds like they want to transform into moderate-dense population housing from single family housing.

We are a street of mostly single family homes, a quiet, low-trafficked street. I want the street to remain quiet and low-trafficked. Therefore, I'm against any change to the property's single family status. I want to limit or stop further multi-family zoning in this and other neighborhoods within CdA city limits and keep our city small and navigable.

Thank you,
Margaret Walmer, 1130 E Timber Lane, CdA
COEUR D'ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS AND ORDER
ZC-2-22

A. INTRODUCTION
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on, November 8, 2022, and there being present a person requesting approval of ZC-2-22, a request for a zone change from R-3 to R-8 zoning district

APPLICANT: RICHARD AND SUSAN BENNETT

LOCATION: PROPERTY EAST OF HONEYSUCKLE DRIVE, WEST OF E. SHOREWOOD COURT, ON TIMBER LANE COMMONLY KNOWN AS 1095 E. TIMBER LANE IN GARDENDALE ACRE TRACTS

B. FINDINGS: JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DECISION/CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND FACTS RELIED UPON
The Planning Commission (adopts) (does not adopt) Items B1 to B7.

B1. That the existing land uses are Residential and Commercial.

B2. That the Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Urban Neighborhood Place Type

B3. That the zoning is R-3

B4. That the notice of public hearing was published on, October 22, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B5. That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on, October 28, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B6. That notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property.

B7. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2022.
B8. That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies as follows:

Community & Identity
Goal CI 1: Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.
Objective CI 1.1: Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

Goal CI 3: Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households.
Objective CI 3.1: Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing.

Growth & Development
Goal GD 1: Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.
Objective GD 1.1: Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

Objective GD 1.5: Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

Goal GD 2: Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.
Objective GD 2.1: Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

B9. That public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use. This is based on

Criteria to consider for B9:
1. Can water be provided or extended to serve the property?
2. Can sewer service be provided or extended to serve the property?
3. Does the existing street system provide adequate access to the property?
4. Is police and fire service available and adequate to the property?
B10. That the physical characteristics of the site (do) (do not) make it suitable for the request at this time because

Criteria to consider for B10:
1. Topography
2. Streams
3. Wetlands
4. Rock outcroppings, etc.
5. Vegetative cover

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

Criteria to consider for B11:
1. Traffic congestion
2. Is the proposed zoning compatible with the surrounding area in terms of density, types of uses allowed or building types allowed
3. Existing land use pattern i.e. residential, commercial, residential w churches & schools etc.

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION
The Planning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of RICHARD AND SUSAN BENNETT for a zone change, as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).

Motion by ____________, seconded by _____________, to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order.
ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming               Voted ______
Commissioner Ingalls   Voted ______
Commissioner Lutropp   Voted ______
Commissioner Mandel   Voted ______
Commissioner McCracken  Voted ______
Commissioner Ward   Voted ______
Chairman Messina               Voted ______ (tie breaker)

Commissioners _______________ were absent.

Motion to ________________ carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

____________________________________
CHAIRMAN MESSINA
COEUR D'ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS AND ORDER

SP-3-22

A. INTRODUCTION
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on November 8, 2022, and there being present a person requesting approval of ITEM:SP-3-22 a proposed Warehouse/Storage Special Use Permit in the zoning district.

APPLICANT: RC WORST AND COMPANY INC.

LOCATION: 601, 603 & 609 E. BEST AVENUE

B. FINDINGS: JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DECISION/Criteria, STANDARDS AND FACTS RELIED UPON
The Planning Commission (adopts) (does not adopt) Items B1 to B7.

B1. That the existing land uses are Commercial and Residential.

B2. That the Comprehensive Plan Map Designation Retail Center/Corridor

B3. That the zoning is C-17.

B4. That the notice of public hearing was published on, October 22, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B5. That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on, October 28, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B6. That the notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property.

B7. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2022.
B8. Pursuant to Section 17.09.220, Special Use Permit Criteria, a special use permit may be approved only if the proposal conforms to all of the following criteria to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission:

B8A. The proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the comprehensive plan, as follows:

**Community & Identity**
**Goal CI 1:** Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.
**Objective CI 1.1:** Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

**Goal CI 2:** Maintain a high quality of life for residents and businesses that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live and visit.
**Objective CI 2.1** Maintain the community’s friendly, welcoming atmosphere and its smalltown feel.

