PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE
AUGUST 11, 2026

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Jon Ingalls, Vice Chair
Lynn Fleming
Sarah McCracken
Kris Jamtaas

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director
Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant
Sean Holm, Senior Planner
Randy Adams, City Attorney
Barbara Barker, Associate Planner
Chris Bosley, City Engineer
Mike Anderson, WW Superintendent

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Chairman Messina
Phil Ward
Mark Coppess

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Ingalls at 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Commissioner McCracken, seconded by Commissioner Jamtaas, to approve the minutes of the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on July 14, 2026. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

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

- We did not receive any public hearing items, so we will not be meeting in September.
- We do have the joint workshop scheduled with the Planning and Zoning Commission, Design Review Commission and Historic Preservation Commission to discuss recommendations from the Downtown Core Working Group. Members of public are welcome to attend, but there will not be any opportunity for public comment, which is typical of a workshop.
- We received an appeal on the Coeur Terre 2 subdivision, that will go to City Council for an appeal hearing on August 31st. Per the Municipal Code, that will be conducted as a de novo hearing, meaning it will be a full hearing. It's different than some appeal hearings where they're only dealing with the matter that has been appealed. That will take place as a special meeting of the City Council on August 31st at 5 p.m. For you, commissioners, please do not communicate with any members of the neighborhood or the applicant team in case that does get remanded back to you.

Commissioner McCracken asked if there was a reason why it will be a full hearing again.

Ms. Patterson stated that's in the code. This falls under the Subdivision Code provisions versus in the Zoning Code provisions for an appeal hearing. There are different sections of the code that specify how the hearing is held. It was very clear in the code that it's a de novo hearing, which is handled differently.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Fleming stated that on July 21st, she had the honor of talking to the North Idaho Building Contractors Association (NIBCA). She introduced them to the thought of dark sky illumination and restricting the excess use of light and how to prevent sky glow. She presented to them a slideshow and introduced them to limiting light for residential uses, trying not to overlight or uplight into the sky, and how to be aware of the adjacencies that you are now illuminating your entire backyard, and that illuminates your neighbor's backyard. She also spoke about using LED lighting in a warm spectrum, keeping that warmer so that nature, and all things that grow and feed off this earth are not impacted by too much light. We're losing our night sky. We're not seeing our stars in our city, and you have to go way out there to find it. It was really fun to work with them to try to encourage education and plant the seed that maybe when they're meeting with their clients, that they will talk about something called Dark Sky lighting.

OTHER BUSINESS: ***ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM.

1. Applicant: Olson Engineering on behalf of Eugene P. Haag, Jr. Trust
   Location: 2248 E. Stanley Hill Road
   Request: A request for a 1-year extension for a 5-lot, subdivision known as Haag Estates (S-1-25)

Mr. Holm, Senior Planner provided the following statements:

Olson Engineering is requesting a one-year extension. On September 9, 2025, the Coeur d'Alene Planning Commission held a public hearing on a request for annexation (A-1-25) and a five-lot preliminary plat subdivision known as "Haag Estates" (S-1-25) at 2248 E. Stanley Hill Road. The preliminary plat was approved by the Planning Commission contingent upon approval of the annexation request and associated R-3 zoning with Hillside Overlay. The City Council approved the annexation on December 2, 2025, which was recorded as Ordinance 3764 on February 6, 2026. With the annexation now final, the property is within the Coeur d'Alene city limits.

The applicant's engineer, Olson Engineering, submitted a written request dated June 12, 2026, requesting a twelve (12) month extension of the preliminary plat approval for "Haag Estates" pursuant to Section 16.20.040 of the Municipal Code. The letter states that the applicant continues to make progress toward satisfying the conditions of approval but requires additional time to complete the final plat engineering and address outstanding department requirements before the preliminary plat approval expires.

There are 7 conditions that would still apply to the project if this extension request is approved.

Mr. Holm noted the action alternative this evening: The Planning and Zoning Commission must consider the request by motion by granting a one-year extension of the approved subdivision permit to September 9, 2027. Or the commission may, by motion, deny the 12-month extension of the preliminary plat approval. If it's denied, the preliminary plat approval expires on September 9th of 2026, and the applicant would have to submit a new application for a plat approval.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated that as he understands it, the code allows for five such extensions. He said he couldn't remember that the commission has ever denied a subdivision extension and he can't think of a

downside. He asked Mr. Holm for confirmation.

Mr. Holm replied that is correct. He provided some history on the need for extensions. During the Great Recession, the code allowed for fewer extensions and there were some subdivision approvals that were expiring and only one or two extensions were permitted at the time. A few years later, the City changed the code to allow five extensions.

Motion was made by Commissioner Fleming, to grant a one-year extension to end on September 9, 2027, seconded by Commissioner McCracken. Motion Carried.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Applicant: Gordon Dobler on behalf of David Swenson
   Location: 3050 W Prairie Ave & 7760 N Atlas Road
   Request: A proposed 9.27-Annexation from County Ag to City R-17 at 17 units per acre QUASI-JUDICIAL, **(A-2-26)**

Vice Chair Ingalls stated let me just set the tone here, there's a lot of people here, and there's going to be some passion. From reading the comments it is clear this is very important to folks. He asked that we set a very respectful tone tonight. Whether you're in favor or opposed, and you come up and provide testimony, others are not going to clap or boo, just treat this like this is what it is. It's a quasi-judicial hearing. Conduct yourselves like you're in a court of law. Give everybody respect. That's the respect we'll give you. You give one another, and we'll get we'll get through this. When we get to the point just before the applicant's going to give testimony, he will ask for everybody that is going to provide testimony to rise, and we'll swear everyone in as a group.

Ms. Barker, Associate Planner, provided an overview of the request and noted the action alternatives this evening. The Planning and Zoning Commission must consider the request and make a recommendation of adoption or rejection of the requested City R-17 zoning prior to annexation of 9.27 acres to City Council.

This property is currently two abutting properties which are currently located in the County Agriculture zone, suitable for one single-family dwelling or one two-family dwelling, with a minimum lot size of 2 acres unless in a conservation development. The sizes of the properties are 4.53 and 4.74 acres. The existing lots are considered conforming lots, as per the Kootenai County Land Use and Development Code.

The R-17 zoning district provides the widest range of housing options, suitable for residential development with single-family housing, duplex housing and multi-family housing. The Comprehensive Plan envisioned the future land use for this property to be higher density, and the Urban Neighborhood place type supports R-17 zoning.

The subject properties are not currently connected to City utilities. If the annexation is approved, the applicant would connect to city sewer at the time of development to better serve this property and meet all other requirements and policies imposed by the City. The water is provided by Hayden Lake Irrigation District.

The owner has three (3) dwelling units on the two parcels which will remain until time of development. The applicant is not requesting a subdivision at this time.

If approved, the R-17 zoning would allow higher density than the zoning of the adjacent properties which

are R-3 and R-8 zoning districts. R-17 zoning is found 0.5 miles to the west and 0.7 miles to the east (aerial distance). There is a C-17 zoned property at the southwest corner of Atlas Road and Prairie Avenue.

Ms. Barker noted there are four findings that must be made, Findings B1-B4.

The first finding is Finding B1, that this proposal (is) (is not) in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan policies. The Comprehensive Plan includes Place Types that represent the form of future development, as envisioned by the residents of Coeur d'Alene. These place-types will in turn provide the policy-level guidance that will inform the City's Development Ordinance. The review for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan is based on:

1. Conformance with envisioned future land use/ place types;
2. Provision of transportation networks; and
3. Conformance with Policy Framework (Goals and Objectives).

