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

MAY 9, 2023

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

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

5:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

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

PLEDGE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: ***ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM.
March 14, 2023

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

STAFF COMMENTS:

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

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

1. Applicant: Tilford Homes Homeowners Association Inc.
   Location: Tilford Place
   Request: A modification of the open space area within the Tilford PUD.
   QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-2-17m1)

Presented by: Tami Stroud, 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 Stuhlmueller 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 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Ward, seconded by McCracken, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on February 14, 2023. Motion approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Patterson Community Planning Director provided the following comments:

- Ms. Patterson announced that we won’t have a Planning Commission meeting in April because we didn’t receive any applications.
- She commented that the impact fees are on track with the consultant team who is busy collecting data from us to help build the Capitol Improvement Plans for Police and Fire to help update our impact fees.
ADMINISTRATIVE:

1. Applicant: Bear Waterfront, LLC.
   Request: A 12-month extension request for S-5-21, Mahogany Lane

Mike Behary, Associate Planner provided the following comments:

- Bear Waterfront LLC is requesting a one-year extension of S-5-21 (Subdivision) to December 21st, 2023.
- Section 16.20.040 of the City Code allows the Planning Commission to allow for a subdivision extension. Up to five one-year extensions may be approved by Planning Commission. The applicant has requested the one-year extension in a letter submitted on December 22, 2022. This request would allow the applicant extra time to complete the infrastructure requirements and extend the subdivision approval.
- He stated, if approved, the existing 32 conditions will need to be met.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation

Commissioner Ingalls inquired what are the issues preventing the recordation of the final plat. Mr. Behary explained it pertained to the installation of the infrastructure plus a retaining wall issue.

Commissioner Fleming inquired if this will impact the Centennial Trail relocation. Mr. Behary explained that the trail will be constructed this summer.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Luttropp, to approve a 12-month extension request for S-5-21, Mahogany Lane. Motion approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: City of Coeur d’Alene, Police Department
   Location: Lot 2, Block 1 Bunker Park
   Request: A proposed Civic/Administrative Office Use special use permit in the LM zoning district.
   QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-2-23)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner provided the following comments

- The City of Coeur d’Alene is requesting a Civic Administrative Special Use Permit in the Light Manufacturing zoning district. If approved, the current Police Headquarters building located on the adjacent lot to the south would be expanded into the newly acquired lot to the north.
- The first phase would include approximately a 5,000 square foot addition, with the goal of a future expansion of another 20,000 square feet in the future with a total complex of approximately 25,000 square feet.
- The new facility would house several offices, an evidence storage area, and shower/locker facilities. It may also include briefing and other meeting rooms.
- The expansion is needed due to the increasing population to maintain the current level of service in regards to public safety.
On March 11, 1997, the Planning Commission approved a request from the City of Coeur d’Alene for a Civic Administrative Special Use Permit on property located at 3818 Schreiber Way.

The special use permit approval allowed for civic administration use in the (LM) Light Manufacturing zoning district.

The approval authorized construction of a +/- 20,000 square foot law enforcement facility. A one-year extension of the special use permit was approved on January 24, 1998.

She stated that the Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as General Industrial land.

She noted the various staff comments located in the staff report with no objections to this request.

She commented that there are no conditions.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation

**Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Ingalls noted that there has been a number of Special Use Permits approved over the years in this area with the majority of properties requesting something other than light manufacturing. Ms. Stroud stated CDA Cellars was considered manufacturing but required a Special Use Permit to provide a tasting room and retail. Commissioner Ingalls maybe be this area should be rezoned as Civic/Office, business support etc. and would seem an odd fit if someone requested a special use permit for Light Manufacturing wouldn’t fit.

**Public testimony open.**

David Hagar, Police Captain representing the City of Coeur d’Alene’s Police Department as the applicant, provided the following statements:

- He stated that the Police Department is planning ahead for a total buildout by expanding the building into this location that will more than meet all of our needs in the future.

Mr. Hagar concluded his presentation.