**Growth & Development**
**Goal GD 1:** Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.
**Objective GD 1.5:** Recognize neighborhood and district identities.
**Objective GD 1.6** Revitalize existing and create new business districts to promote opportunities for jobs, services, and housing, and ensure maximum economic development potential throughout the community.

**Goal GD 2:** Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.
**Objective GD 2.1:** Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

**Goal GD 5** Implement principles of environmental design in planning projects.
**Objective GD 5.1** Minimize glare, light trespass, and skyglow from outdoor lighting.

**Jobs & Economy**
**Goal JE 1:** Retain, grow, and attract businesses.
**Objective JE 1.2** Foster a pro-business culture that supports economic growth.
B8B. The design and planning of the site (is) (is not) compatible with the location, setting, and existing uses on adjacent properties. This is based on

Criteria to consider for B8B:
1. Does the density or intensity of the project “fit” the surrounding area?
2. Is the proposed development compatible with the existing land use pattern i.e. residential, commercial, residential with churches & schools etc?
3. Is the design and appearance of the project compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of architectural style, layout of buildings, building height and bulk, off-street parking, open space, and landscaping?

B8C. The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development (will) (will not) be adequately served by existing streets, public facilities and services.

This is based on

Criteria to consider B8C:
1. Is there water available to meet the minimum requirements for domestic consumption & fire flow?
2. Can sewer service be provided to meet minimum requirements?
3. Can police and fire provide reasonable service to the property?

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that RC WORST AND COMPANY, INC. for a special use permit, as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).
Special conditions applied are as follows:

Planning:

1. Per the C-17/C-17L Commercial Design Standards, the buffer yard requirements must be met as provided in the staff report, the site plan, provided flexibility may be necessary as allowed in SITE DESIGN F#3, “The Planning Director may approve other approaches to screening, so long as the intent is satisfied.” with the goal to:
   - Provide parking lot screening along all frontages with a minimum 6’ wide planting strip planted.
   - A 10’ wide planting strip shall be planted where the subject property abuts a residential district.
   - Buffer along the alley for additional screening for the residential uses to the north.
2. A Site Development Permit will be required to ensure the Buffer Yard Regulations have been met.
3. A lot consolidation will be required prior to issuance of a Site Development permit. A copy of the Lot Consolidation must be submitted at the time of Site Development permit submittal.

Engineering

4. Sidewalks must be installed along the property frontage on Best Avenue and 6th Street.
5. Curb ramp(s) must be installed on Best Avenue and 6th Place and brought into compliance with current City standards.
6. Existing curb ramp on Best Avenue and 6th Place must be brought into compliance with ADA standards.

Urban Forestry

7. Trees will be required to be planted in the public right of way abutting the entire street frontage abutting 6th place, 6th Street and Best Ave.
8. The proposed swale along Best Avenue can accommodate the required street trees within swale and a street tree easement shall be recorded.
9. All trees must be selected from the approved street tree list and spaced/planted per code.

Wastewater:

10. Alley access must be maintained and sewer manholes to the north of the subject property need to be brought up to finish grade.
11. The two (2) abandoned sewer laterals from 601 Best Avenue and 603 Best Avenue must be abandoned at the City sewer main.
Motion by ____________, seconded by ______________, to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming               Voted ______
Commissioner Ingalls   Voted ______
Commissioner Luttropp   Voted ______
Commissioner Mandel   Voted ______
Commissioner McCracken Voted ______
Commissioner Ward   Voted ______
Chairman Messina               Voted ______ (tie breaker)

Commissioners ___________ were absent.

Motion to __________carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

______________________________________________
CHAIRMAN TOM MESSINA
COEUR D'ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION  
FINDINGS AND ORDER  

PUD-3-19m1

A. INTRODUCTION  
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on November 8, 2022, and there being present a person requesting approval of: PUD-3-19m1, a request for a modification to a planned unit development known as “The Union”.

APPLICANT: DENNIS CUNNINGHAM  
LOCATION: 0.67 ACRES LOCATED IMMEDIATELY EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF BEEBE BOULEVARD AND UNION DRIVE.

B. FINDINGS: JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DECISION/Criteria, STANDARDS AND FACTS RELIED UPON  
The Planning Commission (adopts) (does not adopt) Items B1 to B7.