R-17 and R-34SUP, NC, C, C-17, and C17L are the compatible zoning districts for the Urban Neighborhood Place Type.

Finding B2, that public facilities and utilities (are) (are not) available and adequate for the proposed use.

Ms. Barker noted that the commission will review the information provided, summary of facts, and testimony from the hearing, to make this determination. She shared images and information related to:

- Existing Infrastructure
- Photos of existing conditions along Prairie Avenue and Atlas Road
- Staff comments and conditions.

Ms. Barker noted that Hayden Lake Irrigation District (HLID) provides water in this location. They have provided a Will Serve letter and the applicant has provided a draft hydraulic study. To summarize, they are generally stating that they have the capacity in their system to serve the property at the proposed zoning density. However, when definitive development is proposed, they are requiring a hydraulic study to show what updates may be required to serve the proposed uses.

Finding B3, that the physical characteristics of the side (do) (do not) make it suitable for the request at the time.

Ms. Barker noted that the commission will review the information provided, summary of facts, and testimony from the hearing, to make this determination. She shared images and information related to the subject property and physical characteristics.

Findings B4, that the proposal (would) (would not) adversely affects the surrounding neighborhood regarding traffic, neighborhood character, (and) (or) existing land uses.

Ms. Barker noted that the commission will review the information provided, summary of facts, and testimony from the hearing, to make this determination.

Post Falls Highway District has denied access, other than emergency access, from the properties to Prairie Avenue. Currently, the only allowed access to the subject property would be through W. Daylily Drive's dead-end and from Atlas Road.

The proposed annexation itself would not adversely affect the surrounding area with regard to traffic, as no traffic is generated from an annexation. The proposed annexation is requesting R-17 zoning for the approximately 9.27-acre property. Without knowing what housing type is proposed, a theoretical maximum of 161 apartment units is being assumed which could result in over 1071 trips/day or 82 trips during the AM peak hour and 100 trips during the PM peak hour. The estimated traffic was derived from Land Use Code 220 – Apartments in the ITE Trip Generation Manual. The Streets and Engineering Department has no objection to this annexation request but will require a traffic impact analysis prior to issuance of building permits or subdivision of the property.

Regarding neighborhood character, directly south of the subject property is 4.75 acres within Kootenai County Agriculture zone with a private residence and a commercial auto repair shop. North and west of the subject property are two parcels with a total of 3.98 acres also in Kootenai County Agriculture zone with private homes and agricultural use.

West of the subject property is the major subdivision known as Landings at Waterford (annexed in 2003) with R-3 zoning and lots that are approximately 12,500 square feet. To the east is a planned development known as Garden Grove (annexed in 2017) with R-8 PUD zoning and lots that are approximately 5,000 square feet. The larger surrounding area is R-8 zoned developments known as Landings at Waterford First Addition and Sunshine Meadows with 7,000 to 10,000 square feet lots, annexed in 2003 and 2006 respectively.

These neighborhoods in the surrounding areas are conventional suburban layouts with public streets, sidewalks, and access to city utilities. These areas exhibit a cohesive residential character with well-maintained lawns, mature trees, and minimal commercial uses. On the southwest corner of Prairie Avenue and Atlas Road is The Landings strip center with a small convenience grocery store, food and beverage, and personal service uses.

Ms. Barker noted the seventeen recommended conditions and provided the commission with the action alternatives this evening. The Planning and Zoning Commission will need to consider this request for R-17 zoning prior to annexation and make findings to recommend that the City Council adopt the requested R-17 zoning with or without conditions to be included in the Annexation Agreement or reject the requested R-17 zoning.

Ms. Barker concluded her presentation.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated thank you for a very thorough report, Mr. Barker. He asked for clarification on condition #6 from staff recommending a condition to impose an increased setback to 25 feet and what is the default dimension without that increase.

Ms. Barker replied that the standard setback for multi-family is 10 feet to the side and 20 to the side if it was next to a street, and 20 feet for the rear setback. The condition would be for 25-foot setbacks along Garden Grove for principal buildings.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated depending on how a multi-family building might be oriented, it could be as little as five feet if it wasn't for this condition.

Ms. Barker replied, not a multi-family, the minimum would be 10 feet.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated it would increase from 10 to 25 feet.

Ms. Barker stated, correct. For a duplex or a single-family use, the front setback is 20 feet. The side setback for a duplex or single-family is where you may only have a five-foot setback because the code requires one side to be five feet and 10 feet on the other side.

Vice Chair Ingalls asked how that recommended condition came about.

Ms. Barker stated we obviously got a lot of concern from the residents at Garden Grove. They have rather shallow rear yards that are abutting this property. Looking at the typical rear setback of 25 feet for most development, staff felt it would help mitigate concerns and provide a buffer between an intensified use, which is multi-family, and single-family or duplex.

Vice Chair Ingalls asked if this condition was like other examples, such as the one in the Landings where there's some R-17, Carrington apartments, and then some that are close to Ramsey and Prairie, where there's R-17 in there and buffering was a condition.

Ms. Barker said she would respond to the Landings. In this particular case we don't have a subdivision to look at, so it's just a wide open field, and we don't know what they're planning. In comparison, when they did the planning for the Landings, they knew exactly where they're going to put that R-17.

Chairman Ingalls swore the applicant and the group in as a whole.

Gordon Dobler, applicant's representative, introduced himself and he stated he would like to start out by complimenting staff on that fine staff report. It's one of the better ones that he's seen, and he thinks you're fortunate to have competent staff. The more information that you get, the easier the decision-making process becomes. Looking at this, in just general terms, you have a little island that's surrounded by the city. The whole piece, including property owned by others, is about 17.5 acres. It is inevitable that this will come into the city eventually. The applicant's plan does not include annexing the corner property. The plan, though, does not include the development of the Atlas frontage. Where we're headed with the owner Swenson is that the pumpkin patch and the farm, and those residents will stay. If you can imagine a middle north south line just extending to the south, his client's intention is to ultimately parcel that off and leave the front half undeveloped.

Commissioner Fleming asked for clarification on access from Atlas Road. We have an exit problem. We can only go through Hydrangea and down, and then a deadhead. We need a road and access to Atlas Road. You will need to carve out a bit of the pumpkin patch for a roadway access.

Mr. Dobler replied that they will. Water and sewer will be connected. Water comes up Atlas and there will be at least a 30-foot utility easement because water and sewer will be brought along the southerly portion of the property and that could be used for access.

Commissioner Fleming asked about having curb cuts and sidewalks on the street.

