

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE
FEBRUARY 10, 2026**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Phil Ward
Kris Jamtaas
Sarah McCracken
Lynn Fleming

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

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 Jamtaas, to approve the minutes of the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on January 13, 2026. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

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

- We didn't receive any public hearing items; we will not have a meeting in March. We are working on doing the joint educational workshop with City Council. We will get you more details as that progresses.
- I wanted to mention, and this is of interest particularly to any of the developers or the applicants involved with public hearing items. There is a scam happening statewide. It's been happening in other jurisdictions where scammers scrub the websites and look for applicants' information and send them fake invoices for public hearing items. We have posted a scam alert on our website and we've redacted sensitive information for our newest agenda packet to try and hopefully help avoid that.
- The city has been watching closely this legislative session. There is a short-term rental bill that is

moving rapidly through the House. We expect there will be a hearing this Thursday. House Bill 583. It would strip all local control and remove even the best practice of the registration and the good neighbor policy, which is very unfortunate. The city has taken a position that we oppose this bill. Commissioner Fleming wrote to legislators and the press in response. We've had some community members also send letters. If you are interested, I can get you more details. There is a competing bill that actually is supportive of local control, the registration process and having a responsible party named. That bill has not been introduced yet, but that's Senate Bill 1263, and we hope that it will be introduced in the Senate soon.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

None.

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

1. Applicant: Michael & Norma Reasor
 Location: 3620 N. Fruitland Lane
 Request: A proposed zone change from MH-8 to R-17
 QUASI-JUDICIAL, **(ZC-1-26)**

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

The applicant is requesting approval of a zone change from MH-8 to R-17.

The subject property is located on the east side of Fruitland Lane, west of US-95, south of W. Lauf Ln. prior to W. Bosanko where the Fred Meyer complex exists. Currently, the property is vacant with a pull behind trailer/camper that appears to be sitting on the parcel, unoccupied. Prior to this, a single-family home with accessory structures existed on the lot, hence the associated address. A demolition permit was issued over the counter September 28, 2023, and closed October 6, 2023.

The subject property is adjacent to a multitude of housing types; single-family mobile, manufactured, and real property homes to the north, east, and west, with R-12 pocket housing and R-17 multifamily to the west on the opposite side of Fruitland Ln. A number of the local streets and access ways in the area are private, including W. Clady Lane, Link Lane, W. Myriah Loop, W. Lake City Lane and associated N. PJ Lane and N. Addy Lane, and W. Max Loop and its offshoots N. Gunnar Court and N. Baron Court. To the northwest there is a mini-storage facility.

Note that the applicant's proposed project idea for nine (9) workforce housing units is not tied to this requested zone change. If the subject site is approved to be changed to an R-17 residential district, then all permitted uses in the R-17 residential district would be allowed on this site as listed below (including the applicant's proposed project).

There are Four (4) findings that must be met for the re-zoning, Findings B1-B4.

The first finding is **Finding B1**. That this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies. Mr. Holm explained that the property is within city limits and the City's 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan categorizes this area as a "Compact Neighborhood" Place Type.

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 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

Mr. Holm presented the curated list of goals and objectives from the Comprehensive Plan for Planning and Zoning Commission consideration and noted the commission could review the full list to determine which are appropriate for this zone change request. He shared goals and objectives from Community & Identity (CI), Growth & Development (GD), and Health & Safety (HS).

Finding B2 That the public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use. Mr. Holm noted the department comments related to the zone change request related to stormwater, streets, water, sewer, and fire.

Finding B3 That the physical characteristics of the site (make) (do not make) it suitable for the request at this time. Mr. Holm outlined the physical characteristics of the site being generally flat with residential uses adjacent. There are no topographical or other physical constraints that would make the subject property unsuitable for the request. Currently, no sidewalk or street side swale exist on the east side of Fruitland Ln.

Finding B4 That the proposal (would) (would not) adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, (and) (or) existing land uses.