B1. That the existing land uses are Commercial and Residential  
B2. That the Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Planned Development.  
B3. That the zoning is C-17.  
B4. That the notice of public hearing was published on October 22, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.  
B5. That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on, October 21, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.  
B6. That notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property.  
B7. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2022.
B8. Pursuant to Section 17.07.230, Planned Unit Development Review Criteria, a planned unit development may be approved only if the proposal conforms to the following criteria to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission:

B8A. The proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. This is based upon the following policies:

**Community & Identity**

**Goal CI 1**
Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.

**OBJECTIVE CI 1.1**
Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

**Goal CI 3**
Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households.

**OBJECTIVE CI 3.1**
Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing.

**Environment & Recreation**

**Goal ER 1**
Preserve and enhance the beauty and health of Coeur d’Alene’s natural environment.

**OBJECTIVE ER 1.4**
Reduce water consumption for landscaping throughout the city.

**Goal ER 2**
Provide diverse recreation options.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.2**
Encourage publicly-owned and/or private recreation facilities for citizens of all ages. This includes sports fields and facilities (both outdoor and indoor), hiking and biking pathways, open space, passive recreation, and water access for people and motorized and non-motorized watercraft.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.3**
Encourage and maintain public access to mountains, natural areas, parks, and trails that are easily accessible by walking and biking.
Growth & Development

Goal GD 1
Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d'Alene a great place to live.

OBJECTIVE GD 1.1
Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

OBJECTIVE GD 1.3
Promote mixed use development and small-scale commercial uses to ensure that neighborhoods have services within walking and biking distance.

OBJECTIVE GD 1.5
Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

Goal GD 2
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.

OBJECTIVE GD 2.1
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

OBJECTIVE GD 2.2
Ensure that City and technology services meet the needs of the community.

Goal GD 3
Support the development of a multimodal transportation system for all users.

OBJECTIVE GD 3.1
Provide accessible, safe, and efficient traffic circulation for motorized, bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.

B8B. The design and planning of the site (is) (is not) compatible with the location, setting and existing uses on adjacent properties. This is based on

Criteria to consider for B8B:
1. Density
2. Architectural style
3. Layout of buildings
4. Building heights & bulk
5. Off-street parking
6. Open space
7. Landscaping
B8C The proposal *(is) (is not)* compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties. In the case of property located within the hillside overlay zone, does not create soil erosion, sedimentation of lower slopes, slide damage, or flooding problems; prevents surface water degradation, or severe cutting or scarring; reduces the risk of catastrophic wildfire in the wildland urban interface; and complements the visual character and nature of the city. This is based on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria to consider for B8C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wildlife habitats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B8D The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development *(will) (will not)* be adequately served by existing streets, public facilities and services. This is based on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria to consider for B8D:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there water available to meet the minimum requirements for domestic consumption &amp; fire flow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can sewer service be provided to meet minimum requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can the existing street system accommodate the anticipated traffic to be generated by this development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can police and fire provide reasonable service to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B8E The proposal *(does) (does not)* provide adequate private common open space area, as determined by the Commission, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and usable for open space and recreational purposes. This is based on
B8F  Off-street parking (does)(does not) provide parking sufficient for users of the development. This is based on

B8G That the proposal (does) (does not) provide for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property. This is based on

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of DENNIS CUNNINGHAM for approval of the planned unit development, as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).

Special conditions applied are:

Planning:

1. The incorporation of the newly created lots into the existing homeowners association will be required to ensure the perpetual maintenance of the open space and other common areas.

Water:

2. Any additional main extensions and/or fire hydrants and services will be the responsibility of the developer at their expense.

3. Any additional service will have cap fees due at building permits.
Wastewater:

4. Sewer Policy #719 requires a 20’ wide utility easement (30’ if shared with Public Water) to be dedicated to the City for all City sewers if private roadway.

5. An unobstructed City approved “all-weather” access shall be required over all City sewers.

6. This PUD shall be required to comply with Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to be assigned with a single (1) sewer connection.

7. Idaho Code §39-118 requires IDEQ or QLPE to review and approve public infrastructure plans for construction.

8. Cap any unused sewer laterals at the public main.

Motion by ____________ seconded by ______________ to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming Voted ______
Commissioner Ingalls Voted ______
Commissioner Luttropp Voted ______
Commissioner Mandel Voted ______
Commissioner McCracken Voted ______
Commissioner Ward Voted ______
Chairman Messina Voted ______ (tie breaker)

Commissioners ___________ were absent.

Motion to ______________ carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

__________________________
CHAIRMAN TOM MESSINA
COEUR D’ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS AND ORDER

S-4-19m1

A. INTRODUCTION
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on November 8, 2022, and there being present a person requesting approval of ITEM: S-4-19m1 a request for a modification to the proposed preliminary plat known as “The Union”.