**Public testimony closed.**

**Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Ward, to approve Item SP-2-23. Motion approved.**

**ROLL CALL:**

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

Motion to approve carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

2. Applicant: Dennis Cunningham
Location: Btwn Beebe & Lakewood Dr on Union Dr

Request:  

A. A modification to “The Union PUD”  
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-3-19m2)  

B. A modification to the preliminary Plat “The Union”  
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-4-19m2)  

• Mike Behary, Associate Planner provided the following comments.  

• A proposed modification request is to allow Lot 24 of The Union PUD to split into eight residential lots and one mixed-use lot.  

• 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.  

• In 2022 the applicant proposed to modify the PUD. This request was to have Lot 24 of the Union split into 10 residential lots, and 1 mixed-use lot.  

• This proposed modification added 11 dwelling units to the PUD and reduced the commercial lot from 29,482 SF to 5,366 SF.  

• The planning commission held a public hearing on this item (PUD-3-19m1) on November 8, 2022. After hearing all the testimony on this PUD modification request, the planning commission denied the request without prejudice.  

• The applicant has since revised his PUD amendment application and reduced the number of units. This PUD modification request is more consistent with what was approved in the original PUD.  

• The current proposed PUD has a reduced number of lots after hearing the testimony from the 2022 meeting. The applicant is proposing to modify the PUD of the commercial mixed-use lot (Lot 24). This request is to have Lot 24 of the Union split into 8 residential lots, and 1 mixed-use lot. This current proposal will reduce the commercial lot from 29,482 SF to 6,191 SF.  

• This proposed PUD amendment will use the existing public street that was approved in the original PUD in 2019.  

• The proposed 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 a 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 8 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. This is similar and consistent with what was approved in the original PUD. The applicant has submitted building elevations of the proposed mixed-use facility and the proposed residential dwellings.
The applicant has also submitted a PUD site plan that shows the proposed site layout and the building locations on the proposed PUD.

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 adjacent to the mixed-use development. This public open space area will have a patio area with patio tables and chairs for seating 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. 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 8.9 units per acres which is less than the 17 units per acre that is allowed in the C-17 zoning district.

The City Comprehensive Plan Map designates this “Place Type” as: Planned Development.

He noted in the staff report where the city departments comments were located and stated that all departments didn’t have any objection to this request.

He commented, if approved, there are eight conditions for consideration.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation

**Commission Comments:**

Chairman Messina noted on page 19 in the staff report the comment from Chris Bosley, City Engineer indicated that the existing street width wouldn’t allow for on-street parking and if it did would result in an enforcement issue pushing overflow parking to other areas and also stated they had no objection to the Planned Unit Development (PUD). Ms. Patterson explained that there is some on-street parking allowed where one side of the street allows for on-street parking and that all code requirements have been met for single family/mixed use. Mr. Behary explained in the original PUD on street parking was approved along with the road width which isn’t part of this request.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired about the requirement for open space and for clarification if all PUDs
require 10% private/public open space is a requirement for finding B8E. Mr. Behary commented that’s correct. Commissioner Ingalls explained that he uses the trail and down the road if these open space areas are converted to some other use would the applicant be bound to keep it public without reopening the PUD. Mr. Behary explained part of the PUD/Platt process the open space will be in a separate tract and recorded as open space and if a change is requested that would require another public hearing.

**Public testimony open.**

Christine Baker from HMH Engineering, applicant representative, provided the following statements:

- This new proposal fits in with the original PUD.
- She noted on the rendering of what is being proposed that includes a change to lot 24 splitting it into eight residential lots, one mixed use lot and an open space tract that was previously discussed.
- She explained we are also requesting a 3-foot setback instead of the required 5-foot setback on the open space border and on the residential side is the standard 5-foot setback which is the only difference to what was previously approved.
- She noted on a rendering of what the open space area will look like providing a patio space which will be open to the public that will include bike racks, tables and landscaping.
- She explained parking meets the City Code requirements providing two-off street parking spaces per residential unit including the mixed-use lot have been met and that commercial parking requirement will be fulfilled by the carport located underneath on the first floor of the building that will provide four spots with an ADA parking spot in the front plus the residential will have three garage spots including the two spots in the driveway and that we are providing more spots that is required.