Mr. Holm stated City Engineer Chris Bosley has weighed in on the traffic aspect of this request. He has stated that zone changes in and of themselves do not create traffic, but it is the buildings and the people that live in them that do. This land use code 221, which he reviewed, estimates that if nine units are built of family low-rise apartments, that it would generate 59 trips per day. I wanted to point this out because this is something that I've learned recently that is not 59 trips from the subject property. That's 59 trips total for those units. It's just so everybody is aware moving forward, this is an important factor to take into account. Let's say one of the people that live in these units, they decide to go to Fred Meyer. That's one trip. They need gas. That's a second trip. It's not 59 trips to and from this property. That is 59 trips total that these people would make throughout a typical day on average. During the a.m. peak hour would be 5 and 6 occurring during the peak p.m. hour. And he says that Fruitland Lane has the available capacity to accommodate additional traffic. Moving on to neighborhood character. The area along North Fruitland Lane displays a transitioning suburban residential character common to the vicinity positioned west of US 95. This portion of Fruitland Lane is a transitional zone between more compact urban amenities featuring a varied mix of housing types that reflect incremental development over many decades. Overall, the neighborhood character is defined by its compatibility with a range of uses, both owned and leased, modest lot sizes, formal and informal street layouts, and a blend of housing forms that combine affordability and practicality over uniform architectural style. The area supports a sense of an established working class neighborhood in proximity to commercial amenities. As part of that is also the general land use pattern. This is our land use map.

Regarding neighborhood character, the area along North Fruitland Lane displays a transitioning suburban residential character common to the vicinity positioned west of US-95. This portion of Fruitland Lane is a transitional zone between more compact urban amenities featuring a varied mix of housing types that reflect incremental development over decades. Overall, the neighborhood character is defined by its compatibility with a range of residential uses both owned and leased, modest lot sizes, formal and informal street layouts, and a blend of housing forms that combine affordability and practicality over uniform architectural style. The area supports a sense of an established working-class neighborhood in proximity to commercial amenities (such as the nearby Fred Meyer complex).

Conditions:

There are no conditions proposed for this zone change request.

Decision Point:

Mr. Holm noted the action alternatives this evening. The Planning and Zoning Commission must consider the request and make a recommendation to the City Council on whether the proposed zone change from MH-8 to R-17 should be adopted or rejected.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Ward commented on one of the exhibits on page 18 of the staff report, it shows all color-coded, and it shows C-17, I think it was court-ordered at, I believe it's the northeast corner of the property. But where the actual subject property is and everything around it within that quadrant, it's all colored turquoise. Does that mean it's all MH-8?

Mr. Holm replied everything north of the red, which is also part of that kind of a super block, if you will, because there aren't a lot of cross streets that go out to U.S. 95 due to limitations of access, is MH-8. That's the way it was across the street as well prior to the zone change.

Commissioner Ward stated this property is really small. I know that's a problem with it, but I'm really reluctant to give up any MH-8. It's one of the few affordable zone districts we have in Kootenai County or any place for that matter because so many of the mobile homes are being purchased by financial interests and so on, making them less than affordable houses. Looking at what we have here, I know they're asking for R-17, But directly to the west is R-12, and below that is R-17. I almost feel like we're creating a spot zone on this side by putting R-17 there, rather than an R-12 or, you know, even possibly an R-8, but I have no problem with R-12. I'm just a little concerned about R-17.

Commissioner Fleming asked does R-12 allows six units?

Mr. Holm replied no, R-12 as a single lot would only allow a maximum of two units. It would allow a maximum of two lots and two units on each lot. We used to have what was called pocket housing, which would allow some landlocked lots with tracks to get to them, which could increase some of that density. That was repealed a number of years ago. Now our code reads that you can only have a maximum of two units on any R-12 lot. If this was three acres, you could only have two, a duplex or two single families or a single family and an ADU.

Commissioner Fleming stated the R-12 across the street; I drove by it because I shop at Fred Meyer's and the car wash. That's two buildings, four units, so it's because of the length of that lot that they could pack that in.

Mr. Holm replied that was pocket housing from what I remember. It's been a long time ago, the road

through there, which is a private street, Clayton Lane, does meander from one side, the units are on one side, and then it swaps over because that access road drops across to the other side and then it swaps over because that access road drops across.

Commissioner Fleming commented that Mr. Bosley is not here, and we know that coming down the pipeline is the reconfiguration of Appleway and Highway 95. Fruitland is going to be a turn-off so that you can get on to Appleway off 95. You're not going to be able to go up over and down so you're going to go into Fruitland. Do we see and it's a reverse thinking but it almost makes Fruitland a through way for if I'm going for Fred Myers I'm not going to get on the freeway and have to go back on to Fruitland or I'm going down Howard did you and Mr. Bosley talk about that and any thoughts with that being the road that and no consideration because I'm worried about what's going to happen down at Fruitland.

Mr. Holm stated Mr. Bosley did not mention anything about this being this far north and that traffic patterns will change.

Commissioner McCracken had a question while you have that map up. The upper left teal square, are those storage units, but it's still zoned MH-8?

Mr. Holm replied yes, that is what our zoning map represents, they've been there a long time.

Commissioner McCracken I was kind of curious, this one, since it can't really be subdivided, I guess it's going to be a rental product is what they're considering for affordable housing.

