

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**  
**OLD CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**MAY 10, 2011**

**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.

**12:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:**

**ROLL CALL:** Jordan, Bowlby, Evans, Luttropp, Messina, Rasor, Soumas, Neal (Student Rep)  
Kieswetter, (Alt Rep)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

April 12, 2011

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

**ADMINISTRATIVE:**

1. Applicant: Greenstone Homes  
Location: Coeur d'Alene Place  
Request: Rear Yard Setbacks  
ADMINISTRATIVE, (I-1-11)

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

1. Applicant: City of Coeur d'Alene  
Request: Proposed amendments to awnings  
LEGISLATIVE,(0-2-11)

**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 Stuhmiller at (208)769-2240 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting date and time.***

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
APRIL 12, 2011  
LOWER LEVEL – COMMUNITY ROOM  
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Brad Jordan, Chairman  
Heather Bowlby, Vice-Chair  
Amy Evans  
Peter Luttrupp  
Tom Messina  
Peter Luttrupp  
Lou Soumas  
Jake Garringer, Student Rep.  
Aubrey Neal, Alt. Student Rep.

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Sean Holm, Planner  
Tami Stroud, Planner  
Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant  
Warren Wilson, Deputy City Attorney

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:**

Jennifer Kiesewetter, Alt. Student Rep.

**CALL TO ORDER:**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by Luttrupp, seconded by Bowlby, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on March 8, 2011.

**COMMISSION COMMENTS:**

There were none.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

Planner Stroud announced that a joint workshop is planned with City Council on Tuesday, April 26<sup>th</sup>, and because of lack of items, there will not be a Planning Commission meeting in May. Staff would like to congratulate Tom Messina on his re-appointment to the Planning Commission.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were none.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 1. Applicant: Scott Poorman  
Location: 1813 N. Government Way  
Request: A proposed zone change from R-12 (Residential at 12 units/acre) to C-17L (Commercial Limited) QUASI-JUDICIAL (ZC-2-11)

Planner Stroud presented the staff report, gave the mailing tally as: 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 neutral.

There were no questions for staff.

**Public testimony open:**

Scott Poorman, 8884 N. Government Way, explained that this is the second time this request has been heard by the Planning Commission. He explained that the first time was in 1983, and was denied because the commission felt the C-17 zoning was not appropriate. He stated the applicant does not have any plans for the property if this is approved, but feels the property being zoned commercial would make it more appealing to a future buyer. He noted that there is a vacant house on the property that is unsuitable for renting. He then asked if the commission had any questions.

There were no questions for the applicant.

**Public testimony closed.**

**Motion by Bowlby, seconded by Luttropp, to approve Item ZC-2-11. Motion approved.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Commissioner Bowlby	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Evans	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Messina	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttropp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Soumas	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

- 2. Applicant: Young's – Hayden of Idaho, LLC  
Location: 2845 W. Seltice Way  
Request: A proposed Warehouse/Storage special use permit in the C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre) zoning district QUASI-JUDICIAL (SP-2-11)

Planner Holm presented the staff report, gave the mailing tally as: 0 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 neutral and answered questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Bowlby commented that in the staff report, the applicant will need to provide a turn lane onto Seltice for trucks to use going eastbound to prevent accidents from occurring. She inquired if staff could explain the design of the turn lanes.

Planner Holm answered that the applicant is available to address that question.

Commissioner Soumas inquired why a special use permit is required, since the zoning is C-17.

Planner Holm explained that a warehouse use is not an allowed use in the C-17 zoning district.

**Public testimony open:**

Dan Scovel, applicant representative, 11521 N. Warren, explained that this project is intended to be a beverage dealership that will have five trucks making deliveries between 5:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m., Monday through Friday.

Commissioner Soumas inquired if the applicant could estimate how many employees they intend to have.

Mr. Scovel commented they would have a minimum of three, and a maximum of seven.

Commissioner Soumas commented that he has concerns about trucks pulling out onto Seltice Way and inattentive drivers causing rear-end collisions.

Mr. Scovel commented that he is aware of that concern and recently sat on the property between 6:30 and 7:00 a.m. and noticed there was not a lot of traffic. He added that he did discuss with Gordon Dobler, City Engineer, and the condition in the staff report regarding a turn lane if the project is approved and agrees with his recommendation.

**Public testimony closed.**

Commissioner Messina inquired if the applicant would agree to a condition that states no left turns allowed.

Planner Holm commented that he could not answer that and that the best person to answer that question would be someone from the Engineering Department.

Chairman Jordan commented that when Atlas Mill was in operation, it had many trucks coming and going from that property with no problems in the years they were in operation. He feels that if this project is denied based on the amount of trucks going in and out of the property, he reminded the commission that something worse could go on this property. He added that from the applicant's testimony, there will not be a lot of deliveries, and if allowed to vote, he would approve this project.

**Motion by Soumas, seconded by Luttrupp, to approve Item SP-2-11. Motion approved.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Commissioner Bowlby	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Evans	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Messina	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Soumas	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Messina, seconded by Bowlby, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at: 6:30 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 10, 2011

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Planning Director

RE: **I-1-11 INTERPRETATION OF PUD-2-05m** Single Family Rear Yard Setback

### DECISION POINT:

Determine whether provision of a 5 foot rear yard setback for single family homes not on an alley is consistent with the Planning Commission's approval.

### HISTORY:

In February 2007 the Planning Commission approved the Sorbonne Addition Planned Unit Development located in Coeur d'Alene Place (PUD-2-05m) This PUD included a required narrative and map that provided for the layout and development standards for the development. Numerous setback provisions were set forth for the various housing types within the development. Following Commission approval, the Final Development Plan was submitted by the applicant and approved staff.