Mr. Dobler replied that there will be improvements to the Atlas Road frontage. There will be a curb, sidewalk, etc. He said he would provide more information about access to Atlas before the conclusion of his presentation. There is a need for this annexation because of the economy, the demand for housing and the scarcity of land. It's inevitable that this is going to be annexed into the city. How it's annexed or what zoning, that is yet to be determined. But to those that would say they want it to remain as a field, he would say growth is inevitable. Staff did a great job of presenting the surrounding zoning and the appropriateness of the requested R-17 zoning. He reiterated that the Comp Plan calls this out as an Urban Neighborhood, and R-17 is certainly one of the enabling or compatible zones. In fact, R-17 is probably one of the less dense zoning districts for the Urban Neighborhood Place Type, other than if a property was developed with single family residential in the R-17 zone. Most of the surrounding areas are zoned R-8 with C-17 at the corner. The property owners at the southeast corner intend to request annexation with C-17 zoning pending the outcome of this annexation request. You've got a major arterial

collector intersection and you've already seen C-17 on one corner. The other corner is ripe for C-17. The question is what will happen with the rest of this area in the future and is R-17 zoning compatible? He would say that it is going to be compatible with the kind of uses you'll see on the remaining pieces coming in and the kind of zoning. The R-17 does allow for a variety of uses. It's probably one of the broader ones, where you can go single-family all the way up to multi-family. The intent of the Urban Neighborhood Place Type is to have denser residential development. Regarding utilities, sewer will come up Atlas and be brought into the property along a utility easement. Whether it extends as far north here, there is no sewer available. There is sewer out in this intersection, but it's way too shallow for us to access. Water is from Hayden Lake Irrigation District. As part of the requirement to get the will serve, we did a modeling study on probable extensions of water mains into this development. Prairie Avenue has a 12-inch. Atlas Road has a 12-inch, and we will be looping from Daylily and connecting to probably both of them. The modeling study predicted the flows and the resulting pressures. There's actually an increase in pressure when we connect these two because of the additional flow capacity. There's no negative impact at all on pressures in the existing subdivision. He then touched on one of the concerns of the residents that was in some of the comments you read. Some of the houses in Garden Grove have an easement and an existing four-inch water main that comes down behind the houses that is pretty much under the fence, and that currently connects out and provides service to this house to the west. With the development of this parcel, that four-inch line becomes obsolete. It will be abandoned by Hayden Lake Irrigation District. He has had discussions with Brandon, the supervisor at HLID, as recently as this afternoon to confirm it and they indicated they would vacate the easement and abandon that four-inch water line. This also responds to concerns about having backyards ripped up. That line will be abandoned and the easement will be vacated. It actually would allow them more use of their backyards, as far as putting structures and whatnot in that easement because it would be going away. This is a benefit. Regarding transportation, let's talk about access because it is important. As staff pointed out, Post Falls Highway District manages Prairie Avenue and they won't allow direct access. But they would permit secondary fire access onto Prairie Avenue, if needed. The applicant has also been in the process of discussions with the property owner to the west about creating a secondary access to Atlas Road. Having that additional connection would be a benefit to developing this property and we understand that. That ends up being an important mitigation for any and all the impacts to traffic. Traffic is always an issue and it's really not one specific development that's the issue. It's traffic patterns, traffic flow, signal timing. It's really more of a regional or local issue. Any development of any kind will contribute incrementally to that new traffic. Any new growth will do that. It's really the effective management of traffic is more at a regional or a local level. The City of Coeur d'Alene is part of the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO), and they do have model forecasts out 20 years that predict traffic given the predicted land uses. They come through and identify land uses all through the city, and then generate traffic and trips and route it on the streets. Atlas Road is pretty much at its ultimate width of 40 feet with three lanes. The regional planning is really more of the answer to how are we going to alleviate our traffic issues. When Hanley was opened all the way over to Huetter Road, you have seen that the traffic on Atlas Road really jumped up. It was a regional impact. Interestingly enough, single-family generates about 50% more trips than one multi-family unit. So let me just throw some numbers at you. If you had 10 acres and you developed it as an R-17 in a peak hour, you'd get about 114 trips in the peak hour. If you developed it as R-12, you're going to get about 120 trips in the peak hour. If you developed it as R-8, you'll get less. Then you start to reduce it. You'd get about 80 trips in the peak hour. The whole point of it is not to remember the numbers, but the trend, and say just because it's R-17 doesn't mean you're going to get more traffic generated than some of the other residential uses or some of the other zoning and development density that would be allowed in the urban neighborhood. Well, because when you have single family as opposed to multi-family, you generate more trips for things like deliveries, for lawn care, for a variety of additional uses that come along with single family. Even Amazon will deliver to a CBD, so they make one stop to those multiple mailbox things, they make one stop for 15 units versus 15 separate stops. That's why you get more traffic for detached than you would for multifamily. Lastly, regarding the recommended conditions for the annexation agreement, we didn't see any red flags or any fatal flaws. We would suggest a refinement of a few of them, and one of them was the condition for a traffic study. We don't have any problem with that, but we would want an opportunity to discuss the scope of the traffic study. The buffer zone was an interesting condition but not a surprise given the public comments. We just want an opportunity to review that and discuss it with staff as we move forward through negotiating the annexation agreement. Remember when we talk about

impacts of development that all of the development here is going to pay significant amount of impact fees that go to street projects, public safety, parks to acquire land. That is part and parcel with any annexation and any development.

Commissioner Jamtaas asked Mr. Dobler to help him understand the decision that was made about not allowing access onto Prairie Avenue, and if that determination was made by the Post Falls Highway Department that you couldn't have an exit, or access or egress onto Prairie Avenue. It seems that same number of people are now going to be going through Daylily to access Prairie Avenue. They're just going to go through the neighborhood. What is that rationale?

Mr. Dobler said he wished he could explain it all. The highway district doesn't allow access onto Prairie. It's that simple. He did ask about a right in, right out. They were concerned that with the 45 miles an hour speed limit that access would slow traffic down. That is just the highway district's policy.

Vice Chair Ingalls asked for clarification on the access. He recalls reading something in the staff report about Atlas Road and Daylily Drive. He knew some traffic would go out Daylily but wants clarification on access off of Atlas Road. Help us understand why we don't have some definite Atlas Road connection.

Mr. Dobler stated that the applicant has the ability to develop access where the property fronts Atlas Road but the property owner doesn't want a throughfare on the side. The specifics are yet to be negotiated with the property owner, but clearly it'll be an easement, and both utilities will require access over that easement. There will be a developed, limited access for utilities here, and we're in negotiations to plus that up depending on what we can do with this before we develop.

Commissioner McCracken asked if the limited access to Atlas Road would have sidewalks or connection into the trail on Atlas or anything like that.

Mr. Dobler responded that it would basically be a driveway or drive aisle and is not anticipated as a dedicated city street.

Commissioner Fleming asked if Mr. Swenson owns the pumpkin patch.

Mr. Dobler replied that he does.

Commissioner Fleming asked if the owner wants road access through the southerly border of his property.

Mr. Dobler replied that they are not looking for a public street to go through there, but they understand that there will be access of some sort.

Commissioner Fleming commented that this access needs to be more than emergency-only access. It must be a dedicated road. Even if this didn't go to multi-family, which is high density and 161 units, it is truly a mistake to think that we can't exit a lot of people out onto Atlas Road because you would be shoving all 1,000 cars a day through a small development with closely stacked houses. That would be a real concern. If you cannot dedicate a real road accessing Atlas Road that belongs to this development, it's a no-go for me. It's dangerous and it's thoughtless. If this were to go to full multi-family, high density, lot of people, sometimes two and three cars per unit, because the people are triple bunking now here to afford it, that we need to get people out. We need to move them north and south, up north, up south. They need to be able to turn left and go down Atlas. And yes, we will be improving Atlas over time. It will come, maybe in time to catch this development. This is just an annexation. She knows it may not be developed as high density housing. The drive now for affordability drives us into multi-family because the young people can't afford housing. This is where we are. This request needs a proper road on that southerly border. That's the reality.

Commissioner McCracken asked for clarification on the timing of the different elements and if the

roadway connections and improvements to the trail would be done at time of subdivision or construction.