Mr. Holm stated I'm not sure if there was no mention if they would attempt to condominiumize the units.

Commissioner McCracken stated otherwise they wouldn't really be individually owned.

Mr. Holm replied unless they were condo platted.

Commissioner McCracken commented if this was zoned R-17 and they conformed with the current uses allowed in R-17, would there be a reason they would have to come back to us or they would just go about whatever they're planning on building?

Mr. Holm stated if City Council decides to allow the zone change moving forward without conditions they would not have to come back to Planning and Zoning.

City Attorney Randy Adams stated spot zoning was brought up, and I would like to address that. There is an Idaho Supreme Court case that says permitting a use of a parcel inconsistent with the use permitted in the rest of the district is invalid if it is not in accordance with the comp plan. Since the comp plan does indicate that R-17 is a permissible zone in this area, then it would not be in conflict with the comp plan or constitute a spot zone.

Ms. Patterson commented that she wanted to clarify the Habitat for Humanity project is zoned R-17 and is flanked by MH-8. As you go further south, there's a bunch of parcels where the zoning is MH-8, R-17, and MH-8. It's been kind of a consistent pattern of transition along there.

Commissioner McCracken stated Okay, I was thinking it is similar to that product, but it's just a little bit below on the map.

Commissioner Fleming said she just wanted to mention, I think the owners are indicating that they'd like to do workforce housing. I don't know if we can hold their feet to the fire on that. It'll be whatever they can build and whatever they can put out to the market. I don't know if we can insist that they do workforce housing.

Ms. Patterson stated that is correct. The only way you could do that would be to recommend conditional zoning, and council would have to make that determination.

Commissioner Fleming stated it would be the neighborhood that would drive it.

Commissioner Jamtaas stated just as I looked at the history of the transition of this area over the last 20 years, it seems like it's going towards higher density, towards an R-17 designation, either commercial or residential. While I appreciate that, the thought of a little less density. And as I drove there a few times in the last week, I just think that's where it's going, and I think it's an appropriate zone.

Public Testimony Open:

Mr. Fred Harris introduced himself and was sworn in. He stated he is representing the applicant but had nothing to comment on regarding the hearing.

Public testimony closed

Commission discussion:

Motion by Commissioner McCracken, seconded by Commissioner Fleming, to recommend that City Council adopt the R-17 zone change (ZC-1-26). Motion carried.

Commissioner Ward commented that I really don't have a problem with the zoning. I know the area and what's going on. I have a problem with the fact that the application says this will be affordable housing, and we have no way of guaranteeing that you know, I don't know how you do that. If they were here and committed to voluntarily giving a covenant to something, that would be helpful. The applicant is not here and I don't expect this gentleman to do that. But that's the only reservation I have, is that it's probably a proper use, but if it's not affordable. We're just putting more units in a place where they don't really help a whole lot because people can't afford a half-million-dollar house.

Chairman Messina stated thank you for that I think even if we were to add a condition, we don't have a solid definition of what an affordable unit is because it's driven by the market. Ms. Patterson could maybe help me with that.

Ms. Patterson stated the way to ensure affordable housing would be to deed restrict it. The options we've discussed in the past would be conditional zoning, and you could do in conjunction with a development agreement. That would be a recommendation to council, but then they would have to determine what is based on 80% or is it 80 to 100% area median income and deed restricted over how many years.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Jamtaas	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

Commissioners Coppess and Ingalls were absent.

2. Applicant: Bear Waterfront LLC
 Location: 3.6 acres located along Bellerive Lane, Beebe Boulevard and Tilford Lane,
 including Mahogany Lane Tracts A, B, C & D, and 1570 Tilford Lane
 Request: A. A proposed amendment to the Mahogany Lane Planned Unit
 Development (PUD)
 QUASI-JUDICIAL (**PUD-3-21m.1**)

 B. A proposed replat of the Mahogany Lane Subdivision
 QUASI-JUDICIAL (**S-5-21m.1**)

Ms. Patterson, Community Planning Director, provided the following statements about the Mahogany Lane PUD amendment and replat request:

Background Information:

- April 2022: Interpretation request: clarify height and 2nd story stepback of ADUs to be 29" and up to 32' on Lots 4 & 7.
- March 2023: 2-Year extension for Subdivision Approval (granted)
- November 2024: Interpretation request to clarify 5' extensions of 2nd story roofs and decks would be allowed in the front setbacks of Lots 2, 3, & 4.
- November 2025: City agreement to establish updated timelines

Mahogany Lane PUD Amendment & Replat Overview

- Delores Depot (Lot 1): changes to final building design, community patio space, and parking/vehicle circulation
- Tract A: Reduced to 13,487 SF from 15, 827 SF and community seating has been moved
- Tract B: The pedestrian seating node location has been modified slightly from its previous location
- Tract C: 2, 340 SF to open space shifted from Tract A to Tract C
- Tract D: Removed and is converted into new Lots 12 and 13
Note: Replat is only related to Tracts A and D

Requests:

1. Bear Waterfront LLC is requesting approval of an amendment to the Mahogany Lane Planned Unit Development (PUD) to modify the tracts, reduce the open space to 12.95%, create two new residential lots, and change the design of the Delores Depot. AND;
2. Bear Waterfront LLC is requesting approval of a replat of the Mahogany Lane Subdivision to convert Tract D into two residential lots (Lots 12 and 13), reduce Tract A, increase Tract C, and change the access into the Delores Depot.

PUD Findings (PUD-1-3-21m.1)

Ms. Patterson noted there are seven findings that must be made for the PUD amendment request, Findings B1-B7.

The first finding is **Finding B1**, that this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies. Ms. Patterson noted that the project was approved under the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. The 2022-2042 Comprehensive Plan now applies to the project. The property is within existing city limits and is zoned R-17PUD.

The Comprehensive Plan includes Place Types that represent the form of future development, as envisioned by the residents of Coeur d'Alene. The Place Type for this project is Planned Development.

Ms. Patterson presented the curated list of goals and objectives from the Comprehensive Plan for Planning and Zoning Commission consideration and noted the commission could review the full list to determine which are appropriate for this PUD amendment request. She shared goals and objectives from Community & Identity (CI), Environment & Recreation (ER), Growth & Development (GD), and Jobs & Economy (JE).

Finding B2, the design and planning of the site is compatible with the location, setting, and existing uses on adjacent properties. The changes requested to the Mahogany Lane PUD would add two additional single-family lots on the north side of Bellerive Lane where a common parking area was anticipated. It also moves open space between tracts, shifts the driveway access into the Delores Depot further to the east and Tilford Lane, and changes the design of the Delores Depot structure, community patio space, and parking/vehicle circulation. Ms. Patterson described the surrounding uses and zoning districts. She noted that the Planning and Zoning Commission found that the project met this finding with the original approval. The commission will need to determine if the requested change would meet this finding.

Finding B3, the proposal (is) (is not) compatible with natural features of the site and adjoining properties: Ms. Patterson noted that there is no change to the analysis of the project under this finding. The subject property is relatively flat. There is some grade change for Lot 1 from Tilford Lane to the subject property. There is a slope behind the single-family residential lots and the Centennial Trail. Ms. Patterson said the amendments to the PUD and the replat will not affect the grade change from what was approved previously. The project will enhance the vegetation and natural features along the Centennial Trail.

Finding B4, the location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development (will) (will not) be adequately served by existing public facilities and services. Infrastructure already exists for the Mahogany Lane Subdivision and surrounding neighborhoods such as Bellerive and Tilford Place. The requested modifications would not impact city services or utilities. Ms. Patterson referred the commission to the staff comments under the Subdivision findings.

Finding B5: the proposal (does) (does not) provide adequate common open space area, as determined by the Commission, no less than 10% of gross land area, free of buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. The common open space shall be accessible to all users of the development and useable for open space and recreational purposes. As noted in the background section, the original project was approved with 13.92% open space designed as a large natural area, pedestrian sitting and viewing area, and landscaping areas for the public and the residences to enjoy. Ms. Patterson clarified that this PUD amendment would reduce the open space from 13.92% to 12.95%. A PUD project requires a minimum of 10% open space. The following images show the changes to the open space. It should also be noted that Bear Waterfront, LLC is working with the City and the North Idaho Centennial Trail Foundation to make significant improvements along the Centennial Trail that do not count toward the open space percentage because they are not within the project boundaries.

Finding B6, off-street parking (does) (does not) provide parking sufficient for users of the development. Ms. Patterson noted that there is no change to the analysis of the project under Finding B6 from the original PUD request. There was no request made to change the City's off-street parking requirements through the prior PUD approval process. Single family homes would be required to provide two (2) off-street paved parking spaces per unit, which is consistent with code requirements for single-family residential. The mixed-use development on the Lot 1 will have to meet both the commercial and multi-family parking requirements per the City's parking code requirements.

Finding B7, that the proposal (does) (does not) provide for an acceptable method for the perpetual maintenance of all common property. Ms. Patterson noted that there is no change to the analysis of the project under Finding B7. An HOA was formed for the project to maintain all common areas and the private driveway that serves the residential lots. The HOA will also maintain the stormwater, streets, paths/sidewalks, structures within common areas, auxiliary parking areas, snow storage, and irrigation.