The applicant concluded her presentation.

Karen Hansen commented that this request has changed since it was first presented with the building that now looks like it covering the entire lot. She added if the 3-foot side setback is approved it will set a precedence for other developers asking for the same thing. She invited the commission to drive this area noticing how congested this area is after approving these deviations.

Karen Schomeer stated she concurs with the previous statements and stated this area is congested and doesn’t understand why the applicant is requesting further modifications.

**Rebuttal:**

Ms. Baker provided the following comments.

- She explained the 10% open space is based on the entire lot that will be divided among the three open space tracts.
- She explained the street parking originally approved with the PUD those requirements haven’t changed.
- She explained the streets are narrow and one of the Engineering tools we use is a “road diet” a design where narrow streets promote slower traffic in residential areas.
- She noted the commercial building footprint won’t cover the entire lot that will meet the current code setbacks excluding the 3-foot set back we have requested next to the open space lot.
- She explained that the driveways do meet code which has a 20-foot depth which is a standard requirement.

**Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Ward inquired about the 3-foot setback is it adjacent to the public open space and questioned how wide is the open space. Ms. Baker estimated at the southern end is about 29 feet wide.
and at the northern end is 36 feet with the first building from Beebe Boulevard would be 35 feet. Commissioner Ward inquired if the two parking spaces provided are those outside in a garage and are they tandem or parallel. Ms. Baker explained that it would be both driveway and garage and that the residential plans are in draft form but will be meeting all city requirements. Commissioner Ward asked if there are garages. Ms. Baker explained that the plans are still in draft form and not sure if those spaces will be tandem or two car garages but there will be two off street parking spaces available.

Commissioner Ward commented traffic is bad not because of the number of units because there isn’t enough through streets which is something we can’t do anything about since this is already developed.

Commissioner McCracken inquired with this proposal was the height of the building lowered. Ms. Baker answered that is correct and explained in the previous proposal the residential units were proposed to be higher than originally approved.

**Public testimony closed.**

**Discussion:**

Commissioner Fleming stated that she wasn’t here when this PUD was originally approved and based on the Engineering comments that the commercial use of the building would have driven more trips and by putting in these homes will have less impact to traffic. She stated that she supports this request and it is much better plan than what was previously approved.

Commissioner Ingalls concurs this project will promote less traffic. He added that he was at the original hearing for this project which was denied and now with this request is a continuation of what is already there. He commented Riverstone isn’t for everyone and is more congested and explained Riverstone was conceived a long time ago with a different vision that has changed but we got a wide range of housing types.

**Motion by Fleming, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item PUD-3-19m2. Motion approved.**

**ROLL CALL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner Fleming</th>
<th>Voted</th>
<th>Aye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Lutropp</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 7 to 0 vote.

**Motion by Mandel, seconded by McCracken, to approve Item S-4-19m2. Motion approved.**

**ROLL CALL:**

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

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

3. Applicant: Hamilton Investments, LLC
Location: 1411 N. 4th Street
Request: A proposed Custom Manufacturing special use permit in the C-17 zoning district.
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-3-23)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner provided the following comments.