APPLICANT: DENNIS CUNNINGHAM
LOCATION: 0.67 ACRES LOCATED IMMEDIATELY EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF BEEBE BOULEVARD AND UNION DRIVE.

B. FINDINGS: JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DECISION/Criteria, Standards and Facts Relied Upon
The Planning Commission (adopts) (does not adopt) Items B1 to B6.

B1. That the existing land uses are commercial and residential.

B2. That the zoning is C-17.

B3. That the notice of public hearing was published on October 22, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B4. That the notice was not required to be posted on the property.

B5. That notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property.

B6. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2022.
B7. Pursuant to Section 16.10.030A.1, Preliminary Plats: In order to approve a preliminary plat, the Planning Commission must make the following findings:

B7A. That all of the general preliminary plat requirements (have) (have not) been met as determined by the City Engineer or his designee. This is based on

B7B. That the provisions for sidewalks, streets, alleys, rights-of-way, easements, street lighting, fire protection, planting, drainage, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and utilities (are) (are not) adequate. This is based on

B7C. That the proposed preliminary plat (does) (does not) comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15) and all of the subdivision improvement standards (contained in chapter 16.40) requirements. This is based on

B7D. The lots proposed in the preliminary plat (do) (do not) meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district. This is based on

Criteria to consider for B7D:
1. Do all lots meet the required minimum lot size?
2. Do all lots meet the required minimum street frontage?
3. Is the gross density within the maximum allowed for the applicable zone?

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of DENNIS CUNNINGHAM for preliminary plat of approval as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).

Special conditions applied to the motion are:
Planning:

1. The incorporation of the newly created lots into the existing homeowners association will be required to ensure the perpetual maintenance of the open space and other common areas.

Water:

2. Any additional main extensions and/or fire hydrants and services will be the responsibility of the developer at their expense.

3. Any additional service will have cap fees due at building permits.

Wastewater:

4. Sewer Policy #719 requires a 20' wide utility easement (30' if shared with Public Water) to be dedicated to the City for all City sewers if private roadway.

5. An unobstructed City approved “all-weather” access shall be required over all City sewers.

6. This PUD shall be required to comply with Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to be assigned with a single (1) sewer connection.

7. Idaho Code §39-118 requires IDEQ or QLPE to review and approve public infrastructure plans for construction.

8. Cap any unused sewer laterals at the public main.

Motion by _____________, seconded by _____________, to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming                  Voted ______
Commissioner Ingalls                  Voted ______
Commissioner Luttropp                 Voted ______
Commissioner Mandel                   Voted ______
Commissioner McCracken                Voted ______
Commissioner Ward                     Voted ______
Chairman Messina                      Voted ______ (tie breaker)

Commissioners _____________ were absent.

Motion to ______________ carried by a _____ to _____ vote.

_____________________________________
CHAIRMAN TOM MESSINA
A. INTRODUCTION
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on November 8, 2022, and there being present a person requesting approval: PUD-4-22 a request for a proposed planned unit development known as “Birkdale Commons PUD”

APPLICANT: 15th STREET INVESTMENTS, LLC/TERENCE ALLING
LOCATION: 3525 N 15TH STREET

B. FINDINGS: JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DECISION/CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND FACTS RELIED UPON

The Planning Commission (adopts) (does not adopt) Items B1 to B7.

B1. That the existing land uses are Commercial and Residential.

B2. That the Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Compact Neighborhood.

B3. That the zoning is R-12.

B4. That the notice of public hearing was published on, October 22, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B5. That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on October 21, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B6. That notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property.

B7. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2022.
Pursuant to Section 17.07.230, Planned Unit Development Review Criteria, a planned unit development may be approved only if the proposal conforms to the following criteria to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission:

B8A. The proposal *(is) (is not)* in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. This is based upon the following policies:

**Community & Identity**

**Goal CI 1**
Coeur d’Alene citizens are well informed, responsive, and involved in community discussions.

**OBJECTIVE CI 1.1**
Foster broad-based and inclusive community involvement for actions affecting businesses and residents to promote community unity and involvement.

**Goal CI 3**
Coeur d’Alene will strive to be livable for median and below income levels, including young families, working class, low income, and fixed income households.

**OBJECTIVE CI 3.1**
Support efforts to preserve existing housing stock and provide opportunities for new affordable and workforce housing.