Subdivision Findings (S-5-21m.1)

Ms. Patterson provided the analysis and findings for the subdivision request for the Mahogany Lane replat. She noted that there are four findings for a subdivision, Findings B1-B4 .

Finding B1, that all of the general preliminary plat requirements (have) (have not) been met as attested to by the City Engineer. Chris Bosley, City Engineer, the replat of the Mahogany Lane Subdivision contains all of the general plat elements required by the Municipal Code.

Findings B2, that the provisions for sidewalks, streets, alleys, rights-of- way, easements, street lighting, fire protection, planting, drainage, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and utilities (are) (are not) adequate. The site, which is zoned R-17PUD, consists of 3.6 acres and is in various stages of development. The project design related to sidewalks, streets, easements, street lighting, fire protection, planting, drainage, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and utilities have not changed with the requested amendment to the PUD and replat of the Mahogany Lane Subdivision. Ms. Patterson provided a summary of staff comments related to stormwater, streets, traffic, water, wastewater, fire, police, parks and urban forestry and noted where there were not changes from the original request and new comments related to the PUD amendment and replat.

Finding B3, that the proposed preliminary plat (does) (does not) comply with all of the subdivision design standards (contained in chapter 16.15). Ms. Patterson noted that the City Engineer has attested to the preliminary plat and replat complying will all applicable subdivision design standards.

Finding B4, the lots proposed in the preliminary plat (do) (do not) meet the requirements of the applicable zoning district. Ms. Patterson noted that the R-17 zoning district requires that each single-family lot have a minimum of 5,500 square feet. The proposed lots area ranges from 2,982SF to 26,317SF. The applicant has requested the street frontage, lot width, and lot area deviations through the PUD process, which were approved with the original project. The gross area of the subject property is 3.6 acres. The overall density of the project with the two additional lots, would be less than 4 units per acre. The existing zoning allows for a density of 17 units per acre, which allows for a total of 61 units. The proposed density is less than what is allowed by the existing zoning. The replat exhibit meets these requirements.

Conditions:

Ms. Patterson provided an overview of the original conditions of approval and the conditions the applicant agreed to in the November 2025 agreement with the City Council. There are 12 new conditions and 31 original conditions.

Decision Point:

Ms. Patterson noted the action alternatives this evening. The Planning and Zoning Commission must consider these two requests and make separate findings to approve, deny, or deny without prejudice. The findings worksheets are attached.

Ms. Patterson concluded her presentation.

Commissioner McCracken asked Ms. Patterson to clarify the height on the two additional lots.

Ms. Patterson stated the height of the two new lots would be the same as Lots 2 through 4. The applicant can clarify if that's wrong.

Commissioner McCracken asked for clarification on the height allowed on Lots 2 through 4 since the commission doesn't have that information.

Ms. Patterson stated 32 feet is what is allowed. The reason they requested different heights for some of the homes with the original PUD request was because those lots are subject to the Shoreline Ordinance. Lots 2 through 4 and the two new lots would be allowed to have 32 feet.

Commissioner McCracken asked if there is a second story setback.

Ms. Patterson replied these are not ADUs. These are just single-family homes. They would be allowed to do the same deck and the roof encroachment as the other ones, but they wouldn't have to meet that second-story step back like an accessory dwelling unit.

Commissioner Fleming stated on Tilford Lane, we have the now public parking that's pulling off. Is that then dedicated to the city and maintained by the city going forward?

Ms. Patterson replied there's an easement along Tilford Lane, so it's a little tricky. Tilford Lane is private, so the city does not own that, and that's part of the Riverstone Master Association. The parking they will be providing along the street is required to be public.

Commissioner Fleming asked if the Riverstone Master Association is responsible for maintenance of Tilford Lane.

Ms. Patterson stated, that is correct.

Commissioner McCracken asked about Lots, 4, 3, 2, 13, and 12 and if their parking is only in the garage and in front of the garage.

Ms. Patterson stated, correct.

Commissioner McCracken stated there's no street parking or anything near them.

Ms. Patterson stated Bellerive Lane does allow for on-street parking for those owners within there, but not for the greater public.

Commissioner Ward asked a question about the text on page 19 of the staff report where it says Tract D is to be removed and Lots 12 and 13 are being created. What was the intended purpose of Tract D?

Ms. Patterson stated that Tract D was the common area parking just for the Mahogany Lane PUD project.

Commissioner Ward said, basically now it's just becoming two 13,500 square foot lots. Is that correct?