- The applicant/owner is requesting a Custom Manufacturing Special Use Permit using the existing multi-tenant commercial space which would be converted into a beverage processing/production facility.
- A retail area will be provided, where the organic juices produced on-site will be sold directly to walk-in customers. Most of the products (100% of the beer) will be sold to Pilgrims Market, located across the street and also owned by the applicant.
- There will also be a classroom area opened to the public, which is a use allowed by-right. The existing building is 3,608 sf and was previously used for retail type wine and beer making business.
- The city Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as Retail Center
- She noted in the staff report where the various city departments comments were located stating that all departments didn’t have any issues with this project.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Ward questioned if this area is north of the Midtown overlay. Ms. Stroud stated that is correct. Commissioner Ward explained that the special use permit is for light manufacturing and if approved they decide to discontinue the use and this property is sold would the light manufacturing special use permit carry over to the new owner. Ms. Stroud clarified this applicant is requesting a custom manufacturing special use permit that wouldn’t carry over to a new owner.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired about parking and if the six-stall parking requirement meets the requirement for parking. Ms. Stroud stated that is correct. Commissioner Ingalls commented that he found six stalls a little "light" with the applicant proposing to have classes and making beer with customers coming in six stalls seems light. Ms. Stroud explained based on our parking code six stalls were triggered and with the previous use the city didn’t hear any complaints or issues with parking. She added that she discussed with the applicant about deliveries who is here to explain and if there were any deliveries using the alley,

Chairman Messina inquired about the previous use and if they were making or just selling equipment to make beer or wine. Ms. Stroud commented that the previous use was for people making wine.

Commissioner Luttropp commented that 6 parking spots meet our code and, in the future, we should have further discussion about parking to maybe looking at reducing parking in other parts of the city.

Public testimony open.
Joe Hamilton applicant provided the following statements:

- He explained we wanted to do only manufacturing and told by staff that we had to have something open to the public and if this is something that could be changed tonight.
- He explained that this project fits with the Comprehensive Plan and provided a list of policies that support this project.
- He commented by having a classroom this will benefit the community with education and by approving this permit would provide more jobs, especially in the community.
- He commented in the past we have provided other places space in their facility for production.
- He explained the addition of building was only for production and distribution.

Mr. Hamilton concluded his presentation.

**Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Ward inquired if this type of use produces any odors. Mr. Hamilton commented that there will be no odors and noted other breweries in this area that haven’t had any complaints. Commissioner Ward inquired if there is an area designated for unloading trucks. Mr. Hamilton stated that he has seen delivery trucks stop on 4th Street and there is an alley which would be discouraged to use. Commissioner Ward inquired if there will be any outside storage. Mr. Hamilton stated yes there will be storage outside. Commissioner Ward inquired about trash pickup. Mr. Hamilton stated that it would be in the alley since there are other commercial buildings in this area who use the alley and that there is an existing shed not being used that could be used for a trash pickup area.

Chairman Messina asked staff to clarify the applicant’s comment about preferring not to do retail, and wondered if this is something we can place a condition for that change. Ms. Patterson clarified that the property needed to have a retail component as a principal use which would allow the Special Use Permit (SUP) for the proposed use.

Commissioner Mandel commented that this has to be open to public but we can’t dictate hours or services that something has to be accessible to the public. Ms. Patterson answered that is correct and we don’t determine the hours of a business.

Commissioner Ingalls commented if this is approved the applicant will have some flexibility since this application if for a light manufacturing business. Mr. Hamilton explained in the past we offered classes maybe have two a week.

Lawrence Lepinski explained that he was recently hired at Pilgrim’s to be a part of beverage production. He explained that the dumpster will be located where the exiting shed is located as noted on the floor plan.

**Public testimony closed.**

**Motion by Fleming, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item SP-3-23 Motion approved.**
ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming  Voted  Aye
Commissioner Ingalls  Voted  Aye
Commissioner Mandel  Voted  Aye
Commissioner McCracken  Voted  Aye
Commissioner Luttrell  Voted  Aye
Commissioner Ward  Voted  Aye
Chairman Messina  Voted  Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
PUBLIC HEARING
This is a request to modify the approved Open Space amenities within the Planned Unit Development. No other changes were requested. Approving this request would bring the Tilford Place PUD into compliance.