It has since been discovered by the applicant that an intended 5 foot rear yard setback for single family homes not serviced by alleys was not included in the narrative portion of the submittal describing all setbacks for the PUD. The set back does appear as an example site plan in the map submittal.

Not having the setback called out in the Narrative portion of the plan creates a question in what the Planning Commission has approved. The minutes of the approval meeting do not give guidance sufficient for the staff to glean the Commission's intent.

Please see attached letter and Planning Commission Minute excerpt for additional information.

### PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS:

The staff has determined that the Planning Commission may interpret if the request is consistent with the original approval.

### DECISION POINT RECOMMENDATION:

Determine whether Planning Commission approval included provision of a 5 foot rear yard setback for single family homes not on an alley is consistent with the Planning Commission's approval.

Jason Wheaton, Applicant Representative, 1421 N. Meadowwood Lane, Liberty Lake, WA, commented that this request is necessary for housekeeping due to changes made from the original request. He explained that open space was increased with these changes, making Coeur d'Alene Place one of the most attractive places to live, and commented that over the past several years, the local and regional housing market has undergone significant changes to product type and lot size. He explained that because of the decrease in lot sizes, the need for recessed garages and rear-loaded traditional "alley" homes have increased to ensure a quality streetscape appearance. He continued that they have visited several sites in Boise and Bend to determine what will be consistent with the product they desire to maintain.

Commissioner Razor commented that he is concerned with the proposed narrow streets and how vehicles parking on the side of the street will reduce the width. He questioned if a 20-foot setback for a driveway is enough, so that bumpers from cars will not protrude into the street.

Mr. Wheaton answered that most cars are less than 20 feet and that all the homes are required to have the standard two parking stalls. He commented that they will be watching the 30-foot setback closely for any problems, and evaluate if changes need to be made.

Commissioner Razor commented that if cars are parked along the street, it takes away from the character of the subdivision.

Mr. Wheaton commented that after visiting different cities, such as Boise and Bend, this design seems to be a success in those areas. He commented that when the apartment complex originated, there was a concern that the design would resemble a shopping mall, so asphalt was replaced with additional open space, and it works well



# Greenstone

4/22/11

Dave Yadon  
Planning Director  
710 Mullan Ave.  
Coeur d' Alene, Id 83814

**Re: Sorbonne Addition Rear Yard Set Backs for gated neighborhood now called Parc Rose**

Mr. Yadon

To resolve the above referenced issue we are requesting an administrative interpretation to the PUD and Final Development Plan for Sorbonne Addition located in Coeur d' Alene Place.

The following is a brief narrative of what we believe took place and what our intent was, with regards to the approval of the 2005 Coeur d' Alene Place PUD amendment ( PUD-2-05m), the Sorbonne Addition Preliminary Plat ( S-3-07) and the Final Development Plan for Sorbonne Addition.

In February of 2007 the Planning and Zoning Commission approved the above mentioned PUD amendment and Sorbonne Preliminary Plat. As part of this approval certain PUD modifications were approved that addressed Lot Area, Lot Frontage, Set Backs and Street widths.

Our intentions for reduced rear yard setbacks to 5 feet are noted on page 4 of the exhibits which were part of the Final Development Plan submittal. We acknowledge the description of this request was inadvertently left out of the PUD submittal.

The intent of this reduced setback was to create smaller back yards. The area of Sorbonne Addition where this is to be utilized is limited to the Senior/ Empty Nester neighborhood, now called Parc Rose. The demographics of the buyer who is interested in Parc Rose does not see a benefit in large back yards. This request currently affects 10 lots in the recently platted Sorbonne 2<sup>nd</sup> addition, which was originally part of Sorbonne Addition.

Sincerely,

Kevin Schneidmiller  
Vice President  
Greenstone-Kootenai

Date: May 10, 2011  
 To: Planning Commission  
 From: Design Review Commission  
 Subject: **O-2-11 Amendment to Zoning Code** - Design Review - Awnings

**Decision Point**

The Planning Commission is asked to consider the following amendments to the zoning ordinance

**History**

In 2008, the City adopted procedures and the thresholds for the types of projects that would be required to be brought before the Design Review Commission (DRC). At that time, the Design Review Commission felt that awnings merited their review.

<i>Thresholds for Design Review Commission Review</i>					
	District	New Construction	Street Façade Alterations	Exterior Expansion	Projects or Sites with unusual sensitivity or context issues
<i>Areas where Design Guidelines and Standards exist with trigger points for DRC review.</i>	DC District Downtown Core	All exterior projects south of midblock Lakeside / CdA for preliminary review	All  Abbreviated process for minor projects ie <i>awnings</i>	All  Abbreviated process for minor projects ie <i>awnings</i>	Director's determination
	Infill Overlay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DO-E</li> <li>• DO-N</li> <li>• MO</li> </ul>	Any project over 2 stories &/or 4 units	no	no	Director's determination

*\*Painting, window replacement or other minor repairs are not required to go through design review where the Planning Director, or his or her designee, determines that the repair does not constitute a substantial change to the façade or that the replacement windows are substantially similar to those being replaced. **Awning** replacements are subject to Design Review Commission Review but only one meeting with the Commission is required. The applicant for an awning replacement must submit the items referenced in Section 17.09.320(D) in order to be placed on the next available agenda.*



With three years of experience of reviewing awnings the Design Review Commission has determined that it is not in the best interests of the Commission or an applicant to require this review. The Commission is asking that staff conduct the necessary reviews of these awnings with the option of referral to the Commission if warranted ie complex design question.

**Financial Analysis**

There is no financial impact associated with the proposed amendments.

**Performance Analysis**

Since this code lives in the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission must make a recommendation on this change

**Quality of Life Analysis**

The amendment will provide for reduced review time for awning projects.