Ms. Patterson stated, that is correct. The tract will be changed into two single family lots. I guess it is confusing because on the replat those numbers are different than the PUD exhibit. But yes, for purposes of the PUD amendment, they showed Lots 12 and 13 on the exhibit.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification about the changes to the Delores Depot. That's really just a modification of the building design and little parking change. Everything else is all there and was approved with the original project, correct?

Ms. Patterson stated, that is correct. I believe they are enlarging the parking lot for the Delores Depot, shifting the open space and moving the plaza a little bit. I'll let the applicant speak about that.

Commissioner Ward asked for assurance that the Centennial Trail was not interrupted by this modification.

Ms. Patterson stated, that is correct.

Commissioner Ward asked if any of the changes would obstruct access to the river walk (in Bellerive)?

Ms. Patterson replied, this would not and in fact with the open space that was approved for the project previously, there are connections that go between the trail and onto Bellerive Lane. Those will remain. The public can continue to go that way from the trail to access the river walk. The people that live along Bellerive Lane can go up to the trail using those access points.

Chairman Messina asked if the prior project approval specified a certain number of parking spaces along Tilford Lane, and if there was anything that requires how many spaces there should be now.

Ms. Patterson asked the chairman if he was referring to the Delores Depot.

Chairman Messina replied, yes, I just want to make sure we're not losing parking spaces. We're giving up a parking lot for two more residential lots, which is a sellable project. We're taking a little open space away, but not a lot. We still have open space and access to the boardwalk. I'm just trying to get clear on with the shift of all this parking.

Ms. Patterson stated, they're not reducing it. I think they're increasing the parking for the Delores Depot. I don't see the numbers, but we can ask the applicant.

Commissioner Jamtaas stated he is still a little confused about what changed with the project design. The approved project had 12 parking spaces (in the Tract along Bellerive Boulevard). They must have needed 12 parking spaces for something. What's changed between then and now to put two more residential lots and remove the 12 parking spaces. Where are the people going to park? It's very narrow in that area, as we all know.

Ms. Patterson stated, they did not need those parking spaces before. From a code perspective, they meet the parking requirements for each of the homes within the project by providing the two or more off-street parking spaces. A lot of the homes within the gated portion of this project have provided way more than is required by code. They probably realized that for all the occupants and visitors, they will exceed the code requirements for parking. I will have the applicant speak to why they initially wanted parking and now they feel that they don't need that.

Commissioner Jamtaas asked are these all public parking spaces that are going to be developed up on Tilford?

Ms. Patterson stated on Tilford, those would be for public parking.

Commissioner Jamtaas stated, I think someone asked the question, "how is the public going to get over that berm to get through this project to get down to the river?"

Ms. Patterson replied, there are two stairways connecting the Centennial Trail to Bellerive Boulevard providing access to the river.

Commissioner McCracken stated, I think Commissioner Jamtass's point is important, too, that they are reducing access to the public boardwalk by making it harder to get to and or if the commercial spaces are designated with signage that the parking is only for commercial use, are people not going to feel welcome to walk down to the boardwalk.

Public Testimony Open:

Scott Hislop introduced himself and was sworn in. He stated he works for Bear Waterfront and is speaking on behalf of the applicant. Regarding the Delores Depot, the design did have a different footprint. Things are expensive. We have changed the design to make it more affordable so that we can pay to have somebody go in and have a commercial business go into the main floor of the building. In doing that, we also changed parking. All of that is new parking and was not on the previous PUD. There was some parking that came off Tilford Lane. It cut into and carved into some city property. We decided that it would make more sense for Tilford to go to the next intersection to take parking away from the intersection. Instead, we'll build it and have additional public parking. The parking modifications we made for the Delores Depot are adding net parking spaces for the public, not taking away. (Mr. Hislop pointed to the exhibit to show Tract D and Tract C). Right next to Tract C is Tract D. In the initial PUD, Tract D was a parking lot. That parking lot was private. Chairman Messina asked the question, what's changed? Why are parking spaces no longer needed in Tract D? Well, in working with the HOA at Bellerive, they don't see a need for them. The better use for that property is two residential homes that we can put there. During the day, parking on the street is allowed. Bellerive Lane is a private lane that people in Bellerive live on, and you can park on the street during the day, not at night. Visitors come to visit the homes on the waterfront side. They can park on the street and visit the property and then when they leave, they take their car and they leave. Parking overnight is now resolved and there's no parking overnight. The homes on lots 12 and 13 will have sufficient parking in the garage and in front of the homes. The net effect is positive. There will be public parking at the Depot building. There was a question on the height of the buildings. I'm not going to jump back to that one particular picture that was in staff report. But if one can think back to the building that's there, we see that shed roof with the trail behind it. The trail hits about the floor plate. There's about 12 feet between the trail and roof. It's like if you're standing on the trail looking at a single-story home. We're not exceeding height. We've also trimmed some of the trees in there. They were overgrown, but we trimmed some of those. Tract A is the common area space that the HOA for Mahogany Lane takes care of. Then there will be a single-story home feel. Then there's going to be Bellerive Lane and then you have the multiple story homes that front the river. Visually to the river, it's going to be difficult to see past the homes on the river and then you'll have a single-story home that's between trail and the road access points. That's another question that came up. Access points are staying the same. We're not modifying access points. One can see next to Lot 12 the concrete staircase. We're putting in a concrete staircase to get trail access down and then within the Bellerive PUD that has access points for public to access the boardwalk all along the way. Also, the people who live in Bellerive can walk to Bellerive Lane and take one of those two concrete staircases up to the trail. It does slope as we reoriented the trail as it winds down. You might recall the trail used to go straight across where the now the parking is north of the Delores Depot. We reorientated the trail, bringing it down and bringing it away from Tilford Lane. It slopes down and right now where the trail is south of Delores Depot, we have a stem wall that supports it. One walks along the trail and there's a stem wall to one's left or right, depending on if they're going east or west, then we'll have the Delores Depot access to the river and for the public, we bring them down the trail. They can get to Beebe Boulevard and go across Le Peep or the condos that are there, or they can hit the other access points within Bellerive. People won't be climbing over any sort of dirt. Instead, we have those two access points, and then otherwise it's going to go into the natural area. Most people are going to follow the trail and come off and go through either Beebe Lane or one of the staircases. Addressing the Depot modification, looking at this site, the Depot was a two-

story building with multiple tenants on a commercial use on the main floor and three condo units above. Now, there will be multiple commercial uses on the main floor and a commercial use upstairs. There are no more residential uses going in there, just the commercial uses. The commercial uses are actively pursuing us. What we thought was happening in 2021 is happening on the commercial side for tenant use. It's going to be something that people will use in the neighborhood, go to on a regular basis, and are great uses. One of them we have on our map is a restaurant. The Flying Goat is coming in. They will have food and beverages. The others we're still working on. The feeling of the building is going back to the heritage and the history of the train. We believe that the proposed 2026 Delores Depot also has a very nice train feel that ties back to the history of our area. In summary of the findings, all of the boxes have been checked. There's not a lot of change, but those changes that are there fall squarely within the rules, the code, and the requirements. Ms. Patterson did a good job doing that. I'll just walk through these here quickly. It's a replat, taking the parking lot and turning it into two residential lots. There are no changes to the standards for the buildings or increased height. We do comply with the zoning. It is a PUD area. This is a PUD and all of those things are applicable. There have been a couple comments that were made in writing. I'd like to address some of those just to make sure that we're letting people know we hear and we're responding. There are nine comments that were submitted. Two comments are somewhat similar. I'll just address those, not each individually, but as they go. One comment is it's being overbuilt. Another comment is we don't need more housing here. Two additional homes are not necessary. And there are already enough homes in the area and the amendment should not proceed. To clarify, the project is below the zoning density. There are fewer homes than allowed. The idea with these particular homes and the way it's laid out in this neighborhood, is that there are people who come on a partial yearly basis. There are also people that do live there year-round. The neighborhood itself is one where Coeur d'Alene residents live year-round. There are people that come a few months out of the year, but at the same time, it's a neighborhood where our residents live. Overpopulating it, over packing it full of houses is not our desire. Our desire is to have a neighborhood that is enjoyable, walkable, close to the Riverstone area, where residents can get to the water, can get to food, can get to entertainment and enjoy. Another comment talked about access to river views. We've addressed that a little bit already today in both questions and my answers. There were quite a few trees that were overgrown that did prevent people from seeing towards the water, and the HOA has cleaned those up and removed some of the dead trees, making the trail actually a nicer place to be. But again, the height of that trail over the water is such that if there were no homes, one could see it. But the homes that are in Bellerive are two stories and one can't see the water anyway. The homes that we're asking to add, like I said, we'll have the first floor plate will be at or below the trail level. The second story would be at trail level or above. Looking across the street to the north, one's going to see Tilford Place, and they're going to see single-family homes with that particular height. They could see the park if they could get to it, meaning the park over there in Riverstone. Turning back towards the river, they're going to see a single-family home. that's on the other side of a set of trees that we've cleaned up. The view is difficult to say we're taking it away because it really wasn't there. We believe that the neighborhood and the way our HOA is taking care of the neighborhood is making it a better place for everybody to enjoy the park and the neighborhood. There was a question of, well it's sort of a question, more of a statement. Why is the amendment being considered? The PUD has already been approved. We're following the rules and we want to make sure that we get approval for the modifications. Regarding construction, there will be trucks and workers. We will be as respectful as we can, obviously, and responsive in making sure that there is access for the residents.

Chairman Messina stated, you made a comment on the commercial side of things for Delores Depot, the parking given what you might build and your tenants you might have, and I'm looking on my page 33 here, where it says Lot 1 and then there's other parking locations, north of that, closer to Tilford Lane. Is that all parking for the commercial area? And maybe I misheard you, but you said the public can park in

that space as well but given that it's commercial and we've had other areas in that area down there where it's a mixed kind of use of public and commercial and we hear a few complaints about parking. How can the public distinguish it's not all just commercial parking. Can park there if they need to without having some problems down the road?

Mr. Hislop stated looking at the map, the parking on Tilford Lane is public. That's all public. There could be somebody who wants to go to the Depot, and they want to park on Tilford Lane. The parking that we have within our lot is for the Depot. The very nature of how it's pulled in and what's going to be happening there, my guess is that most people will pull in and go to the Depot.

Commissioner McCracken brought up a discussion regarding the lots that were for sale on the MLS. She said it appeared that they might already be advertising lots for sale that haven't been created yet. Mr. Hislop consulted with Mr. Bloem before responding. Mr. Hislop said the lot that is for sale is already platted. They are not listing property for sale that is being discussed this evening.

Commissioner Fleming commented on the descending slope from the Centennial Trail down to where it loops in the new grade. Do we have an idea of what that slope to grade is? Do you have a sense for what that is? Only because I'm on the Centennial Trail up north and there are a lot of night-time bicyclists, not paying attention, headlamp on maybe, and there is a lack of visibility. Can we make sure that we illuminate it properly or flag it properly so they know when they're descending down that hill at a breakneck speed. I think we need to make sure there's lighting on it and there's warning or some sort of warning on the trails as you're going up and down. Because we see a lot of bike traffic, especially in the summer, after the lights go out.

Mr. Hislop stated I'm not sure what the slope is. We built it to the spec of what we had in our approved plans. However, the depot building is going to be lit. So not at midnight, maybe, but it's going to be lit along that section of trail. So as the slope goes down, it goes to grade right in front of the Depot. There's the whole length of the Depot on the trail that is going to be offset by lighting of the Depot building. The restaurants and the activity that are happening there will be. The staircase does have lighting.

Public testimony closed.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Ward stated I wasn't here when this went from a lumber yard to what it is. But it's a beautiful development. I mean, it's a gorgeous location. Two multi-million dollar homes probably aren't going to impact the community too adversely. I do agree parking's an issue. It has been for a while. My wife and I love to go to Le Peep, but you just can't go on weekends anymore. It's just too crowded, and not enough parking. But it meets the parking requirements, and that's all we can review. As long as it conforms to the code. Is there enough parking? Probably not in any place in this town any longer. But I think it meets all the current code requirements, and it's still a beautiful place that people get to live in.

Chairman Messina stated, I would have to agree with that. I'm familiar with the area. I think the public parking is going to help regardless of where we put it. It's just going to add more parking in that area, which is getting more popular. But I think any additional parking in that area is a benefit to the public. I'm okay with this item.

Motion by Commissioner Fleming, seconded by Commissioner Jamtaas, to approve item PUD-3-21m.1 with conditions. Motion Carried.

Commissioner McCracken stated she does not love the exchange regarding the open space for the two residential units. She feels this makes it feel higher and tighter and dense on the trail. There had been a lot of discussion on parking when we added that parking now, they say they don't need it, but I feel like we did have a lot of discussion on why that was needed when it was there. I don't have any problem with the commercial. I think it's a much-needed use type. We need the commercial space. I'm kind of glad it's all commercial instead of mixed-use, but I don't know if there's any way to approve the commercial without the residential lots. I just don't feel like it's a fair exchange of open space. I feel like we keep squeezing in two more lots every time we approve it.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Ward	Voted Aye
Commissioner Jamtaas	Voted Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted Nay
Commissioner Fleming	Voted Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted Aye

Commissioners Coppess and Ingalls were absent

Motion approved carried by a 4 to 1 vote.

Motion by Commissioner Fleming, seconded by Commissioner Ward, to approve item S5-21m.1 with conditions. Motion Carried.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Ward	Voted Aye
Commissioner Jamtaas	Voted Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted Nay
Commissioner Fleming	Voted Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted Aye

Commissioners Coppess and Ingalls were absent

Motion approved carried by a 4 to 1 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

Prepared by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant