

**PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

DECEMBER 13, 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, Luttrupp, Messina, Soumas, Garringer,(Student Rep)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 8, 2011

WORKSHOP:

Approval of Findings and Order for ZC-4-11 and PUD-1-11

ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:

Motion by _____, seconded by _____,
to continue meeting to _____, ___, at ___ p.m.; motion carried unanimously.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 8, 2011
LOWER LEVEL – COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Yadon, Planning Director
Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
Warren Wilson, Deputy City Attorney

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Lou Soumas

CALL TO ORDER:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Messina, seconded by Bowlby, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on October 11, 2011. Motion approved.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

None

STAFF COMMENTS:

Planning Director Yadon announced a couple of workshops scheduled on Friday, November 12th and Thursday, November 18th. He stated if any of the commissioners are interested in attending, to contact staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

1. Applicant: Mike Hansen
Location: Lot 1 Blk1 South Lacrosse Addition
Request: A proposed 1-lot preliminary plat "South Lacrosse Addition"
SHORT PLAT (SS-2-11)

Engineering Services Director Dobler presented the staff report and then asked if the Commission had any questions. There were no questions.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: North Idaho College
Location: North of River Avenue and the existing campus and extends
Northeast to Northwest Boulevard at Hubbard Avenue
Request:
 - A. A proposed zone change from LM (Light Manufacturing) to
C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre)
QUASI-JUDICIAL (ZC-4-11)
 - B. A proposed 18.78 acre 11-lot PUD "The North Idaho College
Campus PUD"
QUASI-JUDICIAL (PUD-1-11)

Planning Director Yadon presented the staff report, gave the mailing tally as 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 neutral and answered questions from the Commission. Planner Yadon explained since this is two requests, he will discuss the zone change first.

ZC-4-11:

Commissioner Bowlby referenced a comment submitted by a citizen who inquired if there are any plans for the alleys on N. Military Drive.

Engineering Services Director Dobler stated that there are not any current plans and added in the future, they may be vacated.

Commissioner Bowlby inquired if staff is comfortable with adding more commercial zoning and questioned if C-17 is the appropriate zone for this property.

Planner Yadon explained that the city has a process when a zone change application is submitted; staff will discuss with the applicant if this zone is appropriate for the project. He explained that since this application was submitted with a PUD, the C-17 is appropriate to allow the applicant the ability to plan for future projects.

Commissioner Luttropp questioned if the city had considered annexing a portion of Rosenberry Drive to save the trees along the dike road.

Deputy City Attorney Wilson commented that this is something the city has discussed.

Public testimony open:

John Mueller, applicant representative, 210 E. Lakeside, complimented staff on a great staff report that covered most of the issues associated with this request. He explained C-17 was chosen based on what the campus has planned in the future. He stated as an example, two garages are planned on campus that when completed will allow 1,000 additional parking spaces for each garage and by approving the C-17 will allow the necessary height needed for the project. He explained that the college has had a shortage of parking, and hopefully these garages will help that problem.

Commissioner Bowlby inquired if the applicant could explain where the parking garages will be placed on campus.

Mr. Mueller presented a picture of the campus showing the site where the two garages are planned. He explained that the college does not have any plans for the construction of these two garages anytime in the future and why the approval of the C-17 zoning is needed - to allow the college the flexibility of having the tools in place to start the project.

Bob Macdonald, 1407 Silver Beach Loop, commented if the city would consider a piece of property on Rosenberry Drive for a potential dog park.

Susan Snedaker, 821 Hastings, commented that the 84' height requirement needed for the future parking garages is unappealing.

Public testimony closed:

REBUTTAL:

John Mueller commented that the parking garages are planned based on future growth of the campus. He feels that the parking garages are a good choice for more parking when needed.

Commissioner Luttrupp commented that he is comfortable with approval of C-17 based on what was presented, because the PUD being approved will limit heights in the area.

Motion by Bowlby, Seconded by Luttrupp, to direct staff to prepare the findings for Item ZC-4-11. Motion approved.

Motion by Bowlby, seconded by Evans, to approve Item ZC-4-11. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion to approve carried by a 4 to 0 vote.

PUD-1-11:

Planning Director Yadon presented the staff report, gave the mailing tally as 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 neutral and answered questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked who owns the property.

Planner Yadon answered that the college owns the property.

Commissioner Bowlby commented in the staff report it states that North Idaho College will maintain the road.

Engineering Services Director Dobler explained that when staff met with North Idaho College, they wanted to maintain the road and the signage and a win/win for both the city and North Idaho College. He added when the plat gets ready to be approved, it will state that public access will be allowed.

Public testimony open:

John Mueller presented a PowerPoint showing a map of the North Idaho College campus broken down into nine different sites within the PUD. He commented sites one and two include placing two buildings that would have a maximum height of 32' and the other 56'. He continued that they are proposing a pump station at the southwest corner of the campus to allow a mainline that would loop irrigation water from the lake to the campus. He continued with his presentation showing a picture of the parking garage located at Kootenai County Hospital that the college may use as a model for their future parking garages. He explained that parking has always been a concern and stated that currently there are 1,900 parking spaces available on campus and by providing the parking garages; it could triple that current number. He commented that they approve of the conditions staff has requested. He commented on a slide showing a picture of the campus taken in 1940 and since that time a lot of things have changed on campus. He feels by approving this PUD, it will allow the college the flexibility for future projects without coming back for approval.

Commissioner Bowlby inquired why the parking garages are not scattered.

Mr. Mueller explained that the configuration of the parking garages were determined by the amount of walking time students need to get from the parking garages to the buildings on campus. He stated that many students who commute to campus and why there is a need for parking.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired how the amount of parking is determined for a project.

Planner Yadon answered that the amount of parking is based on use.

Commissioner Luttrupp complimented the applicant on his presentation showing how each of the areas on campus what is proposed on that site. He feels this presentation provides a vision to what this campus may look like in the future.

Mr. Mueller explained by having the flexibility of a PUD, it will allow the college the flexibility without coming back to the city for approval when opportunities come forward.

Susan Snedaker, 821 Hasting, commented that she is concerned with the proposed heights for some

buildings and after reading the applicant's narrative, the word "academic structure" is referenced many times throughout the narrative and feels if this project is approved, will the campus only have "academic structures" on the property. She stated that the proposed plan is loose and would like to know what the purpose is for the proposed buildings.

Commissioner Bowlby referenced the paragraph in the staff report which states:"that no standard commercial uses are anticipated for the project that would be outside what would normally be delivered as part of a higher education institution". She added that she feels comfortable with this request and that if there are any modifications, they would have to come back for approval.

REBUTTAL:

John Mueller explained that the building height proposed on some of the buildings could reach the heights within the C-17 zone, but designed so the building is staggered. He added that construction of these buildings are not planned anytime soon and will depend on when the money is available. He feels that this could be many years.

Public testimony closed.

Commissioner Luttrupp commented that he was confused what the plans were for the education corridor, and now, after this presentation, those concerns have been addressed.

Commissioner Bowlby requested that when staff prepares the findings and order for PUD-1-11 to include the paragraph on page 13 of the staff report that addresses restriction of land.

Motion by Bowlby, seconded by Luttrupp, to direct staff to prepare the findings for Item PUD-1-11. Motion approved.

Motion by Bowlby, seconded by Evans, to approve Item PUD-1-11. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion to approve carried by a 4 to 0 vote.

2. Applicant: Scott Poorman
Location: 188 & 196 W. Haycraft
Request: A proposed zone change from R-17 (Residential at 17 units/acre) to C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre) QUASI-JUDICIAL (ZC-5-11)

Planning Director Yadon presented the staff report, gave the mailing tally as 2 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 neutral and answered questions from the Commission.

There were no questions for staff.

Public testimony open:

Scott Poorman, applicant representative, P.O. Box 2871, commented that a lot has happened to this site since this was approved by the Planning Commission last year. He commented that the staff report covered all issues and would like to compliment Planner Stroud on her assistance on this project. He commented that this request is more of a “housekeeping issue” to get the northern part of the parcel to have the same zoning as the southern parcel. He explained that he wants to place an auxiliary building on the northern parcel and if approved will submit an amended site plan with that change. He then asked if the commission had any questions.

There were no questions for the applicant.

Motion by Bowlby, seconded by Evans, to approve Item ZC-5-11. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

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

Motion to approve carried by a 4 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Bowlby, seconded by Evans, Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at: 8:01 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant

COEUR D'ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS AND ORDER

A. INTRODUCTION

This matter having come before the Coeur d'Alene Planning Commission on November 8, 2011, and there being present a person requesting approval of ITEM PUD-1-11, a request for a planned unit development known as the "Education Corridor" PUD.

LOCATION: +/- 18.78 acre parcel located between the Wastewater Treatment Plant and River Ave.

APPLICANT: North Idaho College

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

- B1.** That the existing land uses are residential, civic and commercial and vacant land.
- B2.** That the Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Stable Established and Transition.
- B3.** That the zoning is C-17 (a zone change has been approved by the Commission for a portion of the property from Light Manufacturing (LM) and Limited Commercial (C-17L) to C-17).
- B4.** That the notice of public hearing was published on September 24, 2011, which fulfills the legal requirement.
- B5.** That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on October 24, 2011, which fulfills the legal requirement.
- B6.** That 7 notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property on September 23, 2011, and 4 responses were received: 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 neutral
- B7.** That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2011, including but not limited to:

Dave Yadon, Planning Director.

Mr. Yadon presented the staff report and stated that NIC, who owns the property, is seeking approval of a PUD to allow for the future growth of the college campus. Mr. Yadon reviewed the staff analysis for land use, neighborhood characteristics, utilities, traffic and streets and open space.

Gordon Dobler, City Engineer.

Mr. Dobler stated that the street network will be owned and maintained by NIC to accepted public standards.

Jon Mueller, 210 E. Lakeside

Mr. Mueller outlined the nine (9) sites within the PUD as outlined in the application and staff report. He presented the maximum height of the various sites as well as setbacks and building envelopes. He noted that NIC has designed the site to ensure sufficient parking as the college grows.

Susan Snedaker, 821 Hastings Ave.

Ms. Snedaker testified that she is concerned with the potential height for some of the structures and is concerned that the “Education Corridor” may be for commercial development rather than education.

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 City Council:

B8A. The proposal is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

We find that the proposed PUD is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

The proposed PUD will allow for the future development and growth of the NIC campus as well as providing a home for the other higher education providers in the City. This is consistent with the comprehensive plan where this site was designated for just this purpose (Education Corridor special area and land use area). In addition, we find that the following additional Comprehensive Plan policies are achieved by this subdivision:

Objective 1.11 - Community Design.

Objective 1.12 - Community Design.

Objective 1.13 – Open Space.

Objective 1.14 – Efficiency.

Objective 2.02 – Economic and Workforce Development.

Objective 3.12 - Education.

B8B. The design and site planning is compatible with existing uses on adjacent properties. This is based on:

Based on the staff report, application and testimony provided, we find that the design of this project provides for a significant amount of open space and is laid out to continue development of the existing NIC campus which adjoins the site. Additionally, the site has been laid out to co-exist with the neighboring wastewater treatment plant and the North Military neighborhood. As such, the design and site planning is compatible with existing uses on adjacent properties.

B8C. The proposal is compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties. This is based on:

The site is relatively flat and does not present any significant burdens to development. As such, the proposal is compatible with the natural features of the site and adjoining properties. Further, based on the testimony, the site has been planned to allow access to the Spokane River, which is the most significant natural feature of the site.

B8D. The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development will be adequately served by existing public facilities and services. This is based on:

The staff report indicates that adequate sewer, water, drainage, police and fire services and street lighting are available for the subject property. There was no testimony received at the public hearing that indicated that this is not the case. As such, we find that the provisions for these requirements are adequate.

B8E. The proposal does provide adequate private common open space area, as determined by the Planning 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:

Based on the staff report, the development contains approximately 10.9% open space, which exceeds the requirement for 10% open space. Further, the site includes trails along the Spokane River that will be usable for recreation purposes. We find that the amount of open space provided by the development exceeds the requirement and that the open space is available to all users of the development for recreational purposes.

B8F. Off-street parking does provide parking sufficient for users of the development. This is based on:

Based on the testimony, application and staff report, much of the PUD area will allow parking for the interim period while the campus develops. Longer term, two sites are provided for structured parking that are sized to meet the anticipated need. Parking for the campus is based on the available spaces on the campus as a whole (approx. 1700 spaces currently). As such, we find that the development provides sufficient parking area for current and future users of the development. Additionally, staff will require that one parking space per unit is provided for each structure at the time of development.

B8G. That the proposal does provide for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property. This is based on:

The staff report and testimony indicates that the PUD will be owned and maintained by NIC, which is a tax supported local college. We find this to be an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of the common property.

B8H. That the proposal would not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood at this time with regard to traffic, neighborhood character or existing land uses because:

Traffic impact to the surrounding neighborhoods will not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood because the street network around and through the site have recently been constructed to city standards. The new street infrastructure was designed to accommodate the future needs of the property as an educational campus as discussed in the staff report and testimony. With regard to compatibility with neighborhood character and existing land uses, there will be no adverse impact. We find this because the property is essentially surrounded by the existing campus and the wastewater treatment facility. Given the above we find that the proposed development will not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood at this time with regard to traffic, neighborhood character and existing land uses.

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning and Zoning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of **North Idaho College** for approval of the planned unit development, as described in the application should be **approved**.

Special conditions applied are:

1. Construct an 8 foot wide paved trail located on the Spokane River side of the levee wall, in addition to the Centennial Trail, connecting the north end to the newly constructed Centennial Trail and the south end to Rosenberry Dr. This is to include improvements to the area around the levee wall opening as a viewpoint. The approximate location is shown above on the PUD open space map marked "Exhibit 14" and is indicated in red. The trail must be completed by one year from the date of Planning Commission approval.
2. The portable classrooms, as shown within the proposed open space, are removed prior to the approval of a site development permit anywhere within "lot 3" as depicted herein.
3. The final development plan must reflect that uses within the proposed PUD shall be civic in nature.
4. All streets within the limits of the PUD will adhere to the approved section that is shown in the October 2010 Education Corridor Preliminary Infrastructure Design Report, and, the as constructed section that was built with the Education Corridor Phase 1A road construction project (see page 36).
5. The constructed road sections cannot be deviated from without prior approval of the City, and, any changes must be approved by the City Engineer.
6. In order to maintain continuity with all streets within the City limits, and, for the general safety of the driving, walking and bicycling public, signing and striping of the streets will be required to adhere to and be maintained in the format dictated by the MUTCD.

D. ORDINANCES AND STANDARDS USED IN EVALUATION

Comprehensive Plan - 2007.

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.

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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Bowlby	Voted _____
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted _____
Commissioner Messina	Voted _____
Commissioner Soumas	Voted _____
Commissioner Evans	Voted _____
Chairman Jordan	Voted _____ (tie breaker)

Commissioners _____ were absent.

Motion to approve carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

CHAIRMAN BRAD JORDAN

**COEUR D'ALENE PLANNING COMMISSION
FINDINGS AND ORDER**

A. INTRODUCTION

This matter having come before the Coeur d'Alene Planning Commission on November 8, 2011, and there being present a person requesting approval of ITEM ZC-4-11, a request for a zone change from LM (Light Manufacturing) and C-17L (Limited Commercial) to C-17 (Commercial at 17 units/acre).

LOCATION: +/- 6.79 acre parcel located between the Wastewater Treatment Plant and River Ave.

APPLICANT: North Idaho College

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

- B1. That the existing land uses are residential, civic and commercial.**
- B2. That the Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Stable Established.**
- B3. That the zoning is Light Manufacturing (LM) and Limited Commercial (C-17L).**
- B4. That the notice of public hearing was published on September 24, 2011, which fulfills the legal requirement.**
- B5. That the notice of public hearing was posted on the property on October 24, 2011, which fulfills the legal requirement.**
- B6. That 7 notices of public hearing were mailed to all property owners of record within three-hundred feet of the subject property on September 23, 2011, and 4 responses were received: 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 neutral**
- B7. That public testimony was heard on November 8, 2011, including but not limited to:**

Dave Yadon, Planning Director.

Mr. Yadon stated that NIC was seeking a zone change from C-17L and LM to C-17 as well as a PUD for the "Education Corridor". The parcel is approximately 6.79-acres located within the Education Corridor. Mr. Yadon reviewed the staff analysis for land use, neighborhood characteristics, utilities, traffic and streets.

Gordon Dobler, City Engineer.

Mr. Dobler stated that there are no current plans to develop an alley for N. Military Drive and explained how access to those properties is accomplished with the new street infrastructure in place.

Jon Mueller, 210 E. Lakeside

Mr. Mueller testified on behalf of NIC and explained that the basis for the request for C-17 zoning was to give the college the necessary flexibility to accommodate future growth and development of the college campus. He noted that two parking garages may be constructed in the future and the C-17 zone provides the necessary height allowances.

Bob MacDonald, 1407 Silver Beach Loop

Mr. MacDonald testified that in the future he would like to see an off-lease dog park in the area of this request.

Susan Snedaker, 821 Hastings Ave.

Ms. Snedaker testified that she is concerned with the potential height allowed in the zone especially for potential future parking structures.

B8. That this proposal is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

We find that the proposed zone change is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

The property in question is designated by the Comprehensive Plan as a stable established area within the Education Corridor special area, which recognizes that the growth of the higher education institutions on the property in question is crucial to future quality growth. The area is intended as a place for the current NIC campus to grow in a manner that will accommodate other higher education institutions. Further, the existing LM zoning on much of the property does not allow higher education uses and the bulk of the education corridor is already zoned C-17. The requested C-17 zone gives the applicant the flexibility to design and grow the Education Corridor campus into the future. In addition, we find that the following additional Comprehensive Plan policies are achieved by this subdivision:

Objective 1.12 - Community Design.

Objective 1.13 – Open Space.

Objective 1.14 – Efficiency.

Objective 2.02 – Economic and Workforce Development.

Objective 3.12 - Education.

Objective 3.10 – Affordable and Workforce Housing.

B9. That public facilities and utilities are available and adequate for the proposed use.

Installation of public infrastructure for the proposed uses was just completed. The staff report indicates no concerns about the adequacy of the sewer, water, police and fire services for the subject property. are available for the subject property. As such, we find that the public facilities are available and adequate for the proposed use.

B10. That the physical characteristics of the site make it suitable for the request at this time because:

The site is essentially flat as such we find that the physical characteristics of the site do make it suitable for the requested zoning.

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

Traffic impact to the surrounding neighborhoods will not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood because the street network around and through the site have recently been constructed to city standards. The new street infrastructure was designed to accommodate the future needs of the property as an educational campus as discussed in the staff report. With regard to compatibility with neighborhood character and existing land uses, there will be no adverse impact. We find this because the property is essentially surrounded by the existing campus and other portions of the education corridor that is already zoned C-17.

C. ORDER: CONCLUSION AND DECISION

The Planning and Zoning Commission, pursuant to the aforementioned, finds that the request of **North Idaho College** for approval of the zone change, as described in the application should be **approved**.

D. ORDINANCES AND STANDARDS USED IN EVALUATION

Comprehensive Plan - 2007.

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.

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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Bowlby Voted _____

Commissioner Luttrupp Voted _____

Commissioner Messina Voted _____

Commissioner Soumas Voted _____

Commissioner Evans Voted _____

Chairman Jordan Voted _____ (tie breaker)

Commissioners _____ were absent.

Motion to approve carried by a ____ to ____ vote.

CHAIRMAN BRAD JORDAN