

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM  
702 E. FRONT AVENUE  
FEBRUARY 11, 2025**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Tom Messina, Chairman  
Sarah McCracken  
Lynn Fleming  
Phil Ward  
Peter Luttrupp

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director  
Sean Holm, Senior Planner  
Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant  
Randy Adams, City Attorney

**Commissioners Absent:**

Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair  
Mark Coppess

**CALL TO ORDER:**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by Commissioner Fleming, seconded by Commissioner McCracken, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on December 10, 2024 workshop minutes. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director, provided the following comments:

- Mike Behary, Associate Planner will be retiring next Wednesday after 9 ½ years of service at the city. We are sad to see him go.
- The March 11, Planning & Zoning Commission meeting will be a proposed zone change associated with the Coeur Terre project. They are seeking a small zone change request, a portion on the NW property away from all the residential areas where they want to change the zoning and also change the zoning where they want to change the well site. They have worked with the City's Water Department to reconfigure the appropriate site for the well. There will be an amendment to the development agreement as well.

**COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARING: \*\*\*ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM.**

1. Applicant: Aaron Mote  
Location: 213 E. Harrison Ave  
Request: A proposed zone change from a C-17PUD to a C-17 on a parcel measuring 0.213 acres (ZC-1-25)

Mr. Holm, Senior Planner, provided the following statements:

The applicant is requesting approval of a zone change from C-17PUD to a C-17.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

**Summary of Past Actions on 213 Harrison Avenue (ZC-3-80):**

The applicants, Frank K. Myers and Julie A. Clovis, sought to rezone the property from R-1 (Residential One) to C-1aL-PUD (Commercial One-A Limited / Planned Unit Development) to remodel the existing residence into an insurance/real-estate office.

*Public Hearing Highlights from prior request:*

**Planning Commission Recommendation (February 12, 1980):**

The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the zone change, subject to the condition that the structure be retained in a residential style.

Justifications for the recommendation included:

- The Comprehensive Plan designated the property as suitable for Neighborhood Service.
- The requested use aligned with the Neighborhood Service designation.
- The existing curb cut on Harrison Avenue, though not ideal, was the best alternative to encroaching on a residential street (2<sup>nd</sup> St.).

**City Council Review (March 4 and April 1, 1980):**

The initial hearing on March 4, 1980, was continued to April 1, 1980, to allow the Traffic Safety Committee to explore one-way traffic feasibility on Harrison Avenue. The Traffic Safety Committee ultimately recommended against the one-way street.

On April 1, 1980, the City Council approved the zone change (4-2 vote) with the condition that the structure retain a residential appearance.

Conditions of Approval- As detailed in Ordinance No. 1611, the zone change approval included the following conditions:

- The property was rezoned to C-1aL-PUD with the specific limitation that the site layout and use be restricted to remodeling the existing house into an insurance/real estate office.
- The structure had to maintain its residential style.
- The development was required to install 8-foot sidewalks along street frontages to comply with commercial site improvement standards.

The applicants narrative states: "our intended use for the property will be a Professional Management office in the existing residential structure. We would like to then build a Caretakers Unit additionally on the property with additional space on the ground floor to provide some window displays, as from time-to time we have customers tht request to see examples of a unit."

There are Four (4) findings that must be met for the re-zoning, Findings B#1-B#4.

1. **Findings B#1: That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies.**

**2042 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE:**

- The subject property is within city limits.
- The City's 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as a "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**

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

**Objective GD 1.4:** Increase pedestrian walkability and access within commercial development.

**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.

**Jobs & Economy**

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

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

2. **Findings B#2: That the public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use.**

- City staff from Engineering, Streets, Water, Fire, Police Parks and Wastewater Departments have reviewed the application request in regards to public utilities and public facilities.
- Each department has indicated that there are adequate public facilities and public utilities available to serve the proposed zone change request.

3. **Findings B#3: That the physical characteristics of the site (make) (do not make) it suitable for the request at this time.**

**PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:**

The immediate area is characterized by a mix of small-scale residential and commercial development on a relatively flat elevation. The parcel itself sits at the northwest corner of Harrison Avenue and 2nd Street and is approximately 9,411 square feet in size. The structure on the property is a mid-20th-century house, retaining most of its original residential architectural style. The site features a sidewalk along Harrison, a paved driveway on 2<sup>nd</sup> St., and minimal landscaping along the frontages with mature trees in the NW corner of the lot.

The surrounding streets are primarily residential in character, with single-family homes situated on modestly sized lots. West of the subject property is St. Vincent de Paul HELP Center. Harrison Avenue serves as a key east-west corridor with limited pedestrian infrastructure, as sidewalks are sparse along residential sections. While some parcels have undergone redevelopment, much of the area retains its mid-century neighborhood character, with a mix of older homes and newer infill projects.