**FROM:** TAMI STROUD, PLANNER  
**DATE:** MAY 9, 2023  
**SUBJECT:** PUD-2-17m1 – MODIFICATION OF THE “TILFORD PLACE” PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OPEN SPACE AMENITIES  
**LOCATION:** +/- 1.66 ACRES LOCATED ALONG WEST TILFORD LANE IN THE RIVERSTONE DEVELOPMENT  
**APPLICANT:** Riverstone Holdings, LLC  
PO Box 3605  
Post Falls, ID 83854  
**OWNER:** TILFORD PLACE HOMEOWNER’S ASSOCIATION (HOA) INC.  
212 W IRONWOOD DRIVE, #D514  
COEUR D’ALENE, ID 83814  

**DECISION POINT:**  
The Tilford Place Homeowner’s Association (HOA) is requesting a modification to the Open Space amenities that were approved in the existing Planned Unit Development known as “Tilford Place.” The request, if approved, would bring the PUD into compliance with regard to open space.

Aerial Photo:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
In 2017 the applicant was approved for 13-lot preliminary plat and a residential planned unit development (PUD) known as “Tilford Place” PUD. The 2017 PUD was approved on 1.66 acres that allowed 13 residential lots, private streets and open space tracts. The approved open space improvements were never completed and the Tilford Place PUD has been in noncompliance. The City has been holding a bond for the open space and trying to work with the original owner/developer and the HOA to bring the project into compliance. The proposed modification is to omit and replace the approved amenities in the open space areas, modifying what was previously approved by the Planning Commission.

APPROVED AUGUST 2017 “TILFORD PLACE” PRELIMINARY PLAT AND PUD:
Previous actions:

- On October 10, 2017, the Planning Commission approved the “Tilford Place” PUD and “Riverwalk” Preliminary Plat, which included one phase. The total number of dwelling units approved in the proposed project was 13.

- On January 9, 2018, approved a minor modification of the “Tilford Place” approved Planned Unit Development which is a 13-lot (6 tract) residential development for two existing parcels totaling +/-1.66 acres. The request is to reduce the minimum rear yard setback from 15’ to 10’.

- On July 10, 2018, the Planning Commission approved the request to allow additional design elements and design flexibility for the future homes within “Tilford Place” PUD, and to allow the homes to have “Craftsman” style elements, in addition to the “Bungalow” style that was approved for the project.

The original PUD, approved in 2017 met the 10% open space requirement. During the public hearing, testimony from the applicant described the open space areas as Tract “A, B, C, D, E and F” to include the below amenities. The Planning Commission approved the requested PUD with the proposed open space tracts. The applicant is requesting to modify amenities in Tract “A, B, C and E”.

The applicant’s representative has noted in the Narrative that the Association is requesting the modification and revision of the original approved amenities because the Association desires low cost, low maintenance amenities in the open spaces.

**APPROVED OPEN SPACE TRACT LEGEND:**

| TRACT A | COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE - FENCED DOG RUN AREA WITH IRRIGATION AND AMENITIES. |
| TRACT B | COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE - FLOWER GARDEN WITH IRRIGATION AND 10X10 GREEN HOUSE AMENITIES AND ALL WEATHER SURFACE PATHWAY FOR MOTORIZED ACCESS TO SAID AMENITIES AND CITY SEWER MAIN/ACCESS |
| TRACT C | COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE - VEGETABLE/HERB GARDEN WITH IRRIGATION AND 10X10 GREEN HOUSE AMENITIES. |
| TRACT D | STORMWATER/SWALE. |
| TRACT E | COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE - SITTING/PICNIC TABLE AMENITIES FOR USE BY NEIGHBORS AND CENTENNIAL TRAIL USERS. |
| TRACT F | PRIVATE ROADCWAY & UTILITY EASEMENT (SEWER & WATER) TO THE CITY OF COEUR D'ALENE. |

*FOR FURTHER DEFINITION OF OPEN SPACE AND USE, PLEASE REFER TO THE P.U.D. APPLICATION/NARRATIVE “RESERVATIONS DIAGRAM”.*
Previously Approved Open Space – Site Plan Map:

Previously Approved Open Space – Tract Layout Plan
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:

![Subject Property Map](image-url)
Planned Development

Key Characteristics
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 and lot size. Access should include pedestrian and bicycle facilities

Typical Uses
- Primary: Dependent 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).

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. Large scale Planned Developments often have a determined phasing and development plan and may include land uses such as housing, recreation, commercial centers, civic, and industrial parks, all within one contained development or subdivision. Building design and scale, transportation, open space, and other elements are approved through the City of Coeur d'Alene’s PUD evaluation process.

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 site planning (is) (is not) compatible with existing uses on adjacent properties.

LOCATION, SETTING, AND EXISTING USES:
The site is relatively flat and is the site of “Tilford Homes” a 13-lot residential development. There are no topographical or other physical constraints that would make the subject property unsuitable for the proposed modification to the planned unit development.

The site has existing commercial uses to the north, east and west of the subject property. Northwest Bank, which recently opened is located to the west of the site, to the east is Advanced Health Care of CdA. To the north of the site is Advanced Dermatology and Skin Surgery, and to the northwest is the Pain Management of North Idaho clinic.

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, that the request is compatible with uses on adjacent properties in terms of density, design, parking, open space and landscaping. (See Finding B8E with regards to open space.)

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

The “Tilford Place PUD” has been built out and was completed in one phase. The topography is relatively flat. Per the applicant, there is existing grass, shrubs, two trees and a bench in Tracts “A, B, and C”. There is shrubs, trees and irrigation in Tract “E”. Snow storage is currently located on the east and west ends of “Martin Place” and the perimeter of the development will be fenced along with a gated entry.
Looking north from W. Felton Drive at the Open Space in Tract “A”.

Looking north from W. Felton Drive at the Open Space in Tract “B”.

Looking north from W. Felton Drive at the Open Space in Tract “C”

View looking west along Tilford Ln. looking NW at Tract “E”
View looking at the two snow storage areas on the east and west sides of the development along W. Felton Drive.

Snow storage - east side
**Evaluation:** The Planning Commission must determine, based on the information before them, that the request 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.

The necessary findings were made with the original PUD approval with regard to the location, design and size of the proposal and the city's ability to provide service. The requested change in the open space tracts does not change the ability of city departments to provide services to the Tilford Place PUD. Therefore, no comments were provided by Fire or Engineering or Parks and Recreation under this finding.

**WASTEWATER:**
1. The Subject PUD is within the City of Coeur d'Alene and is being served by city wastewater.
2. Tract “B” of this proposed amendment shows two large trees over city sewer. Wastewater does not allow large trees planted over city sewer lines.

**WATER:**
No trees to be planted over Tract “B” over combined water/sewer easement

**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 approved Tilford Place PUD, and Final Development Plan approved in 2017 met the 10% open space requirement. Public hearing testimony from the applicant described the open space areas as Tract “A, B, C, D, E and F”. The applicant is requesting to modify amenities in Tract “A, B, C and E”.

The applicant's representative has noted in the Narrative that the Association is requesting the modification and revision of the original approved amenities because the Association desires low cost, low maintenance, amenities in the open spaces. (See applicant’s Narrative and graph describing the amenities installed and not installed in the Open Space tracts.)
APPROVED OPEN SPACE AMENITIES PER THE PUD: 7,271 square feet = 10%

Tracts A, B, C and E from the original narrative:

- **Tract “A”** will consist of a fenced dog run area with irrigation, shade trees (Autumn Blaze Red Maple), landscaping and amenities (seating bench, fire hydrant, dog fence, pet waste station and trash dispenser. Tract “A” is +/- 1000 SF.

- **Tract “B”** is proposed to have a community flower garden with irrigation, an 8x12 storage shed, benches, landscaping as well as a 20’ wide GrassGrid surface pathway as an amenity and City sewer access. Everything within the GrassGrid surface area is portable/movable when needed and can be reinstalled should the city need to access utilities. Tract “B” is approximately 2,500 SF including the GrassGrid area for wastewater access.

- **Tract “C”** will contain a community herb garden in planter boxes with irrigation along with a 10x10 green house. The metal planters will be in an area with crushed basalt gravel. Tract “C” is approximately 1295 SF

- **Tract “E”** is proposed as a community open space with picnic table, landscaping and amenities for the community passerby’s from the City Park and Centennial Trail. Tract “E” is approximately 3223 SF.

EXISTING AMENITIES IN THE OPEN SPACE AREAS:

**Tract “A”**:  
2 shade trees, grass and irrigation, 1 bench, 1 fake fire hydrant in what was supposed to be in the dog run area

**Tract “B”**:  
1 bench, grass, irrigation and landscaping, 20’ wide Grass grid

**Tract “C”**:  
Grass, irrigation, rock garden with plants and a rock garden with plants

**Tract “E”**:  
Grass, irrigation, landscaping and trees
**APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE FOR THE OPEN SPACE MODIFICATION:**

*Tilford Place* PUD Amendment Modification Request  
PUD Amendment Application Narrative  
February 15, 2023

**Development Name:** Tilford Place; PUD-1-17; PUD-4-17 & S-4-17

**Description of Modification Proposed:**

Tilford Homes Homeowners Association Inc. (the “Association”) seeks PUD Modification Approval of the “open space” areas within Tilford Place in the City of Coeur d’Alene. The parcel numbers for the proposed amendment are as follows:

1. Tract A: C-L238-000-00A-0  
2. Tract B: C-L238-000-00B-0  
3. Tract C: C-L238-000-00C-0  
4. Tract E: C-L238-000-00E-0

The Association would like to omit and replace the amenities that were on the original PUD as follows:

1. Tract A –  
   - Omit dog fence, dog run, pet waste station, trash dispenser  
   - Replace with three (3) Miss Kim Lilac Bushes, vinyl edging, 1” Basalt Rock, two (2) wrap around benches (to go around existing trees)

2. Tract B –  
   - Omit community flower garden, an 8x12 storage shed, metal planters, horseshoe pit  
   - Replace with Two (2) Silver Maple Trees, two (2) wrap around benches (to go around the trees)

3. Tract C –  
   - Omit community herb garden in planter boxes, 10x10 green house, metal planters w/crushed basalt gravel  
   - Replace with Two (2) Silver Maple Trees, two (2) wrap around benches (to go around the trees)

4. Tract E –  
   - Omit picnic table  
   - Replace with 3ft x 3ft address rock that will say (Tilford Place)
PROPOSED AMENITIES IN OPEN SPACE TRACTS:
The applicant has requested the following considerations:

**TRACT “A”**

- Proposed black poly edging
- Proposed (3) Miss Kim lilac bushes
- Proposed lawn
- (2) Autumn Blaze Red maple
- Proposed benches

**TRACT “B”**

- Hidote lavender
- Karl Forester grass
- Proposed benches
- Proposed lawn
- (2) Autumn Blaze Red maple
- Interior street tree by owner (Typ.)
- Stella d’oro daylily
Planning Commission Interpretation:
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

PUD Requirements:
The proposal provides adequate private common open space area, as determined by the commission, no less than ten percent (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.

Evaluation: The Planning Commission must determine based upon 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. In addition, the Planning Commission must determine whether the requested modification and reduction in open space would satisfy the open space requirement of the Bellerive PUD, and if the proposed open space meets the intent of the Code and previous project approvals. 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.

Standard parking requirements for the proposed use in Tilford Place PUD were approved as follows:

- Single-family dwellings: 2 spaces per unit.

The requested reduction to open space would not impact previously approved parking requirements for the project.

**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 Tilford Place Homeowner’s Association was a part of the original approval and Final Development Plan. The applicant has noted in the narrative that all open space areas will be maintained by the HOA in accordance with the existing governance documents.

**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.

**PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS:**

The following conditions apply to this PUD amendment and do not negate or replace any of the previously approved conditions for Bellerive unless specifically noted.

**WATER/WASTEWATER:**

1. No trees to be planted over Tract “B” over the combined water/sewer easement. No trees in the sewer line easement. The placement of the trees within this open space tract will need to be approved by the Water and Wastewater Departments prior to planting.

**PLANNING:**

2. A Final inspection is required to verify all Open Space tracts are complete. The bond amount of $59,385.00 held by the City will be refunded after a Final inspection sign-off.
ORDINANCES AND STANDARDS USED IN 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
Coeur d’Alene Bikeways Plan
Resolution 14-049

ACTION ALTERNATIVES:

The Planning Commission must consider this request and make appropriate findings to approve, approve with additional conditions, deny or deny without prejudice.
APPLICANT'S NARRATIVE
Development Name: Tilford Place; PUD-1-17; PUD-4-17 & S-4-17

Description of Modification Proposed:

Tilford Homes Homeowners Association Inc. (the “Association”) seeks PUD Modification Approval of the “open space” areas within Tilford Place in the City of Coeur d’Alene. The parcel numbers for the proposed amendment are as follows:

1. Tract A: C-L238-000-00A-0
2. Tract B: C-L238-000-00B-0
3. Tract C: C-L238-000-00C-0
4. Tract E: C-L238-000-00E-0

The Association would like to omit and replace the amenities that were on the original PUD as follows:

1. Tract A –
   ▪ Omit dog fence, dog run, pet waste station, trash dispenser
   ▪ Replace with three (3) Miss Kim Lilac Bushes, vinyl edging, 1” Basalt Rock, two (2) wrap around benches (to go around existing trees)

2. Tract B –
   ▪ Omit community flower garden, an 8x12 storage shed, metal planters, horseshoe pit
   ▪ Replace with Two (2) Silver Maple Trees, two (2) wrap around benches (to go around the trees)

3. Tract C –
   ▪ Omit community herb garden in planter boxes, 10x10 green house, metal planters w/crushed basalt gravel
   ▪ Replace with Two (2) Silver Maple Trees, two (2) wrap around benches (to go around the trees)

4. Tract E –
   ▪ Omit picnic table
   ▪ Replace with 3ft x 3ft address rock that will say (Tilford Place)
The modifications proposed are further illustrated on the enclosed plan set map.

The modifications will occur at one time. A phasing schedule is unnecessary.

Proposals for the improvements and landscaping are also enclosed.

**Reason for Modification:**

The Association requests this modification and revision of the original approved amenities because the Association desires low cost, low maintenance, amenities in the open spaces. The proposed revisions carry a lower cost of maintenance, borne by the Association, than the amenities detailed in the original PUD. The Association also desires the modification to facilitate neighboring owner’s privacy concerns as well as to create more open spaces for depositing snow.
COEUR D'ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS AND ORDER

PUD-2-17m1

A. INTRODUCTION
This matter having come before the Planning Commission on May 9, 2023, and there being present a person requesting approval of: PUD-2-17m1 a request for a modification to the open space and amenities that were approved in the existing planned unit development known as “Tilford PUD”.

APPLICANT: TILFORD HOMES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION INC.

LOCATION: +/- 1.66 ACRES LOCATED ALONG WEST TILFORD LANE IN THE RIVERSTONE DEVELOPMENT

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 Planned Development Place type.
B3. That the zoning is C-17PUD.
B4. That the notice of public hearing was published on, April 22, 2023, which fulfills the proper legal requirement.
B5. That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on, May 1, 2023, 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 May 9, 2023.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria to consider for B8B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Architectural style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Layout of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building heights &amp; bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Off-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Landscaping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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 property

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 TILFORD HOMES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION INC. for approval of the planned unit development, as described in the application should be (approved) (denied) (denied without prejudice).

Special conditions applied are:

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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming  Voted _____
Commissioner Ingalls  Voted _____
Commissioner Lutrop  Voted _____
Commissioner Mandel  Voted _____
Commissioner McCracken  Voted _____
Commissioner Ward  Voted _____
Chairman Messina  Voted _____

Commissioners ___________ were absent.

Motion to ______________ carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

________________________________________
CHAIRMAN TOM MESSINA