Mr. Dobler responded that he can't speak for staff, but the way the condition reads is prior to construction. We're not planning any subdivision at this point. It would be prior to construction of whatever units or whatever development is constructed, and staff controls that because we would have to come in and present site plans for the on-site development, and they approve it.

Commissioner McCracken asked Ms. Patterson for clarification on the requirement for infrastructure.

Ms. Patterson stated Mr. Dobler is correct in saying that it would be required as part of development or prior to, if it's subdivided that would be before a plat is finalized, there's the requirement for the infrastructure to be put in place. If it was built as an apartment complex, that would be part of the building permit process. We'd require one or the other.

Commissioner McCracken asked for clarification on needs of the Fire Department. Their only comment was related to the flow and the pressure of Hayden Lake Irrigation District. Does the Coeur d'Alene Fire Department does not require access on Atlas? She said she is surprised that's not the findings.

Ms. Patterson stated that staff's understanding was that there would be access from Atlas as well as Daylily. That was kind of presumed that you have frontage there and there'd be frontage improvements and access.

Commissioner McCracken stated it wouldn't be unreasonable to add that if it because it seems like they were assuming that was the case.

Ms. Patterson replied, "correct".

Mr. Dobler responded that secondary access for Fire is required after we reach so many units. We expect that, and that's what I said, that at least on Prairie there would be an emergency fire access, and certainly that at this point, that utility road would be used as a fire access also.

Commissioner McCracken said it is hard to say if the criteria would be met if there's no access on Prairie Avenue and no guarantee of what access to Atlas Road could look like.

Mr. Dobler suggested that access could be addressed in an additional condition of approval that would be worked out through the annexation agreement and give us time to come back and talk to Mr. Swenson about what he may or may not have.

Commissioner McCracken stated it's hard having a lot of loose ends.

Mr. Dobler stated let's just pretend if you made a condition of approval saying that you must have an vehicular access for this development out to Atlas, the applicant team can meet with staff before it goes to council. The code defines if it's a vehicular access, it's got to be minimum 24 feet, you know, drive aisle, paved, etc.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated that might make sense here to just get this moving forward. He doesn't believe it needs to be a full street width but it needs to be more than a teeny little easement thing too. He lives just south of there in a neighborhood that turns right off Atlas, and it works. There are 60 homes there, and it's certainly not a full city public road. It's a little private street, and there's one just like it to the north of his neighborhood. Those work and this could too.

Commissioner Fleming stated the trick to this is though that you are forcing the predominance of that traffic through Daylily. It's impacting an existing neighborhood in a profound sense. It behooves the developer/owner, or whomever' s packaging this up, to understand that that's detrimental to the

neighborhood. We keep talking about neighborhoods, established neighborhoods. That's an impact one cannot ignore. We have to give them decent access to the south (to Atlas Road), so that they don't fully feel the weight of that traffic. Knowing that there's a secondary access, whether it's a street that is 25 feet with curbs and sidewalks and a nice walking path, that would be a really nice bonus. But in reality, we should not lay all that traffic onto Daylily.

Commissioner McCracken stated that the commission has to consider the density too. If a private drive works for more for 60 homes, or there's a little loop on Mocha, like a handful of residences, but at a density of you know R-17, there's a significant difference of the amount of funneled traffic there, even if it was more of the same homes right there might fit more to fit right into Daylily.

Mr. Dobler stated, even if it wasn't R-17 to continue to make the point, whatever traffic is generated, even if zoned R-12 or R-8, we would resonate and say second access is not only benefits Daylily, but it benefits this subdivision or this development as well. And that's why he suggested an additional condition that gives us chance to work through the specifics.

Commissioner Fleming stated it's problematic thinking that you're going to turn left to go west on Prairie, as we all know it's getting harder and harder to get that left turn. The people are putting on the pedal to the metal, and they're heading straight for you as you're trying to turn left into them into the median.

Kurt Vitali introduced himself and said he has four reasons why he oppose the property or the zone change – property value, traffic, safety, and finally aesthetics. Property value studies show that multi-family units in close proximity to single-family homes do not necessarily lower the value of the single-family homes, nor do they necessarily increase the value. Either way, it's kind of neutral. However, studies do show that urban homes in close proximity to small-family farms typically have a 3 to 4% higher resale value than homes not near a farm. A zone change to R-17 from this farm will negatively affect my home's value as well as that of my neighbors. The second is traffic, which we've already talked a little bit about. His office window overlooks Atlas. He knows that as soon as Hanley was opened up to Huetter, that the traffic increased significantly. He’s going to make a guess at 50 percent increase when those subdivisions along Hanley are completed, that traffic is going to continue to intensify, and adding another subdivision right, there at Atlas and Prairie is only going to would be totally irresponsible with regard to traffic patterns. He can sit in his office right now and overlook Atlas, and can say that between the hours of 4:30 and 6:00 p.m., he knows when there's a red light on Prairie because the traffic's backed up past his house. When the Hanley development gets completed, that potential traffic could be backed up past Wilbur. The other issue is semi-truck traffic. There was virtually no semi- truck traffic on Atlas before Hanley opened up, and now the big rigs travel that every day. That adds not only to the congestion but also adds to noise and air pollution along that road. He knows the City Engineer said that Atlas can handle the traffic, but you know the roads in Seattle and LA and Portland can handle the traffic too, but you don't want to be on those roads between five and 6o'clock, do you? No, because it's a parking lot, and that’s going to happen too along Atlas eventually when all these subdivisions get built. The next one is safety. He knows the police and fire departments have stated they can handle the impact of 161 new units, but the question is, do they want to? Any firefighter will tell you it's more difficult to fight a fire in a multi-family dwelling than it is in a single-family home, and statistics support that as well. Also, traffic safety statistics show that a 50% increase in traffic flow results in a 60- 80% increase in traffic accidents, so that's significant. The other is just aesthetics. Currently that farm is a peaceful rural oasis in the midst of this urban sprawl, and it's one of the reasons he bought my house there. He likes looking out over the mature trees, the open land, the nice yellow barn that's there, which he knows was said that it's going to stay there for the time being, but you know who knows how long that that means. He also likes to hear the rooster crowing in the morning. That's kind of nice. Re-zoning this property robs him and his neighbors of these simple pleasures. In your packet, one of the things you said in your growth and development goal is "preserve the qualities that make Coeur d’Alene a great place to live”. This proposed zoning change will accomplish just the opposite of that. With every pasture that's turned under, every mature tree that's cut down to make room for another subdivision, the quality of life in Coeur d’Alene diminishes. It's been going downhill for the past 25 to 30 years, so please, do the right thing and recommend that this zone change request be denied. Thanks.

Dennis Tanner introduced himself and said he lives in Coeur d'Alene. He is here to speak as a property owner that doesn't want the quality of life in his neighborhood, which is the Landings, or the property values of the Landing to go down. How many stories might these be? He would guess three. That's 45 feet. Second could low-income housing be part of this package of R-17? He would appreciate an answer to that. Would it be possible, as a response to this request, to say how about R-8 instead of R-17. That would be my third question. Say yes, but let's do this with different zoning because despite what the gentleman said, he believe that would result in less traffic. The fact that we have limited access over here on Atlas and no access on Prairie, and we're going through a neighborhood to get it's like no access to this place, and that should be a reason for you to say no. This doesn't work. There's virtually no access here. It doesn't work. It's not enough access to make this work, and it's going to be problems for the neighborhoods on both sides. Thank you for listening.

Sandra Moulton introduced herself and said she lives in Coeur d'Alene. We are right next to Daylily right on the corner, and it will greatly impact us with that much traffic. Depending on what you build and if it is apartments, it has got to be at least three stories, and they're going to be right up against our fence with everybody looking down into our backyard. Also, the infrastructure on the streets there at Atlas and Prairie, like the other gentleman said, if you're there and you're looking out, and we can see both from our backyard, the traffic is terrible. And God help us if they're doing any redirection because of other road construction in other places. It makes it 10 times worse. Going through the red light there at the corner. Sometimes you're sitting there through two cycles of the red light. Also, please take into consideration not only the farm animals because we love the farm back there. That's one reason why we bought where we did. But there's also the wildlife. That lone pine tree that sits on that property has a pair of nesting red-tail hawks, which she understands are under federal and state protection. We see them there all the time. What's going to happen to that tree and those hawks because who's going to speak for them? We love the farm. We love the animals. We enjoy it. We're also worried about the four-inch water main that runs through our backyards. She said she knows he said that Hayden Lake told them that they're not going to use that four-inch water main. It actually goes through the backyards of the first five houses from Daylily down, and the backyards get smaller as they go down from Daylily on through Hydrangea there, and we're wondering: Are they actually going to shut that water main down because it does go to the barn? It provides water, and if not, if they're going to try and use that as part of the water for the development. If it breaks, then they come through and they tear up our backyards all the way down to fix that main. We understand that the property owner has the right to do with what you know they want to do with it. It's just that you know we really like the farm, and I hope everybody takes that into consideration too. Thank you.

Cal Whitfield introduced himself he states we own the five acres directly to the north of the proposal. He lives in the County and has a lot of questions. He actually came here not in opposition to this. We've known the Swenson's for years. We knew that this was something that they were working towards and we do support them in the idea of it. Next door to it, we do have an auto repair shop. We ran it for many years. We sold the business itself last year to one of my employees. On the back half of the property is a small farm with a house. We occupied it for many years. At this point, we're using it as a VRBO. Right now, the business generates a lot of traffic. It does. It's been there for 41 years. It's one of the oldest auto shops in the city. Well, in the area. And right now, you get over there in any kind of traffic times, and it is deadlocked. Atlas is absolutely deadlocked, and with him talking about punching an access right on our property line, my shared property line with the Swenson's. Now you're talking the other corner of my property, right down over here. My property is about 330 feet wide, directly opposing that other property line is the entrance to the Landings. Anybody who goes in or out of the Landings anytime near or around traffic times knows what it's like getting on Atlas. Now we're talking 330 feet from that Landings, another entrance with potentially better than 1000 cars a day, feeding in and out of Atlas on it. Right now, it's going to completely deadlock access to our property, because already we can't hardly get in and out. Another big question is about the sewer main. It sits on the far corner of his property. He has already talked to the city, and they said any development that happens, they're going to have to punch that sewer main through the front of his property. He didn't see a single picture showing the extension of the sewer main and if that would affect the front of his property. There's absolutely no discussion with how that's going to impact our property or our business as they do this, nor what are they going to do the put back

together the front of my property? Is it going to match the proposed annexation? Does he have a say in it? And then once it's done, does he get to maintain something that somebody else put together? None of these questions are being answered in this. Not to mention the fact that he doesn't love the idea of having a road with potentially over 1000 people a day running up and down his property line. He is not opposed to this project, but really thinks somebody needs to be talking to him and the more impacted neighbors to get people on board, and not coming here with a lot of ambiguous answers to questions that everybody in this room has. Thank you for your time.

Anthony Walker introduced himself and said he lives in Coeur d'Alene Place, which is just another side down from Garden Grove. He states he is in support of this annexation because he is young and has a lot of friends that live in the apartments off of Prairie and Ramsey. He graduated college seven eight years ago. He started living in an apartment when he graduated from University of Idaho. He grew up in the County just north of Coeur d'Alene. He had his first job in 2019 for $40,000 a year. He wanted to make this home, and so he did. He rented an apartment and then COVID happened. Obviously this made everything more expensive, everything more unattainable. But he worked hard to afford a home, and now he has a family. He is in favor of this because he wants to see more urban infill projects in our city and the overall area. We see a lot of urban sprawl. Highway 41 is going to be full before we even know it, and there's going to be more and more houses that take up the actual big, farms and the fields that are actually farmed for hay and alfalfa. This is kind of a hobby farm right now, but he does think it's a great development site for something that can provide attainable housing for younger generations to keep them here, keep my friends here who are waiting for the hospital to be built down the road and want to live kind of close to the hospital. It's going to be built in Post Falls, and they want to see their families raised here. They're for the next generation. He'd rather keep areas like this more density and have our actual farms remain undeveloped. If you look at Boise, they have subdivisions in the middle of farmlands because projects like this aren't approved but if we do approve them with the density, we have the open fields once you leave town. He'd prefer to see that personally and see a project like this approved. Thank you.

Justin Sherfey introduced himself and said he lives in Coeur d'Alene. He states he also represents the younger generation tonight. He appreciates everybody coming out. There are peers and people older than me who want to live here, and it's hard. A lot of my friends live in their mom's basements in Post Falls. Where do you want to live? They would love to live in Coeur d'Alene. He knows some developers that own apartments and he asked them about the rental market in Coeur d'Alene. They said it is their best market. They're 95% full and beating rents by 100 bucks on their pro forma. What does that tell you? It tells you that there's a lack of supply, and there's a true demand for people who want to be here. The Swenson's have owned this property since 2013. He is sure they probably weren't thrilled when Garden Grove came in. A lot of those property owners bought in 2018, and 2020, they weren't here. They also have property rights. This is Idaho. That's why people live here, and we're not doing a zone change tonight. From what he can tell, this is following the Comp Plan and filling in a color for the City of Coeur d'Alene on what your Comp Plan calls for. Traffic sucks. Until we have something in writing that says what's going to happen, he actually thinks that coming off a Daylily, and if you want to take a left on Prairie, he'd rather come through this development and then take a right out on the Atlas instead of trying to dodge cars on Prairie Avenue. This is your neighbor. It's their time. They've chosen now to sell for different reasons. A lot of people have done this in the past. This isn't the best time. But we're in an affordability crunch, and others my age are out there who don't know about these meetings, who don't come here, who don't share their concerns. They're just like, "It is what it is". My buddy's an elevator mechanic, who makes a great income. He's like, "Yeah, I just kind of come to the reality I'm never going to own anything in Coeur d'Alene because it's just gotten so crazy". And this does help. It's surrounded by city. Yeah, the restricted access onto Prairie, he doesn't like that either. That they won't let us come in and out. He thinks that that's for the residents there. It's not great. he just appreciates you guys listening to your future generation and the problems, the real problems that we're facing. And if we can find a solution to some of the issues brought up tonight. Thank you.

Eric Sorenen introduced himself and stated that he lives right on the border in Garden Grove. One of the big problems he sees with the R-17 zoning is that not only is it really tall because it's going to tower over his property, but it also allows for the possibility to be converted to an R-34 later. He doesn't know if

there's going to be a hearing on that or if that's just a thing that goes on behind closed doors. So that's a huge concern of his. He doesn't want people staring into his backyard in the privacy of his home, and also the light, the effect of this that it'll have on the sunlight. He has a lot of plants that he has spent a lot of time cultivating, and they rely on that sunlight because we have such a short growing season already. He would like to see if it's possible to have a sun study if this were to go through. Plus, he has solar panels also on that side too. If they block that, then it's literally cost me money. Another concern he has is with Atlas. It sounds like, if he heard correctly, that the Parks Department is requiring a 10-foot-long path on the side, and Atlas Road is still only one lane. He doesn't know how they're going to accomplish that and also put all these people in that property and push them all through Atlas. So that's another huge concern. Dr. Wayne Strickland introduced himself and said he lives on Lockston Loop. He has several reasons for wanting to oppose this request. First of all, there are not very many details, so he is assuming R-17 multi-family residents throughout this would be the proposal. He is concerned that the gentleman indicated that the bottom third of that property there would not be developed contiguous to Atlas, and that reduces the effect of acreage by 2.3 acres approximately. That increases the density of the remaining pieces of property that would be constructed. Another concern was a lack of adequate notice. Many people who live on his street did not receive notices. They were across the street from me, and that's a concern for me that we need to broaden the notice and give them opportunity to be able to testify with regard to this. He is also concerned about traffic, current traffic patterns and congestion on Atlas Street. If all of the entrances are going to be on Atlas. He is concerned with damaging the character of the neighborhood. The vast majority of homes are single-family homes in this particular area, and having multi-residence structures is going to severely impact negatively the neighborhood. He is also concerned that there may be substantial increased noise. He didn't hear that addressed in the planning document that you summarized tonight. He is concerned about the impact on schools with that kind of building of structures, and is wondering if that issue has been addressed. He thinks it's not inevitable that this is going to be developed at least at this density R-17. There may be reasons to ask for it to be reduced to an R-8 or something along that line, restricting it to single-family residences. Thank you very much for your attention to my comments.

Cindy Spence introduced herself and said she lives in the Garden Grove neighborhood, right off Daylily, which would have tremendous impact should this be approved. She said we've heard from younger people in our community, but we haven't heard from the older people. Our neighborhood, Garden Grove, is comprised mostly of retired people, of older people that have worked their entire lives to buy a small property. We're not multi-million-dollar homes there. Many of us, many of our neighbors, including us, my husband is a retired Vietnam veteran. He depends, along with many, of our neighbors, on the safety of Daylily to cross the road to go to the park, or maybe to walk up and look at the horses and the mules that occupy this little piece of land, which is our haven in that neighborhood. We're surrounded by cement, and it's a haven for so many of us. For us, it's a safety issue. At any time of the day or night, you can see our residents walking with walkers, some are in wheelchairs, going over to the little grassy area, and they use Daylily, and that would make it impossible for the majority of our neighbors to safely get to where they want to go. Daylily is not a good place for 1000 cars a day to be going through. She can't even imagine it. It's absurd to think that we could safely funnel traffic through our little neighborhood to accommodate this development. She would respectfully ask you to consider that this has not been well studied, and ask that the commissioners take a closer look on how it would impact the culture of their small neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods, and to respectfully consider the older population that have fought for this country and have worked their entire lives to have a little piece of quiet.

James Lechner introduced himself and said he lives in Coeur d'Alene. He stated that he lives on the corner of Daylily and Hydrangea. His house is right up to the back of the field. He doesn't really want to have a three-story apartment complex behind his property. He doesn't live in a dream world where he has a field behind him. He did not ever hope that it would be developed anytime soon. Eight years is a little sooner than he liked, but he doesn't live in a dream world where he doesn't think that that's ever never going to get developed. His preference would be that it not be developed with three-story apartment buildings. He prefers single-family homes, or in the worst-case duplexes. Lower houses would be preferred if it ever happened. That's what he would like. Most of his neighbors probably would like neither of those. That part of Daylily right there that comes in that would be absorbing this traffic. It's a very

narrow road. He recalled when they moved in or we were looking at the property that they were originally told that the city wasn't even going to accept those roads, and that plowing was going to be in the neighborhood, not on the city. They do plow our streets, but that road right there, Daylily, is very narrow. If there's one car parked on the side of the road beside his house, you can't get two cars through there. Once you've done that, you can't get a plow through there. They have issues as is right now with some of renters that fill their garages with all their belongings, so their road cars are always on the road. Winter time it becomes a real hazard trying to get the roads plowed. But if you put one car through there, you can't get two cars through there at the same time, and you can't widen that because it's only the swale and then his house. Daylily, the road that everybody keeps talking about would be their exit, but the road going in and out of our neighborhood is Celebration, and that's the one that's going to catch the backup of traffic of people trying to go left on to Prairie if they need to, it's going to impact that street also. We do have a road that goes in the back of our development and exits out, but also that exits out into Sunshine Meadows, which they would absorb that too. Because the shallowness of our backyards and our lots are not that big. If you put a three-story apartment on there, they're going to be looking into house and see what he eats for dinner. His preference is that this gets zoned for single-family, not for apartment-type complexes. Thank you.

Joyce Zurn introduced herself and said she lives on Hydrangea, in the Garden Grove district. She stated she is not behind the farm. She pays HOA dues in the complex as well as the rest of the homeowners, and knows that if they put in a big R-17 complex that they're going down Daylily. First, it's dangerous because it is so narrow, and the kids go back and forth right there. We have a park right there. You can't tell me that those people are not going to use our park that we pay part of the HOA dues for so, which means it will deteriorate faster, which means that she has to pay more HOA dues, to repair it. She knows that the school is down both ways on that street there, and she is just afraid that they're going to have a lot more accidents with the kids with Atlas Elementary and Nexa. Thank you.

Josie Krahn introduced herself and said she lives in Coeur d'Alene. She stated that her mother's house backs up on Hydrangea, and she was the realtor that did this neighborhood that was very well thought out and planned out. It's 20 acres with 95 homes, and they have five parks, and it's just a pretty neighborhood. And yes, the residents pay for the private park there. What she is not seeing in this new neighborhood is really all the pictures that were presented tonight were all the other beautiful neighborhoods around. There's not anything that that they're offering in this neighborhood and that's a concern to her. And the closeness. Tonight, when Ms. Barker was talking, she pointed out other examples of R-17. This is Carrington Place in the Landings, and that is on 8-acres, and it is surrounded by streets all the way around it. And then across the street is another 8-acre park. There's plenty of buffer for that kind of density. Then on the other side here, this is Prairie Point. That's on 15 acres, and that is they have four openings to get out. Carrington has three openings to get out. Get people moving. This neighborhood that they're proposing – it's just too high density. That corner is so busy, and they need to provide two openings on Atlas. In my opinion, if they don't get another one on Prairie Avenue, because it just doesn't work. There's no way they're going to be able to funnel traffic. They'll be backed up all the way through that neighborhood. Speaking of which, it took her about 45 minutes to get from there after she went up and looked at it tonight to get downtown to Coeur d'Alene. She also want to talk about the schools. We have Atlas, which is at capacity. We have Skyview in Coeur d'Alene Place, which is beyond capacity. We have Ramsey, which is also beyond capacity. Where are these kids going to go to school? The Landings, half of that school goes to Post Falls School District. She thinks compatibility with the other neighborhoods just needs to be single family.

Public testimony closed

Applicant rebuttal:

Mr. Dobler said he wanted to clarify and provide information about the Hayden Lake Irrigation District and the four-inch water line. They're on record saying that it will be abandoned. It won't be dug up, and the easement will be vacated. The sewer main extension along Atlas Road is not going on private property. There's about a six-eight-foot gravel shoulder off the edge of the pavement, and it'll go there. The sewer

is only six feet deep, so it's not a huge trench, and it will fit within there. It must stay in the right-of-way of Atlas. It's not going on private property. We have no right to go on anybody's property. The R-34 that someone referenced would have to be approved with a special use permit. That would have to be approved by Planning Commission. It's not a foregone conclusion. Regarding the path on Atlas, the city is asking for an additional 20 feet of right of way on the piece that we're annexing. The path would be developed in the 20 feet of right of way and the road would be widened to 40 feet; it's about 36 right now to the edge of the pavement. When the curb goes in, the road gets to be 40 feet, with a swale, and a 10-foot asphalt path. He understands the frustration with access to Daylily, but when that subdivision was crafted, Daylily was stubbed to this property. So clearly, the master plan was for the road to be developed and extended. However as this develops, it's going on Daylily, and they would have known when Garden Grove was developed that Post Falls Highway District was not going to allow another access. Expectation of no traffic is, in his humble opinion, not realistic. The amount of traffic, certainly there's an impact there, and we've talked about that, and that's up to you. But certainly, it's crafted that access was always going to be from this property. One of the accesses was always going to be on Daylily. The last one is the backyard views. Those homes that abut the property have minimal backyards, so even if you had a two-story single-family, you're still going to be up against a viewshed with a 25-foot setback in an R-12 or an R-8. That problem isn't going to go away. Whether it's apartments or single-family, you would have to preclude two-story to obviate that altogether.

Commissioner Fleming asked if this was evaluated with R-12 zoning.

Mr. Dobler responded that R-12 in the City of Coeur d'Alene only allows duplexes.

Commissioner Fleming stated yes duplexes or single-family dwellings. It's less dense. Yes, the car traffic may be impactful, but she was just curious to know if the numbers had ever been studied.

Mr. Dobler stated that it was not the first choice, and for a few reasons. One of them is the traffic impact is not much less than an R-17.

Commissioner Fleming stated she recognizes that, but the density is less.

Mr. Dobler stated, it's market driven too.

Commissioner Fleming stated, correct.

Mr. Dobler commented that the market is better for duplex versus the market for condos or townhomes.

Commissioner Fleming asked if it is to purchase and home ownership foot in the door?

Mr. Dobler commented that's what cottage duplexes now are rented for rental income.

Commissioner Fleming commented we didn't really look at when in fact the pumpkin patch is extricated out of this currently or possibly in the future, it comes in. It's being annexed in the whole, but the quantification of units would go down by that 2.3 acres, correct?

Mr. Dobler stated that 161 units is for the whole property. If whatever isn't developed, it's 17 per acre. If we don't develop three acres, then you're 30 to 50 units less.

Commissioner McCracken stated but you do intend to parcel it off?

Mr. Dobler stated not exactly. They plan to do a boundary line, which is technically different than parcel it off.

Commissioner McCracken asked if the pumpkin patch would this be its own parcel.

Mr. Dobler replied yes. It would be a smaller piece of R-17, but at a later date, it could come in and have all the rights of R-17.

Commissioner Fleming stated it's a delay to this parcel. This would come in eventually and join the whole parcel.

Mr. Dobler stated absolutely, and staff can extrapolate on that. But yes, they could conceivably come in with that smaller piece, whatever it is, 2.5 acres. It would already be zoned R-17. They can come in and develop it as R-17.

Commissioner McCracken stated, right, it'll remain its own parcel with the full rights of R-17.

Mr. Dobler stated yes.

Commissioner Fleming stated if the owner currently on Atlas has a problem with us insisting on a roadway, would that be a deal stopper for this one? Is that a no go?

Mr. Dobler stated it gives us the opportunity to go back to him and negotiate. If we're successful, then we've met your conditions. If we aren't successful, we haven't. Depending on how you were to condition it's a bit of a roadblock.

Commissioner Fleming raised concerns with impacts to Daylily if it's only 25 feet wide. She is not sure if on-street parking would be possible anymore if this were to come in because of the traffic that we would force through that area.

Mr. Dobler stated that Daylily Street is standard street width. It's 32 feet and would allow parking on both sides of the street. And that happens all over the place. If you happen to have two cars parked at the same street on any street, Daylily on any standard city street, yeah, it narrows it, and we've all driven it. That's the city's standard. They've taken this into consideration. He's sure they've considered, possibility-wise, you would have two cars parked? And we've all driven it, so we all know. Yeah, I've driven streets where there's two parked cars parked. You sit and wait for the other guy to go. It's the city's standards.

Vice Chair Ingalls asked Mr. Dobler to speak to a few of the recommended conditions. One being the 25-foot setback. He thinks that one must stay. You'd indicated you're not wild about a traffic study. The actual condition says a traffic impact analysis will be required. It doesn't really define the full scope of what that is. Whether it's a limited, you know, just the certain legs and turns and whatnot. He would think that Mr. Bosley would work with you and define what an analysis means. It doesn't mean some exhaustive $50,000 traffic study deal.

Mr. Dobler responded and said it wasn't to say that they opposed it. It was more to say, they want the opportunity to clarify with staff what are we focusing on.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated it seems that that's not a big deal that you two could work that out. And you're nodding your head. He thinks there ought to be a fourth condition under engineering, something to the extent of requiring a second access from Atlas.

Commissioner McCracken stated that Ms. Patterson alluded that fire had already made that assumption. She would even step that up and say that that access should be a full city street with sidewalks. We really tout that we have connectivity to all these great trails, and Atlas is one of them. Atlas is a main trail that people can ride all the way downtown to City Beach on. She thinks you put 1000 car trips a day or however many units, all those people would not have a way to get to get to that trail system from Daylily that we the city has intentionally put along Atlas both sides most of the way to connect into the Prairie Trail, to connect to the Kroc Center, to connect downtown. She struggles with it being not just a full standard access with trail connecting into what we already have as conditions to require the 10-foot. There's a reason why the city is requiring the 10-foot trail on both Prairie and Atlas, because we want that

connectivity, and then to make an entrance that doesn't have that. She feels it would be a conflict, especially with the density, because a lot of the people in those units will want to recreate and use the trail system. If it was the condition that she was adding, it would be a full street with trails connecting into the 10-foot trail on Atlas Road.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated when you have a full street that brings in a whole maintenance agreement and deeding of property to the city. What we're all describing here, recognizing we don't have subdivision kind of data up here, this is a plot of ground. If we're going to move forward with some kind of condition, he thinks it could be the intent of connecting something that has some connectivity for people, cars and bikes, and gets people in and out of Atlas.

Mr. Dobler stated that he didn't disagree. From staff's standpoint, the staff may not want a city street that they have to maintain. But it doesn't mean we couldn't give the commission that opportunity. As Vice Chair Ingalls stated you could ask for connectivity to the paths to extend into the development, and that they connect and provide connectivity, pedestrian and trail connectivity in the development to Atlas and Prairie. That accomplishes your desire to make sure that the people in this development can get to the trails. Then we kind of avoid that staff hasn't had an opportunity to weigh in on this as a city street. But if you were going to do a city street, he would say it probably wants to go through the whole subdivision. Well, now you're really opening up more of a can of worms that gets more difficult to solve and really does not or what you want can be accomplished without a dedicated street. It can provide public access. The access can provide vehicle and pedestrian access to Atlas and pedestrian access to Prairie. Hopefully, that makes some sense to you.

Commissioner McCracken commented that in general she is struggling with answering the neighborhood impact without knowing those things. She knows that's the order of events that we're in right now, and to do the zoning. It feels like there's a lot of moving parts and a lot of neighbors that want to know what's happening. It's a little hard to leave a bunch of loose conditions out there.

Mr. Dobler suggested making it a condition, so there's no mystery about it and the project moves forward with the condition.

Vice Chair Ingalls asked if we recommend R-17 zoning to Council, what if we had a fourth condition regarding this Atlas that said the annexation agreement will require connectivity to be provided for access to and from Atlas for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles.

Mr. Dobler responded he thinks that's a better solution than just denying an R-17 altogether, at least without giving us an opportunity as we move forward to address these concerns.

Vice Chair Ingalls commented that he thinks that captures the essence of what we're talking about here. It allows future study to roll in about the time the annexation agreement and everything else is going forward, and before you start coming in with detailed development plans.

Mr. Dobler stated fair enough.

Commissioner Fleming stated, this is an annexation. You're going for R-17, which is the top of the heap. It could be less, and we know that. We don't know who's going to develop this. We don't know how their vision is forming. All we can do is try to prevent what we believe to be the most challenging aspect, which is that secondary egress. I think that that would be safe to add that fourth point, if you don't mind.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated we are providing a recommendation. This is not an action that we have final say on. What we decide here goes to the City Council. They will make the final decision, and that's not the end of the story. There are more pieces to follow. Perhaps a subdivision, perhaps a PUD, you know, other pieces, building permits.

Commission discussion:

Commissioner Jamtaas commented that he thanks the youth of Coeur d'Alene for coming and appropriately saying that we need badly R-17 zoning in our city for a number of reasons. He's not convinced this is the right property to have R-17 zoning, particularly with the lack of information about road access and all of the other complications that have come up. Also he wants to remind ourselves that it wasn't 15, 20, 25 years ago when none of these communities out here that we live in were here. That was all farmland. All the trees had birds in them. All of them had deer. All of the comments from people that were here before us had probably the same conversations that we had today. This property is going to change. It's not going to stay agriculture land. He think that at this point in time, with as much thought has been put into it, it doesn't fit in his mind as R-17 zoning and he would not be in support of voting for it.

Commissioner McCracken stated she is probably in agreement. She doesn't feel it's appropriate to zone at such a high residential density without having those things figured out. She would support a deny without prejudice. You can come back in a month, come back and have some things sorted out, especially with the neighboring properties. Considering if we do want access that the auto mechanic to the south, and not knowing from the owner they keep saying they want a minimal access, but we don't really know what that means. She thinks it could come back, and we can chat about it some more. She would feel more supportive if it was annexed at a lower zone, but annexing at a higher density without kind of figuring those pieces out feels like we're not being very responsible in in our findings, because she doesn't feel like we could fully address neighborhood compatibility without knowing what is going in there when the zone next to it is two zones down on density. If it was the same density as the neighbor, you're like, sure, more of the same. But two zones up, we want to see the buffer. We want to see kind of what that might look like, because it's hard to say that the neighborhood wouldn't be adversely affected, and at least if we could address the majority of concerns, which she feels are still kind of loose. She would consider deny without prejudice

Ms. Patterson commented, "Mr. Chairman if I may clarify for the commission this evening, you don't approve or deny. You're recommending that city council either adopt the zoning or you recommend that they reject the zoning, and you could provide conditions, or you could say a different zoning is appropriate If you need it to come back, you need to table it and be specific about what other information is needed. Otherwise, your recommendation goes on to City Council."

Commissioner McCracken stated my recommendation would be to reject the zoning due to what's been presented this evening.

Commissioner Fleming stated she is looking back at our conclusions of law. We followed the guidance of our Future Land Use Map. This is an Urban Neighborhood designation, and so that is part of the R-17. We can serve it. We also have a flat site. It's very buildable, very desirable building. It is a donut in our current land use in our city. It's coming into our city. It'll benefit by coming into our city. My hitch is the B4 point that the proposal would or would not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood with regard to traffic, neighborhood character, or existing land uses. There will not be more horses and cattle and llamas or whatever on this piece of land. It is destined to become something, but right now today she is having a hard time not feeling comfortable with just hitting so hard an adjacent neighborhood, and yes, it's a PUD, and yes, they have tiny backyards that sit off their fence by maybe 10 feet off the building side of the building, and that's an impact. She thinks the city's gone out of its way to make sure that 25 feet from that fence line is the beginning, but it also could be the beginning of a 45-foot tall roof line, and that is a sun blocker. She guesses you won't see the red sun from the smoke. But that could be a good thing in Smogust. She does have an issue with not seeing enough. We do not see a development in front of our eyes. We see an annexation. She wishes we had a little more flesh on the bones. She just thinks it's too wide open right now, and she doesn't feel comfortable that we don't have good exiting. We don't have a good address to the congestion into that neighborhood, and it would be great if the guy up north would say, "Yeah, you can come through and bring, Daylily through to Atlas and give us a good exit". But right now, she's not comfortable.

Vice Chair Ingalls responded and said we eventually need to get to a motion and close this up. But to the

applicant's credit, right out of our Comp Plan, defines the Urban Neighborhood Place Type, and it specifically says R-17 is appropriate for that very spot. How can we argue with our own Comp Plan? We sat in this very room right here, with big maps. We had tables, all kinds of community people in here, and we put little monopoly-like boxes on the map, saying where the high density should go. Some of it went on 15th at a different project of yours, on a street that's worse than Atlas, and it seems to be functioning. And the same Comp Plan said that's a good spot for R-17. That's good. We've crossed this bridge. He shares the dilemma that we face at times. This is an annexation decision and we really don't normally have them come in with all the details. Here's where all the buildings go. Here's what they look like. Here's how wide the little drive aisle looks like, and all of this to give us that warm and fuzzy. What I'm hearing here is, you'd be okay maybe with a recommendation if it were too cancel at R-8 or something because it'd be less density because I don't have those details of where things go and what the aisles and the and the traffic exactly looks like. He’s concerned too, and that's why he would advocate it as a minimum, that fourth condition if it were to go forward at R-17.

DRAFT

Motion by Commissioner Fleming, seconded by Commissioner Jamtaas, to adopt the foregoing Findings and Order and recommend adoption of the R-17 zoning in conjunction for item A-2-26 with 18 conditions, including a fourth condition under Engineering to Include a southerly road dedicated to the city with full access to Atlas Road for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Jamtaas	Voted	Nay
Vice Chair Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Nay

Motion failed by a 2 to 2 vote.

Chairman Messina, Commissioners Coppes and Ward were absent.

The motion tied and therefore failed. The Commission did not come up with an alternate motion. The annexation request will move forward to the City Council without a recommendation on zoning.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated it's in the Comp Plan and there's other things that Ms. Barker pointed out. There are other examples in the vicinity and other places around town, again out in the room, we played the game and we indicated where in the town the higher density should be.

Commissioner Jamtaas stated it doesn't mitigate. There is no access to the north, and forcing people through the neighborhood.

Commissioner McCracken stated people would also use the neighborhood amenities.

Vice Chairman Ingalls asked what happens if we are at an impasse?

City Attorney Adams states the statute says that the that the Planning Commission may make a recommendation. At this point, it goes to City Council without a recommendation.

Vice Chair Ingalls stated so be it. He thinks that's a good idea. One way or the other, for everyone in this room, this is going to get the benefit of a second hearing, no matter what, and that gives you know the applicant time to maybe shore up a few things that we know were a little bit fuzzy or needing maybe a little tune-up. With that, maybe that's not a bad result. Is just it going forward, correct?

Mr. Adams stated correct.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Prepared by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant

DRAFT