4. **Findings B#4: 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 they intend to use the existing structure to create two business offices. Additionally, they intend to construct a caretaker's unit on the property. Using Land Use Code 710 – General Office Building from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, and assuming approximately 1400 sf of office space, it can be estimated that this use will generate 18 additional trips per day with 2 additional a.m. peak hour trips and 2 additional p.m. peak hour trips. The caretaker's unit can be assumed to add no additional trips vs. the permitted residential use. It is unlikely that this use will adversely affect traffic. All sidewalk deficiencies on Harrison Avenue must be corrected, new sidewalk installed on 2nd Street, and a pedestrian ramp installed at the corner at the time of building permit/construction. An easement will be required to accommodate the sidewalk on 2nd Street, which will be addressed at the time of development.

**NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:**

The neighborhood surrounding 213 E Harrison Avenue is characterized by a mix of historical development and gradual transformation. Harrison Avenue serves as a local connector street, providing access to the downtown core and nearby amenities. Recent commercial development along 3rd and 4th Streets has contributed to the area's growing commercial vitality, while nearby north-south collectors provide connections to downtown and the I-90 freeway.

The area is predominantly residential, featuring early to mid-20th-century homes in a variety of architectural styles, including Craftsman bungalows, traditional cottages, and ranch-style houses. Many homes retain their original character, complemented by mature trees, landscaped yards, and porches. The neighborhood includes a mix of residential, civic, and commercial uses.

**Decision Point:**

Mr. Holm noted the action alternatives this evening. The Planning and Zoning Commission must consider the request a recommendation to the City Council on whether the proposed zone change from C-17PUD to C17 should be adopted or rejected.

Mr. Holm, concluded his presentation.

Chairman Messina asked besides C-17 which is being requested, there is a NC (neighborhood commercial). Would that zoning district do what the applicant is asking for as far as an office? My question is based on the information that has been provided in the packets. He has a question about the caretaker's unit, which is basically an ADU. Would they be able to put an accessory use similar to that under a Neighborhood Commercial zoning? It's an apartment for residential caretaker. He wants to find out what other zoning application might work instead of C-17 zoning.

Mr. Holm replied there are a few different ways to accomplish something similar to what he is requesting. NC and CC are both somewhat similar. The scope and size of the building that you can build is a little bit different, but there's an hours of operation limitation. It's done by floor area ratio so the size of the lot determines how much you can build on. There are some limitations to use, but General Construction Services would be allowed. One of the limitations is that the caretaker's unit or a living unit would have to be on top or below grade; it cannot be at the ground level elevation.

Chairman Messina asked if it would have to be a on top or below of one of the general construction service buildings, let's say, or another building that's there. He thought he read there was going to be two buildings there. Is that correct?

Mr. Holm states yes, his understanding was that the applicant was going to have the existing single family home be the office space and build the caretaker's home.

Commissioner McCracken asked about the same two zoning districts (CC and NC) and compared them to C-17 and C-17L that allow uses that are not really compatible with the surrounding residential uses.

Mr. Holm replied the general description of service activities is the "services." The way city code works is you have the category of use if you have the commercial category which is a retail or service, such as taxes, haircut, etc. This would be allowed. Getting back to Chairman Messina's question, the other avenue would be a zone change request for a C-17L which is a limited commercial which would allow for office space but it doesn't allow for the general construction service. C-17L also allows the rest of the C-17 uses through the Special Use Permit process.

Commissioner Ward asked about the C-17PUD. Why can he not do what he wants to do under the current zoning?

Mr. Holm replied because it's not specifically selling insurance or real estate. The PUD locked it down and staff believes it was done as part of the wastewater moratorium from the 1980's.

Commissioner Fleming asked about just modifying the existing PUD?

Mr. Holm replied that staff did have a discussion and it would be such a strange action that the Planning Department did not feel comfortable modifying the PUD. It is not an acre and half so it does not meet the minimums. We felt it would be much better to have the Planning and Zoning Commission decide on the

zone change.

Chairman Messina asked if the applicant would want to do a C-17PUD based on what he wants to use the property for. Would he have to come back and do another application?

Ms. Patterson replied he would not meet the criteria for doing a PUD. The code has changed and he would need an acre and half. There is the conditional zoning option in the zoning code. We have only done that a few times, and these can be very challenging as these are al a carte and these are very hard for staff to manage over time when there are certain uses that are restricted or allowed on specific properties.

Chairman Messina commented that we can't restrict the property but we can rezone.

Mr. Holm replied this is what Ms. Patterson was stating with conditional rezoning. The City Council has approved conditional zoning from time to time. Staff is a weary of doing that because it becomes hard to manage over time and ends up being similar to what we have now. If you look at the city's informational zoning sheets and residents come and they ask what can I do with my property and we look at the R-12 zoning, the more time that you put these conditional zones on there, the more staff has to go and find which specific parcels that applies to and give them that information. It becomes quite the task over time.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if there could be a development agreement.

Mr. Holm replied you can, but it's a very small piece of property.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated the property is surrounded by C-17 and C-17L and this property is between. The applicant wants to go to C-17. It seems like the C-17 would be the proper thing to do without hearing from the applicant first.

Commissioner McCracken asked about the details for parking and where they would have vehicular access onto the lot.

Mr. Holm replied he had discussed this with the City Engineer today and asked him how they would access the site. When this was originally done 45 years ago there was a lot of comments that the residential street shouldn't have commercial traffic on it. The City Engineer said he would rather have the access from the existing point of access on the site which is on Second Street rather than having the traffic stop to wait to turn into a parking lot off of Harrison, however he said if Planning Commission wants it the other way, he would be happy to do either.

Chairman Messina asked what is the C-17 to the west of the property.

Commissioner Fleming replied it was the library years ago.

**Public testimony open:**

Aaron Mote was sworn and introduced himself. He stated there will be no business operations going on in the lower level of the caretaker's unit. The caretaker's unit is very necessary for that property because of the Help Center next door. He loves St. Vincent de Paul and he has donated \$35,000 dollars this year. But there are serious problems with vagrancy in the area due to the nature of what they do there. People have been known to be sleeping on the back fence line. He lived on the property when he first moved here. He enjoyed living at that property. He considered a rental property instead of the commercial use, but he does not think it would be the best use. The best use would be a small business or professional management office with a caretaker's unit to properly oversee the property with onsite security. There have been beer bottles thrown into the property. He feels he has provided a plan for adequate parking in front of the ADU and he could fit three or four vehicles in front of that. He would have two parking spots for the office. He would like to provide a nice sidewalk and a blinking crosswalk would be a nice addition. He offered to pay for that as well.

Chairman Messina asked Ms. Patterson if the applicant would have to adhere to all of the parking regulations.

Ms. Patterson replied yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Ward asked about the existing building. Will that be converted into the office and you will be adding the additional separate caretaker's unit?

Mr. Mote replied that he would like to put the ADU as far back in the left corner as much as possible to provide as much parking as he can on the property. If he needed to, he would take out the existing garage to provide more room for parking.

Commissioner Ward asked about what kind of business and how much traffic would come and go throughout the day.

Mr. Mote replied he owns Direct Siding. He does mostly in-home consultations right now. This business would be his physical design meeting place. He hopes to have a larger place in three or four years at a different location if he outgrows this space. Right now, he does have some trailers parked on the property. These will be moved as soon as the zone change is approved. He has hired an architect to start this project a year and half ago. He spent some money on the plans and thought he was good to go. Mr. Mote was surprised when this PUD came up as part of the zoning and he learned from city staff that this could not move forward without a zone change. He has been stuck in a situation where he hasn't been able to do anything because he did not know what to do on the property.

Commissioner Ward asked again if his plan was to convert the existing residence to an office use and build a caretakers' facility in the back closer to Vincent De Paul and have the parking and access in the area between the existing building and St. Vincent De Paul.

Mr. Mote replied yes.

Commissioner McCracken asked the applicant to clarify if the siding materials will be stored onsite.

Mr. Mote replied nothing will be stored onsite. There will be maybe one company vehicle parked on the property. He will be removing all trailers and everything will be removed from the property as soon as the development starts. There will be no building materials on the property. It will purely be a real estate office to meet one client at a time.

Chairman Messina asked if he would be remodeling the existing home somewhat to turn it into an office.

Mr. Mote replied there will be a \$75,000 plan to remodel the existing home.

Commissioner McCracken asked if he is just using the business for office use, why can the PUD not just be used.

Mr. Mote replied he could not build the structure with the PUD. He needs the ADU for the investment. He wants someone living there on the property. He will have security cameras.

Barbara Stamas introduced herself and was sworn in. She stated we have caretakers on the street now. She feels the property has deteriorated since the applicant has lived there. The fence has broken down. She is not happy. The parking is horrible. There were 11 people living at the home at one time.

Chairman Messina replied the intent of the caretaker's unit is not an assisted living home. The applicant will explain again what he wants.

Lori Dawson introduced herself and was sworn in. She stated her concern is the caretaker's unit. The parking is an issue. Her garbage cannot get picked up when cars are parked on the street and her street cannot get

cleaned. There is trash is all over. She is concerned with the homeless in the neighborhood.

**Applicant Rebuttal:**

Mr. Mote said he would like to clarify the caretaker's unit would be for the use of an employee to live on the property and take care of the property, take care of the business, and contribute to the safety of the neighborhood. Going forward with parking there should be two cars during the day for business and maybe a customer during the day. He would like to make the improvements to the property but it been on hold for two years. The existing home is currently unoccupied right now. If he does not get the zone change, he will turn it into a rental.

Commissioner Luttrupp commented that it is zoned C-17PUD currently. This specifies what the use can be limited and restricted to remodeling the existing house into an insurance real estate office. This is the way the property currently sits. You will need a zone change for what you would like to do to either a C-17 or C-17L. He feels the neighbors would feel comfortable with a C-17L because it would be more restrictive. Would that meet your requirements?

Mr. Mote replied he has not reviewed them enough but if they would meet his requirements he would answer yes. He would just want to make sure the zoning district would allow for an ADU.

Ms. Patterson stated the applicant stated this evening he does not intent to have the display or the retail sales at the business. So, it sounds like the C-17L would meet his needs.

Mr. Mote replied he had no intention out retail sales or displays and he thought he made it clear. He apologizes if that was not presented clearly.

Ms. Patterson stated the C-17L does allow the caretaker's apartment and it allows the service uses, including administration professional offices.

Mr. Holm replied in his professional opinion if he is using it as for strictly as an office space for people to show up and open a book, then that is just office space. If there are no goods being stored there. This would be a C-17L use.

Chairman Messina asked Mr. Mote if the existing home will be used as his office space.

Mr. Mote replied 100%.

Chairman Messina asked if the ADU will be used by the employee. Will the employee live there and take care of the property and the office?

Mr. Mote replied yes.

Commissioner Fleming asked if he has reviewed the C-17L zoning sheet.

Ms. Patterson handed Mr. Mote the C-17L zoning district information sheet.

Mr. Mote replied, after look at the sheet, that this would fit what he would like to do on his property.

Commissioner Fleming stated if the Commission recommend the C-17L tonight, would you be happy with that?

Mr. Mote replied yes it would work just fine for his intentions on the property.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated if you were to turn around and sell the property, it would have the C-17L zoning and the uses allowed by right. Are you ok with that?



Mr. Mote replied yes, that would be fair.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked do you feel comfortable with C-17L?

Mr. Mote replied the City initially came back to him with C-17. He just wants to do what is right and both of these zones seem to fit. They both have the ADU as an allowable use.

Chairman Messina stated the C-17 is a broader use. The C-17L is more restrictive.

Mr. Mote replied he is not intending to sell the property. He just wants to use the property for a professional office and an ADU. It works for him either way.

Chairman Messina asked Mr. Adams if the Commission can recommend to change to a C-17 to a C-17L tonight.

Mr. Adams replied if the applicant is willing to do this, the Commission can recommend C-17L to City Council as to the new zoning.

Commissioner McCracken asked where the caretaker's unit would be on the property.

Mr. Mote replied it would be above the garage.

Commissioner McCracken asked about the Community Commercial zoning. You could have the caretaker's unit above the garage without a Special Use Permit. Isn't that correct?

Ms. Patterson replied yes, it has been done before, on 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

Commissioner McCracken said this would allow both of his uses and be restrictive for the neighbors, right?

Ms. Patterson replied yes, it would require a little more buffering between his uses and the neighbors.

Commissioner McCracken stated yes it would have more buffering and she feels when she looks at C-17L you get into boarding house, group dwelling, education, etc. More uses with parking or religious use. The CC would get his project going but would also limit the uses for the neighbors. She feels like this would balance all the uses out. This would meet all of Mr. Mote's needs without the Special Use Permit and fit the neighborhood the best.

Mr. Mote replied he and Mr. Holm did look at that use.

Mr. Holm stated he and Mr. Mote did look at the Future Land Use Map and those compact neighborhoods. He chose this zone for his request but he was told that ultimately the Commission and City Council will make the final determination.

Commissioner Ward stated he does not have a concern about the office type use. The area along Harrison Avenue is rapidly changing and, in a few years, it will totally be changed. He wants to make sure whatever the commission does this evening keeps the change to the Harrison Avenue frontage. He is not big on spot zones.

Chairman Messina asked Mr. Adams if we do a C-17, would that allow whatever falls under that zoning.

Mr. Adams stated it would allow all uses under the zoning district, unless there was conditional zoning limiting the uses. That is not applicable.

Commissioner Fleming stated if this property sells tomorrow, the C-17 is wide open.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated if you look at this site, the C-17 is moving this way. The proper zoning is either C-17 or C-17L.

Mr. Mote replied he would like the C-17L. He thinks this would work for his needs.