**Environment & Recreation**

**Goal ER 1**
Preserve and enhance the beauty and health of Coeur d’Alene’s natural environment.

**OBJECTIVE ER 1.4**
Reduce water consumption for landscaping throughout the city.

**Goal ER 2**
Provide diverse recreation options.

**OBJECTIVE ER 2.2**
Encourage publicly-owned and/or private recreation facilities for citizens of all ages. This includes sports fields and facilities (both outdoor and indoor), hiking and biking pathways, open space, passive recreation, and water access for people and motorized and non-motorized watercraft.
OBJECTIVE ER 2.3
Encourage and maintain public access to mountains, natural areas, parks, and trails that are easily accessible by walking and biking.

Growth & Development

Goal GD 1
Develop a mix of land uses throughout the city that balance housing and employment while preserving the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live.

OBJECTIVE GD 1.1
Achieve a balance of housing product types and price points, including affordable housing, to meet city needs.

OBJECTIVE GD 1.3
Promote mixed use development and small-scale commercial uses to ensure that neighborhoods have services within walking and biking distance.

OBJECTIVE GD 1.5
Recognize neighborhood and district identities.

Goal GD 2
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate community needs and future growth.

OBJECTIVE GD 2.1
Ensure appropriate, high-quality infrastructure to accommodate growth and redevelopment.

OBJECTIVE GD 2.2
Ensure that City and technology services meet the needs of the community.

Goal GD 3
Support the development of a multimodal transportation system for all users.

OBJECTIVE GD 3.1
Provide accessible, safe, and efficient traffic circulation for motorized, bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation.
B8B. The design and planning of the site *(is) (is not)* compatible with the location, setting and existing uses on adjacent properties. This is based on

**Criteria to consider for B8B:**

1. Density
2. Architectural style
3. Layout of buildings
4. Building heights & bulk
5. Off-street parking
6. Open space
7. Landscaping

B8C The proposal *(is) (is not)* compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties. In the case of property located within the hillside overlay zone, does not create soil erosion, sedimentation of lower slopes, slide damage, or flooding problems; prevents surface water degradation, or severe cutting or scarring; reduces the risk of catastrophic wildfire in the wildland urban interface; and complements the visual character and nature of the city. This is based on

**Criteria to consider for B8C:**

1. Topography
2. Wildlife habitats
3. Native vegetation
4. Streams & other water areas

B8D The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development *(will) (will not)* be adequately served by existing streets, public facilities and services. This is based on

**Criteria to consider for B8D:**

1. Is there water available to meet the minimum requirements for domestic consumption & fire flow?
2. Can sewer service be provided to meet minimum requirements?
3. Can the existing street system accommodate the anticipated traffic to be generated by this development?
4. Can police and fire provide reasonable service to the
B8E The proposal (does) (does not) provide adequate private common open space area, as determined by the Commission, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and usable for open space and recreational purposes. This is based on

B8F Off-street parking (does)(does not) provide parking sufficient for users of the development. This is based on

B8G That the proposal (does) (does not) provide for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property. This is based on

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of 15th STREET INVESTMENTS, LLC/TERENCE ALLING for approval of the planned unit development, as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).

Special conditions applied are:

1. The creation of a homeowner’s association will be required to ensure the perpetual maintenance of the open space, all other common areas, stormwater maintenance and snow removal.

2. The applicant’s requests for subdivision, and PUD run concurrently. The subdivision and PUD designs are reliant upon one another. Additionally, approval of the requested PUD is only valid once the Final Development Plan has been approved by the Planning Department.

3. The Open Space must be installed and completed prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. The open space areas shall be consistent with this approval and include the same or better amenities and features.

4. Since annexation has occurred, the designated parcel is eligible for a water main extension. A single service currently exists for the proposed lot # 1 which will not require cap fees. All other lots will require individual services with cap fees due at time of building permits. As this will be a private street, a 20’ public utility easement centered on the water main, (30’ if combined with public sewer), must be granted where no permanent structures such as building footings, car ports or garages are allowed. All improvements will be at the developer’s expense and will be conveyed to the City upon final acceptance. Applicable fire hydrants must be operational prior to granting building permits.
5. An unobstructed City approved “all-weather” access shall be required over all public sewers.

6. All public sewer plans require IDEQ or QLPE Approval prior to construction.

7. Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to individually connect and discharge into (1) public sewer connection.

8. A utility easement for the public sewer shall be dedicated to the City prior to building permits.

9. Public sewer shall be run to and through this project and installed to all city specifications and standards.

10. A public access easement shall be granted to allow the dead-end road/fire turnaround to the south to be extended in the future, if the lot to the south desires to develop.

Motion by ____________ seconded by ______________ to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming Voted ______
Commissioner Ingalls Voted ______
Commissioner Lutroppe Voted ______
Commissioner Mandel Voted ______
Commissioner McCracken Voted ______
Commissioner Ward Voted ______

Chairman Messina Voted ______ (tie breaker)

Commissioners ___________ were absent.

Motion to ____________ carried by a _____ to _____ vote.

__________________________
CHAIRMAN TOM MESSINA
A. INTRODUCTION
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on November 8, 2022, and there being present a person requesting approval of ITEM: S-3-22 a request for a 10-lot preliminary plat known as “Birkdale Commons”.

APPLICANT: 15th STREET INVESTMENTS, LLC/TERENCE ALLING
LOCATION: 3525 N 15TH STREET

B. FINDINGS: JUSTIFICATION FOR THE DECISION/Criteria, Standards AND FACTS RELIED UPON
The Planning Commission (adopts) (does not adopt) Items B1 to B6.

B1. That the existing land uses are Commercial and Residential.

B2. That the zoning is R-12.

B3. That the notice of public hearing was published on October 22, 2022, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.

B4. That the notice was not required to be posted on the property.

B5. That notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property.

B6. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2022.
B7. Pursuant to Section 16.10.030A.1, Preliminary Plats: In order to approve a preliminary plat, the Planning Commission must make the following findings:

B7A. That all of the general preliminary plat requirements (have) (have not) been met as determined by the City Engineer or his designee. This is based on

B7B. That the provisions for sidewalks, streets, alleys, rights-of-way, easements, street lighting, fire protection, planting, drainage, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and utilities (are) (are not) adequate. This is based on

B7C. That the proposed preliminary plat (does) (does not) comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15) and all of the subdivision improvement standards (contained in chapter 16.40) requirements. This is based on

B7D. The lots proposed in the preliminary plat (do) (do not) meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district. This is based on

Criteria to consider for B7D:
1. Do all lots meet the required minimum lot size?
2. Do all lots meet the required minimum street frontage?
3. Is the gross density within the maximum allowed for the applicable zone?

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of 15TH STREET INVESTMENTS, LLC/TERENCE ALLING for preliminary plat of approval as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).
Special conditions applied to the motion are:

1. The creation of a homeowner’s association will be required to ensure the perpetual maintenance of the open space, all other common areas, stormwater maintenance and snow removal.

2. The applicant’s requests for subdivision, and PUD run concurrently. The subdivision and PUD designs are reliant upon one another. Additionally, approval of the requested PUD is only valid once the Final Development Plan has been approved by the Planning Department.

3. The Open Space must be installed and completed prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. The open space areas shall be consistent with this approval and include the same or better amenities and features.

4. Since annexation has occurred, the designated parcel is eligible for a water main extension. A single service currently exists for the proposed lot # 1 which will not require cap fees. All other lots will require individual services with cap fees due at time of building permits. As this will be a private street, a 20’ public utility easement centered on the water main, (30’ if combined with public sewer), must be granted where no permanent structures such as building footings, car ports or garages are allowed. All improvements will be at the developer’s expense and will be conveyed to the City upon final acceptance. Applicable fire hydrants must be operational prior to granting building permits.

5. An unobstructed City approved “all-weather” access shall be required over all public sewers.

6. All public sewer plans require IDEQ or QLPE Approval prior to construction.

7. Sewer Policy #716 requires all legally recognized parcels within the City to individually connect and discharge into (1) public sewer connection.

8. A utility easement for the public sewer shall be dedicated to the City prior to building permits.

9. Public sewer shall be run to and through this project and installed to all city specifications and standards.

10. A public access easement shall be granted to allow the dead-end road/fire turnaround to the south to be extended in the future, if the lot to the south desires to develop.
Motion by _____________, seconded by _____________, to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming Voted ______
Commissioner Ingalls Voted ______
Commissioner Luttropp Voted ______
Commissioner Mandel Voted ______
Commissioner McCracken Voted ______
Commissioner Ward Voted ______
Chairman Messina Voted ______ (tie breaker)

Commissioners ___________ were absent.

Motion to ______________ carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

__________________________________________

CHAIRMAN TOM MESSINA