Commissioner McCracken asked if he would consider NC.

Ms. Patterson handed both the NC and CC zoning district information sheet to Mr. Mote for him to look them over and make a decision.

Mr. Mote replied he would like to continue with the C-17L. If he were to sell the property, he would not want to limit the new property owner to not be able to have duplexes, which both NC and CC both restrict those.

**Public testimony closed:**

**Commission Discussion:**

Commissioner Luttrupp stated he would like to recommend to change the zone to C-17L.

Chairman Messina commented he likes the C-17L as well. It lets you have the option of a duplex. The NC takes that away.

Commissioner Fleming stated the lot is not large enough for a juvenile facility or a hospital. We are trying not to have it do damage to the neighborhood and have it fit in. C-17L fits nicely. Currently it does harm the residential homes it gets away from the "free for all" of the C-17. He will address the parking. C-17L makes sense.

**Motion by Commissioner Fleming, seconded by Commissioner Luttrupp, to recommend that City Council adopt the C-17L zone change (ZC-1-25). Motion carried.**

Commissioner McCracken states she feels the NC is a better fit. She would prefer the NC and it would still achieve Mr. Mote's goals and would better protect the neighborhood.

**ROLL CALL:**

Commissioner Fleming	Voted Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted <b>Nay</b>
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 4 to1 vote.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

1. Downtown Core/Infill Working Group Progress Update
2. Historic Preservation Commission Efforts

**Presented by: Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director**

**Downtown Core/Infill Working Group Progress Update**

Ms. Patterson said she will be providing an update on the work of the Downtown Core/Infill Working

Group and also the Historic Preservation Commission's efforts.

She noted that City Council directed staff to evaluate and recommend updates to the Downtown Core and Downtown Infill (DO-E and DO-N) Development Standards and Design Guidelines in response on community feedback.

Some of the guidance that the infill group gave us was to incorporate an historic preservation perspective to evaluate the development potential of downtown looking at what's allowed in our current code and what it could look like if we built out under the current code also looking at impacts of the current code on infrastructure and traffic and looking at possible alternatives to height and FAR, (floor area ratio). Currently you can go up to 220 feet tall in the downtown if you can meet all the floor area ratio bonuses and so we've been receiving some community feedback that maybe that's too tall and that might be taking away from the character of the downtown and potentially could contribute to a loss of some of the historic characteristics of the downtown. Also, the working group has been evaluating what's allowed currently with the FAR bonuses and looking at other communities to see how they are addressing these same issues and what guidelines and standards they put into place. Then, of course, a big component as we get further along will be making sure we're engaging the stakeholders, property owners, the businesses, those that are downtown, as well as the rest of the community and getting input from them and doing communication and outreach.

She listed the working group members and city staff involved in the effort.

Ms. Patterson shared slides showing the downtown core boundaries and noted it is the bigger boundary here and the dash line is the downtown core. The area with the fuchsia coloring is the area that's the mandatory review of the design review commission and the areas outside of that, it would just be a staff review of any proposals that come through.

The infill areas that we're talking about with this working group are the Downtown North and the Downtown Overlay East the Midtown Overlay we're not looking at this time. The Downtown North is a little tricky because there's underlying zoning. You have to look at both the existing zoning and then the overlay and then there's the downtown core that overlaps some of it. We've talked about maybe separating that out making it easier to administer. The Downtown Overlay East boundary is here. Again, there's a variety of zoning districts that fall within the overlay area.

We've had 12 meetings with the working group we've been trying to have two meetings a month, we've had a few months we couldn't achieve that but we've been working hard to go through a lot of material and evaluate the code and look at other communities and come up with some recommendations so we're still working through the process. Our first meeting was last May and then we did a check-in with City Council in July. Here is the feedback that Council gave us, they said they like where we're going, we definitely do want the working group to consider the view corridors and the towers. They did like preserving kind of a historic core that would have limited heights and then having some historic characteristics on the Main Street. Looking at how the design guidelines would interplay with that. Addressing parking kind of our current parking standards and the fee in lieu of option that you could pay a fee instead of providing parking. They wanted us to definitely look at the FAR bonuses, see which ones could be removed and then if other ones should be added. They asked us to evaluate making Sherman Avenue and Lakeside into one way streets. This was evaluated a number of years ago but this is something that they've asked us to look at again. They want us to incorporate public safety so work closely with Police and Fire as we get further along. They liked the idea of us doing modeling to evaluate the development potential using software and also working with University of Idaho architecture program to do some cost savings. That was their feedback.

We have reviewed our existing code our existing design guidelines as well as a number of historic documents that have been done such as economic development studies done for the city for the downtown. We have outlined some desired scenarios to model such as buildout under the current code and then looking at some varying changes to height and things like increasing or decreasing FAR (floor

area ratio). We've had conversations with a University of Idaho architecture professor about getting some of their graduate students to help us with modeling and also helping us with imaging for the revised design guidelines. We met with Ali Marineau from the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization about traffic modeling based on the scenarios. We have looked at the development standards, FAR bonuses, and design guidelines from other communities. I mentioned for those overlay districts we've discussed it might be a lot easier for everyone if we just created separate zoning districts instead of having three different zoning districts with an overlay on top of it and trying to figure out how that works with the code consistency. We also looked at outdoor lighting considerations at our last meeting. One of the other things that Mr. Holm and Mr. Behary have been doing is working on trying to create a base model or what you call a "digital twin" using ESRI software. You're probably familiar with our GIS maps on the City's website where you see the zoning layers and partial property information. ESRI has this technology available where you can create 3D modeling and you can build it up and you can do it based on existing plans and different scenarios, and then you can turn the image around, look at shadows, look at sight lines, etc.

We're going to discuss this more tomorrow with the working group. I thought it would be fun for you to see some of the behind-the-scenes. With Mike Behary retiring, we're going to be needing to lean more about how the University of Idaho architecture program can help with this effort.

We have been looking at communities' design guidelines and one of the ones we really liked is Kalispell, Montana. They have done a nice job of addressing historic preservation but allowing modern architecture to be built so they're not trying to create a false sense of history but allowing things that are compatible. In these images you can kind of see the scale and the size and some of the design elements really fit well with the historic architecture but it is modern design. We are looking at what they've done to incorporate that in terms of language and imagery into our design guidelines.

We have a lot still to do so here's kind of a list of our next steps mentioned previously. We want to look at what are those boundaries and how do we address the infill areas, look at the parking, in addition to parking ratios and that fee in leu of, and leasing of required parking areas. We need to do some additional modeling to really truly come up with those scenarios and then once we have those scenarios figure out what does that look like for used types for the square footage and then run that through the traffic modeling and run that through for impacts on utilities and traffic.

Commissioner McCracken asked when they pay fee in leu of parking, how can they pay for all parking?

Ms. Patterson replied they can. But we've had very few developers that have taken advantage of the fee. We probably need to look at what the actual cost of fee in leu should be nowadays. Our fees are based on 15 years ago or more for the fee in leu of, but it's very expensive to build parking.

Ms. Patterson continued with her presentation and stated we want to look at the allowable heights and that looking at the one-way roads and what the impacts would be to traffic for that making sure we get input from public safety and stakeholders. Once we have all that kind of put it together in a draft, we will get more input from the public and others and then bring that to this commission and then to City Council for consideration of both the development standards and the design guidelines. We've also talked about it would be great to have some of the University of Idaho students actually package up the design guidelines because that was something that was previously done by Mark Hinshaw and his company. We thought that would be a nice student project.

Chairman Messina asked regarding the FAR what kind of input were you getting to say like what can you increase the FAR's or what are you going to give us if you want more FAR's. What was the discussion on that? Also are you considering expanding the area for the Design Review Commission's review beyond what we have right now and/or maybe lower the square footage of some buildings to have a threshold for staff versus commission review.

Ms. Patterson replied we have not addressed that yet so that's a very preliminary kind of discussion but that would be something that would make sense because, you're right, if it's a very small thing maybe it doesn't need to come for commission review and it could just be staff. We'll look at that. The other question regarding the FAR ratio, currently there are things that you can currently get a bonus if you have recreation space so if you're providing a gym within a facility that's only for people that live in that building, that can be a bonus. There are some other bonuses that Council asked us to remove or review, like water feature. But there are other ones we talked about that would be really important such as workforce housing. We've had the discussion about how do you incentivize that. No one has ever taken advantage of it and it's currently in the code. So, the question is do you have to make it a bigger bonus and how do you trying to figure out realistically what does that look like to achieve the goal. It's really kind of an overhaul of the FAR bonuses and looking at other communities to see what they've done. We've added some neat ones for consideration like a public restroom and an indoor public space, picture an atrium space that could be a year-round space to get out of the weather.

Commissioner McCracken asked if you get rid of the overlay, would you get rid of both overlays, and then are you just getting rid of the Downtown zone.

Ms. Patterson replied we've talked about the Downtown Core zone and then possibly instead of the Downtown North overlay, maybe creating a Downtown North zone. We just talked about it'd be nice to simplify because it has been a challenge to administer.

Commissioner McCracken stated it's similar to the application today where if you have these little PUDs or overlays. For someone purchasing the property, it would be nice if the regulations were very clear on what the restrictions are on it. She asked to see the slide again showing the map boundary of the Downtown Overlay East. It looks like right by the entrance to the City Hall parking lot there are two little parcels at the bottom. Is there a reason why those are separate?

Ms. Patterson replied that she thinks the property owner kept asking City Council to include that in the Downtown East. The one is that parcel and the other is our new Museum site right where the White House has been relocated. We talked too about whether the Downtown East should also include the East Sherman area. If we do that, it becomes a bigger task. But those are some of the things we've discussed as well.

Commissioner Luttrupp stated he thinks that this committee that Ms. Patterson on is excellent. To him it's what was similar to how Atlas was started. We wanted waterfront. We wanted to do something to have waterfront for the public and the city went through a process, a rather elaborate one, and it resulted in open waterfront for the city and other buildings. The city has a desire to keep our downtown area in a certain form, in a certain fashion, in a certain way, and we understand proper rights and so forth, but still we were going ahead to try to see what we can do to keep Coeur d'Alene. Your group that you're working with, that's working. You're to be complimented on taking a task like this on because two meetings a month, it may be a lot but, you're going to accomplish something. It's a small investment. He congratulates the working group and looks forward to seeing the next report.

Commissioner Ward said everyone complains about height and they think 20 story buildings are horrible and we have got to abolish them. Is there anyone looking at the height of the apartments around town. There are a lot of four stories apartments. If they were five stories, they'd have to be sprinkled which makes more cost but may also generate more construction and more buyers and actually bring prices down somewhat. But I just think you know it's either the four or 20 stories is just kind of a dichotomy that doesn't really work very well. I understand your group has not yet looked at the zoning outside of the downtown area to determine if that would be something that could be discussed with this Commission in the future.

Ms. Patterson replied currently if you're doing multi-family, you'd be 45 ft tall would be kind of your general one unless you do the R-34 density increase to get to 63 feet tall. So that would be your maximum height

unless you have a mixed-use commercial building where commercial is more than 51% then you can be unlimited for height. We haven't seen that happen. But you're right that could be something to look at to incentivize additional development.

### Historic Preservation Commission Efforts

Ms. Patterson stated she wanted to give an update on the historic preservation commission's efforts so as you're aware of what has been happening. The commission was formed in 2019 with the goal of preserving our historic buildings and neighborhoods and there are a number of duties. They are able to help make a designation of historic properties and historic districts and make recommendations in the planning process, including recommending ordinances and actions. They have recently been working on a demolition review process so they can enter properties and take photos for documentation and then also taking public comment and testimony on issues of historic importance. Here is a list of our commission members and in addition we have a city council member, Kiki Miller, as our liaison. We are a certified local government and had our ordinance adopted and the commission formed, all in 2019. Then quickly thereafter we received grant funds and we worked on a historic preservation plan that was adopted by City Council in 2021. The commission itself wasn't directly involved in the Hamilton House preservation and getting that listed in the National Register of Historic Places but they were instrumental in helping provide that support and doing a review of that nomination that would go to the State Historic Preservation Office and then to the National Park Service for final listing. Last year was the first year we started celebrating May as preservation month, which is a national event. We'll be doing that again this year and we started a Heart of History award program two years ago. Last year that was rolled into the preservation month celebration. Currently we are finishing up the Garden District nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. We hope to get listed early this year. The commission was also involved with and worked closely with staff and community activists on efforts to help preserve the Roosevelt Inn. We worked closely with City Attorney Randy Adams on coming up with a facade easement to help preserve the exterior of the structure and require that the new owners would preserve that. We worked with the commission and staff to bring forward a temporary moratorium to City Council, which was adopted and expired in December. We've had some recent success with doing some salvaging. There were some photos in the paper and Commissioner Fleming wrote a My Turn in there about the vault doors from the Johnston building which was a bank building built in 1905. They are pretty impressive doors and they have both been salvaged. We also have a new demolition review process and we've had our first meeting with an applicant. The goal is to provide input, have a discussion with the owner to say is it possible to preserve the structure and if not, would you consider some input on the new structure. The commission is not going to say no you can't demolish it, but they'd like to offer some input on how the new structures could be more compatible with the historic character of the neighborhoods.

Chairman Messina asked is that more of just a discussion or recommendation because he believes he read in the paper or heard that the person who owned a property said thanks for the input and they will consider it, but that they really don't have to comply with the commission's input.

Ms. Patterson replied that's correct. On that particular case, we have not received any requests to do a variance. That was a recommendation of the commission to the applicant to doing a variance to reduce the side yard setback to allow the garage and the driveway to access off the side street to make it fit more with the neighborhood. I think based on timing, cost and process, the applicant decided not to pursue it. she doesn't know if it's going to happen.

Chairman Messian asked if the historic commission is looking at or having discussions about putting a little more teeth into something like that.

Ms. Patterson replied the commission, at this point, is just kind of evaluating the process and trying to figure out how to improve it and then if that is a desire, they will definitely have to go to City Council and get their blessing. Council would have to change the code. At this point it's just a recommendation on the replacement structure. They get to review the ones that they select if it was built prior to 1960 and it is of historic significance.

Chairman Messina asked at this point is there anything that the historic commission could do to have input on the overlays in downtown and on Sherman.

Ms. Patterson replied yes, three of them are on that working group for that very reason to make sure that we have that that interface and we are getting their input.

Ms. Patterson continued. Another one we recently had was a very small stakeholder meeting with some property owners along the Government Way corridor because that's been identified as an area that has a lot of historic integrity and the neighbors are really cohesive and have done some things in the past to protect the trees along the median. The goal was to visit with them and get their input on what are things they'd like to preserve and what changes concern them in the neighborhood, to see if they might want to do something related to historic preservation.

Chairman Messina asked about Government Way and some of those historic looking existing homes and the new homes going in there, which we've seen some that they don't match too well. They're nice houses but they're not fitting the character. Would there be further discussions on the design review guidelines and having them expand to any of those areas that the Historic Preservation Commission is looking at to say, here's some design guidelines?

Ms. Patterson replied we have had some discussions and there are some different options. When we brought forward the historic preservation plan and City Council adopted it, there is some language in there to allow for historic overlay zones and within that we anticipated it might be similar to an opt-in where the neighbors would say we want to have this designation and it might have certain design criteria, not super specific and not saying what color, or requiring finials or things like, that there might be certain things that they might want to consider. For example, if there's an alley, to use the alley access, or having the accessory dwelling unit look like the primary home. We're going to be asking some of the neighborhoods if they want to do that or not. At this point it's really up for discussion. I don't anticipate it would become something that would be a design review commission item but it might be something that would be reviewed by staff or maybe the Historic Preservation Commission. At this point the commission really wants a light touch but wants maximum effect, right, so it's this whole balancing act. We want to protect property rights but we also want to make sure that all of the neighborhoods don't change so significantly that people don't recognize Coeur d'Alene.

Commissioner McCracken asked about the Garden District application and if staff could provide a clarification about the contributing homes and non-contributing homes and if the contributing homes are pre-1960. Is that right?

Ms. Patterson replied it's 50 years or older for historic, but for the demolition review process we chose prior to 1960 just to help limit the number of properties reviewed. For historic preservation and for the National Register, it's 50 years or older is considered historic. A contributing home, there's a couple different parts. Yes, it has to meet the age requirement but also it has to be a certain architectural style that's representative of Coeur d'Alene's history and hasn't been significantly modified over time. We bring in an expert that helps us do this analysis and they identify these properties. For example, there might be a home that was built in 1940 but it has been converted and has this huge addition. So now it's non-contributing because it looks nothing like it did when it was built and it's not really helping contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner McCracken stated in that application her understanding is the amount of contributing is like the low 50s like low 50%.

Ms. Patterson replied it's kind of confusing because the total number is over 60% that are contributing and in order to be a historic district you need to be 51% or more for the National Register of Historic Places. The National Parks Service added within the last year that you have to evaluate out buildings as well and so when you average those it brought it into the 50% average for contributing. That makes it

really tricky because there's a lot of out buildings that even if they were built in the 1920s are not contributing because they're dilapidated.

Commissioner McCracken stated for the example the one that went before the Historic Preservation Commission - one home on a double lot. That one home was contributing and it's going to be torn down and have two homes that are non-contributing. If that's correct are we're already really close to that buffer, is there some urgency in having an overlay to protect that before we get into the not qualifying threshold? It's to be a concern when they're getting torn down to build two non-contributing homes and we're already really close to that percentage.

Commissioner Ward stated if the house was built before 1960 it is considered to be potentially historic, he just has to say if you have any idea how disconcerting this for me knowing my age.

Ms. Patterson said we are working with a consultant and tomorrow will be a kickoff meeting for the downtown reconnaissance level survey which is evaluating all of the structures in the downtown area and this will be great. It'll really interface well with the work we're doing with the working group to understand what exists now, the characteristics of the buildings, the heights, massing, and all those different things, and then the age and the architecture. That's exciting work. For preservation month there's already work and discussion underway about what to do this May. We'll continue with the momentum we've been building and do another reception to do the Heart of History Awards. If Garden District gets officially listed, we're hoping it'll be before May so that can be celebrated with some tours and an event and then doing some additional outreach and working with the Museum of North Idaho and the Kootenai County's Historic Preservation Commission.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Commissioner Fleming, seconded by Commissioner McCracken, to adjourn. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Prepared by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant