

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
FOR THE CITY OF HAYDEN, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO**

**January 4, 2021**

**Regular Meeting: 5:00 PM  
Council Chambers**

**Hayden City Hall, 8930 N. Government Way, Hayden, ID 83835**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Brian Petersen called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

**ROLL CALL OF COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Chair Brian Petersen	Present
Vice-Chair Alan Davis	Present
Commissioner Benjamin Prickett	Absent
Commissioner Shawn Taylor	Present
Commissioner Mary Howard	Present
Commissioner Brandon Bemis	Present
Commissioner Corey Anderson	Present

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

Melissa Cleveland, Community Development Director  
Caitlin Kling, City Attorney  
Donna Phillips, Senior Planner  
Shannon Drappo, Commission Clerk

**FLAG SALUTE**

The flag salute was led by Clerk Shannon Drappo.

**CALL FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Chair Petersen asked the Commission if there were any conflicts of interest with any of the items on the agenda. None were stated by any of the Commissioners.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

The item on the Consent Calendar was the approval of meeting minutes for December 14, 2020.

Vice-Chair Alan Davis made a motion to approve all items on the Consent Calendar as presented. Commissioner Mary Howard seconded the motion.

All were in favor, none were opposed. The motion carried.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### **Rainey Zone Map Amendment, PZE-20-0223**

Chair Petersen called the Public Hearing to order at 5:03pm.

**Introduction:** Donna Phillips, Sr. Planner explained the Zone Map Amendment details. On November 6, 2020 an application was received from Brody Cone, Tate Engineering, on behalf of the owner, Rainey Design Group, requesting approval of a zone map amendment from Agricultural (A) to Residential (R-1) of the northern portion of one lot that is approximately 4.99 acres in size. The property is split zoned with the northern 2.62 acres of the property zoned Agricultural and the remainder of the site is zoned Residential. There are no structures on the property. The property is located south of West Orchard Avenue and approximately 230 feet west of North Ramsey Road.

Chair Petersen asked if there was any ex-parte communication. All Commissioners answered they did not.

**Applicant Presentation:** Dale Rainey, Owner, presented via GoToMeeting to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The property recently had a Boundary Line Adjustment which caused the parcel to be split by two different zones, Residential and Agricultural. This was formerly the site of Young's Nursery, which is now closed. The property has been intended for future residential use based on the prior and current Comprehensive Plans. Also, Ridgemont Street is stubbed, indicating it was meant to carry through. He mentioned comments had been made from neighbors to the west of the property regarding the mature trees on the land. The developer feels this is one of the best attributes to the land and they plan to retain as many trees as possible on the east and west sides of the property and will also try to relocate any trees that do need to be removed along the street and in yards of houses. It was also stated there is no intention of creating multi-family housing in that area.

Vice-Chair Davis asked if the applicant is aware of the standards of approval the Commission uses to recommend or deny applications. Mr. Rainey stated he did. Vice-Chair Davis went on to say it is helpful to hear the proposal from that perspective. Mr. Rainey commented that he did make observations based on the Comprehensive Plan and touched on other points.

**Staff Presentation:** Ms. Phillips started the presentation with a visual of the grounds looking south from Orchard Ave., and looking east from Ridgemont Ave. The Current Zoning Map showed Residential-Suburban, Agricultural & Residential surrounding the property. Most of the area developed around the property has been converted to R-1.

Chair Petersen asked for clarification of the colors on the map, and then reiterated the property is surrounded mostly by R-1.

Ms. Phillips continued with the Standards of Approval for the subdivision, and noted the review was based on the 2008 Comprehensive Plan since it was in place at the submittal of the application.

Standard 1) Staff did not find that any additional studies or plans were required.

Standard 2) Per the applicant's narrative, if the rezone is approved as proposed the applicant believes that the use would not have a negative impact on public health, safety, and general welfare. With respect to the surrounding properties and their uses, all properties surrounding this property are single family residential with the usual accessory structures; except the lot to the northwest of the property which is City owned and operated as a sewer lift station.

Standard 3) The site was once the home of Young's Nursery and as such has a large variety of existing trees. Preservation of the existing trees at the time of development, can meet development requirements as identified in the landscaping code for street tree buffers and onsite lot development per Hayden City Code 11-11-11(G)(2). Landscaping requirements are met with the existing trees on the property. Current Future

Land Use Map shows that are R-1 as well as the newly adopted Future Land Use Map. The current Zone of Agriculture would be applicable if the nursery was still in existence.

Standard 4) The Residential (R-1) Zone is established to protect stable neighborhoods of single-family dwellings on smaller lots. Ms. Phillips also stated that Hayden City Code §11-4 states, “*The purpose of the Agricultural Zone is to implement the Comprehensive Plan by protecting large, undeveloped lots or parcels of land primarily used for farming and agricultural pursuits, tree farms and all uses that come under the title of forestry uses. (Minimum Lot size of 5 acres),*” and §11-6 states, “*The Residential (R-1) Zone is established to protect stable neighborhoods of single-family dwellings on smaller lots. (Minimum lot size of 8,250 square feet).*” She added the existing portion of the lot zoned Agricultural is only 2.62 acres.

16 Agency Notices were sent and the following responses were received:

Coeur d’Alene Airport – No comment and requested an avigation easement

Hayden Lake Irrigation District – No Comments

Northern Lakes Fire Protection District – Comments made at time of construction

CDA School District #271 – Neutral with comments related to new students generated from this type of zone.

Two Public Comments were received, both in opposition. Ms. Phillips stated an overview of the Hayden City Codes and Idaho State Codes that fall under a Zone Map Amendment and also showed the Standards of Approval for adopting the ordinance amendment.

Commissioner Brandon Bemis asked if a rough estimate of homes that would be added to the subdivision had been brought forward. Melissa Cleveland, Community Development Director replied that generally there would be 2-4 homes per acre, but it would depend on the size of the lots proposed at the time of development.

There were no other questions from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**Public Comment:** There were no citizens in attendance (in person or via phone) who wished to give public comment.

**Rebuttal:** Mr. Rainey spoke in regards to density. A preliminary layout they have drawn up indicates a maximum of 17 residences. Commissioner Howard asked about traffic studies conducted for this project. Ms. Cleveland stated they did not meet the requirement for any additional studies.

Chair Peterson called the Public Hearing to close at 5:25pm.

**Commission Deliberations:** Commissioner Howard stated there is no red-flag about the request brought forward, however she wanted to add that the Commission should be cognizant of how quickly zone changes are approved in regards to the school district and putting added pressure on the pace they are prepared to build schools.

Vice-Chair Davis stated this is Public Hearing for a zone change and not a development. Being that the lot is not a landmark in Hayden and the standards of approval have been met, he did not see an issue with recommending this zone change for approval.

Commissioner Corey Anderson stated he would like to recommend approving the zone change due to the fact everything surrounding the property is already R-1.

Commissioner Brandon Bemis stated due to the satisfaction of the standards of approval, the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding property being R-1, he would like to recommend approval of the request.

Chair Petersen would like to see this request recommended for approval based on the meeting the four standards of approval. He also reiterated the fact that the northern half of the lot is currently zoned Agricultural, and with it being under the 5 acre requirement for development in that zone, it would not meet the intentions of that zone.

Commissioner Taylor stated this property is a hole the City would like to clean up, and the application meets the standards. He would like to see it recommended for approval.

**Motion:**

Commissioner Howard moved to recommend the Zone Map Amendment for approval with the Staff Recommendations as presented to City Council. Commissioner Bemis seconded the motion.

**Roll Call:**

Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Vice-Chair Davis:	Yes
Commissioner Prickett:	Yes
Commissioner Taylor:	Yes
Commissioner Howard:	Yes
Chair Petersen:	Yes

All were in favor and none were opposed, the motion passes.

**DIRECTOR'S REVIEW**

Ms. Cleveland stated the following PZC meeting details: January 25, 2021 the Commission will Workshop Title 11. February 1, 2021 will bring two Public Hearings – PZE-20-0226, Atlas Park Subdivision and PZE-20-0246, Bradley Moss Special Use Permit. City Council Actions on December 29, 2020 brought the Written Decision of the denial for PZE-20-0021, Jackie's Family Trust Annexation, and the approval of the Annexation Ordinance for PZE-19-0311, Mark's Annexation. On January 26, 2021 PZC will have a Joint Workshop with CC and Jerry Mason at 3pm. She noted there is a lot to cover in the workshops, but because we have back-to-back meetings, she would like to ask the commission if they would like to cancel the meeting on January 25, 2021.

Chair Petersen asked about the workshop on 1/26/2021 and what it will entail. Ms. Cleveland replied that it is a Land Use Training put on by Jerry Mason. Rather than trying to work through the uncertainty of zoning between City Council and PZC, it is best to get it cleared up as soon as possible. He then asked the Commission what their thoughts are on having the meetings as set. Chair Petersen, Vice-Chair Davis and Commissioners Howard, Taylor and Anderson were okay with both meetings. Commissioner Bemis stated he was not able to commit to both, but will do his best.

**WORKSHOP**

Ms. Phillips made comments on Title 11. The Sign Code was the first topic, and covering a prior question regarding the definition of Civic Use. The code and final definition will be ready by the meeting on January 25, 2021. She mentioned a PDF was sent showing the chart of signs and examples of what each would entail. Chair Petersen asked about the freestanding signs and rows three and four showing exceptions. Ms. Phillips indicated anything not attached to a building is considered a freestanding sign. Ms. Phillips stated the differences between a monument and pole/pylon sign. Chair Petersen mentioned it would be beneficial to be specific in Code in regards to these definitions, and Ms. Phillips stated the Code is more precise. She then showed the Sign Code and how it is laid out. Ms. Phillips asked the Commission which signs should be allowed in the Mixed Use and Mixed Residential zones. Commissioner Howard asked if there are restrictions in regards to size and lighting for each of the signs, and Ms. Phillips indicated there are. Vice-Chair Davis would like to see the boxes filled in, rather than having blank spaces. There were no other comments from the Commission.

Density Bonuses and brainstorming ideas from the Commission was next for discussion. Staff would like to allow for bonuses not just for PUD projects, but also for subdivisions when they come in with the community need such as Community Buildings, educational buildings, etc. The City would apply a Density Bonus of a certain percent for all developments, and remove the PUD verbiage that no longer makes sense, reducing the bonuses from five to three. A PUD could still get a bonus based on the standards. She then went into the examples of what Boise, Coeur d'Alene, Post Falls and Meridian offer for density bonuses and/or incentives. Boise provides a 10-20%; (Density Flexibility, Additional Building Height, Parking Reductions, and Streamlined Process). Coeur d'Alene provides additional square footage added in the Downtown Core in three overlay districts, only. Post Falls provides a 10% per bonus with a maximum of three bonuses. They have a list of allowable bonuses.

Meridian provides Density Bonuses for public use buildings only, such as **school, park, fire station, or recreational facility. The bonus shall be proportional to the amount of land being dedicated. For example: if 10% of the gross area is to be dedicated, then the bonus is 10%, but in no case may it be more than 25%.**

Hayden's current PUD requirements provide a 5% -20% Density Bonus. These can be combined with a maximum of 20%. City Staff asked if this is something the Commission would like staff to research and put verbiage to. Ms. Phillips stated she would like direction and thoughts. Chair Petersen stated he believes incentivizing is a good idea. Vice-Chair Davis stated he would rather not see incentivizing due to the largest complaint from the Citizens always being density driven. The developers do a great job making open spaces like community parks when they are forced to. Chair Petersen asked if the Commission could make a recommendation to Council to incentivize certain things. For example; that a developer would dedicate or donate land to a school district, lift station, parks, etc. He would like to know if the Commission even wants to incentivize developers to do that sort of work. Commissioner Taylor stated he believes incentivizing is the only way to get things done. Commissioner Bemis stated he likes the idea of incentivizing, however he believes developers will not dedicate or donate land unless it is forced. He agrees with Vice-Chair Davis' thoughts, and asked to hear more from him and his argument against incentives. Vice-Chair Davis went on to say that developers will come in with projects, and the complaints from the public are generally regarding the density. The developers are also not generally eager to give up buildable land. He believes the vision of the City and Commission will be morphed into something else. Developers will take advantage of the situation. Commissioner Bemis then stated he is concerned about being yes-driven as a Commission. The goal should be making sure the developers are taking the initiative for the betterment of the community. He does not understand the incentives and bonuses.

Caitlin Kling, City Attorney stated that because the City has done away with Code requiring land to be dedicated and maintained by a private HOA, and with the issues of the collection of impact fees. The thoughts are to 1) raise impact fees, and 2) is create zoning and land use codes which have requirements that help the dedication of these spaces that we are not able to require. We are limited on what we can require the developers to pay for or set aside. This is not an open book on what we can ask them to do. They do have to pay their only proportionate share, so this is an idea of a way to get more park land, etc. A school district impact fee would be helpful, but we are not able to do that because of State Code. Sewer lift stations and transportation corridors are large infrastructures for the City so these incentives would help facilitate the issue. We cannot require, but we can incentivize. Vice-Chair Davis asked how if an Ordinance could be written so it is not taken advantage of, but also not so specific to tie the City's hands. Ms. Kling answered that it could definitely be set up like the city of Meridian has written, specific to public facilities. Or is another option giving building flexibility – if you provide 'y', then you get 'x'. She believes it should be more specific for staff purposes as it would be easier to calculate. Commissioner Howard asked how a developer could dedicate land for a fire station if a fire station is not needed at that time. Ms. Cleveland stated they would not be giving the land to the City, but dedicating it to the County or School district (whichever entity is in need at that time), and the bonus is given by the City. Commissioner Howard then asked how five acres could have an incentive when it is not large enough to dedicate enough land for schools or fire departments. Can there be a rule that a parcel size is required? These facilities are important and we need them, but we do not want to see 5,000 square foot lots all around the City. Ms. Cleveland clarified that

by transportation corridors, those include the Ramsey Road Bypass and the Huetter Freeway, which goes through properties in our ACI. For developers to set that amount of land aside for those projects, incentivizing them is a good idea.

Chair Petersen then asked for a consensus of Commission. He asked each Commissioner to answer the following questions: 1) are incentives worthwhile, 2) what should the incentive be, and 3) how do we incentivize?

Commissioner Howard stated she believes incentives are necessary but should be very specific and calculated. A simple way to figure out what the City is asking for and what the developers are getting in return. Ms. Kling interjected that five acre projects are hard to envision for incentives, but the City has projects upwards of 300 acres wanting to come into the city. It is thinking about those developments on the larger scale. Ms. Phillips added that Annexations of larger sizes are common and far easier to account for the long term plans of the City. Commissioner Howard mentioned her concern is the City allows building but does not leave enough space for future schools to be built. She believes people who move up here want open space and we need to put things in that allow us to have the community people want to live in. She feels that at some point, there will no longer be enough room for more people, but it still needs to remain a desirable community. The incentives list should be basic in order to be specific as to what we are requiring. Community Centers vs. Community Services so it opens up what would be an allowable use for the community.

Commissioner Anderson stated developers have options to recreate their plan. People want space and to start cutting that down, may not be a good idea. They want small community. Ms. Kling mentioned one item Staff would like to address is that the community has spoken as to what is needed through the Imagine Hayden process. People want different styles of housing, trails, community centers, etc., and the City is trying to find ways to get those for the community. Commissioner Anderson stated that instead of bonuses for homes, maybe we give space for trails.

Commissioner Taylor stated the bonuses do not mean more houses, it means getting the same amount of homes in the remaining land. If this is done correctly, the Density Bonuses are good. The words maybe scare people, but when done right there is a benefit to the community.

Chair Petersen stated he definitely thinks Density Bonuses are a good idea. Parcel size is something to look at restricting. The City cannot require land to be dedicated, but we can incentivize other things. These bonuses give the developer an option to do this. The market will determine what the lot sizes should be. A developer will not build something he won't be able to sell. There isn't a real good consensus to go off of, but if particulars are worked out and brought up again once that is done, it may be easier to agree or disagree.

Conversation then took place regarding the specifics of what could be incentivized. Public Safety Offices, affordable housing and fire stations were mentioned. Affordable housing brought up more discussion and what the definition of Affordable Housing is. Ms. Phillips mentioned Affordable Housing is a State Definition through HUD. Chair Petersen asked if we have to use that definition, or are we able to come up with our own definition. Ms. Phillips stated the city of Coeur d'Alene has a similar definition of a certain percent below the median housing price. Because that changes so quickly, it is hard to keep track of that. Chair Petersen then asked that if the City does incentivize Affordable Housing, it would allow people to live and work in Hayden. Our housing prices are high, so should we incentivize that type of housing. Ms. Cleveland added that overseeing and tracking this type of housing would be hard to track. Ms. Phillips mentioned the only time she saw the affordable housing incentive when researching other municipalities was in a PUD. Commissioner Anderson asked if anyone knew how much affordable housing is in surrounding cities. Ms. Kling noted the Riverstone area in Coeur d'Alene is the only project she can think of. This is not a common housing style because it is difficult to meet the requirements. Ms. Cleveland stated it is hard to know what the construction and building materials will cost and when you are held to those requirements it makes it difficult to know what the housing costs will be. Ms. Phillips added that 3<sup>rd</sup> party that may be around today, may not be around in a few years, so that adds to the dilemma. Commission Anderson then asked if the City can reach out and ask if that is something developers would be

interested in. Ms. Cleveland answered that she does have a developer in mind to bounce the questions off of, to see if this is even something worth incentivizing. Ms. Kling added that the City of Boise has a few developments, and they could be a good resource. Chair Petersen mentioned a good question to ask developers is what it would take from the City to allow them to build affordable homes.

Ms. Phillips asked about the maximum bonus percentage and what the Commission feels would be a good spot. Chair Petersen stated he could not answer the question, because we do not know if they would work. Ms. Phillips then stated the Hayden North development had 20% bonus on western side of the subdivision. If one would drive through to see how that looks with smaller lot sizes, it would be a good place to see how density bonuses are applied. Chair Petersen mentioned the houses would be packed tighter than we want, but we will get a benefit. If a developer really wants those benefits, it would make sense to have them. Commissioner Howard stated that if we go the way of incentives, they work, and they are used, can we cap it so we do not become a sea of houses. Chair Petersen then asked if the City can make it so the incentive is not available unless the City needs it. Ms. Kling stated what we draft is depending on what the City needs. These would be based on what the Master Plans says we need. We would also ask for documentation from the jurisdiction the dedication would be for, stating they want the land. This would be specific to our needs.

Vice-Chair Davis stated that if we are going to explore density bonuses, they should be limited to public interest like road widening, etc. Whatever is written needs to be specific so it is in the best interest of the City. He is concerned about the amount of work put into this and the overhead and management, and is not sure if the return is good. Do we have builders begging for this type of program? Ms. Cleveland answered that this has not been something we have seen because it is currently part of the PUD process, which developers avoid. We need to find a way to get what the City needs from the developers without requiring it, which the City is not allowed to do anyway. Ms. Kling added that there are big tax benefits for dedicating land to a public entity, and we want to try to encourage that. We need to sustain the land for the school district as they will need to put in more schools, so we are trying to find a way to help them out. The City is not currently meeting the needs of our constituents. There are different types of people and what they want differs from one person to the next. Chair Petersen brought up the fact that the City has already changed zoning to allow for the missing middle and asked if there another way to incentivize those developments to make the missing middle a priority?

Commissioner Bemis mentioned Hayden North and how that is a good picture of what is here now. Then went on to ask about the affordable housing in Riverstone and if it is actually a Section-8 complex or a different type? Ms. Cleveland stated she will look into that. Commissioner Bemis asked if the affordable housing can be defined as something different than Section-8, similar to what Chair Petersen mentioned prior. He also believes workforce housing is a priority in our City.

To round out the conversation on Density Bonuses, Chair Petersen noted the Commission would like to talk further about incentives, they are concerned about too much density, and we want an effective program worth the cost.

Ms. Phillips went on to discuss the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU). She has researched other municipalities and have found the following:

Boise: 700 sf; or no more than 10% of the lot whichever is smaller, and shall not have more than 2 bedrooms.

Coeur d'Alene: 800 sf (does not include unfinished basement); may not be larger than 75% of primary structure

Post Falls: 1000 sf; or no larger than 40% of the primary structure whichever is larger

Hayden: 800 sf; *proposed to be 1000 sf maximum*

She would like the Commission's opinion on maximum sizes for these types of structures.



Commissioner Bemis said he is neutral, but believes 1,000 square feet would be fine.

Vice-Chair Davis stated he would opt for 1,000 square feet allowed. He mentioned he was curious if the PZC is concerned about the percentage of lot coverage. A smaller home versus a large shop may not fit with the look of the City. Ms. Phillips replied that current code was the same for detached or attached units, they have to utilize same driveway and maintain the Single Family Residence feel within the rest of neighborhood. Also, if a shop were part of a detached garage, it would have to be on the first floor due to the height maximum of 20 feet. She proposed changing that height allowance to 35 feet for SFR for those shops added above the garage. Setbacks would be the same as an accessory shop, and lot coverage requirement would not change.

Commissioner Taylor would like to see a maximum of up to 1000 square feet, but no more than 50% of the principal structure, to keep it proportional to home. In order to calculate the square footage, it would be beneficial to use the square footage used by Assessor's office.

Commissioner Howard state she would like to see a percentage as well, however, the height maximum should be same as the height of the house. She asked Ms. Kling if setting requirements for these is even legal, to which Ms. Kling replied it is. There is no concern as to the standards. Boise, for instance, is smaller probably due to the size of the lots they have. The main concern here is the look of the shops. She is also concerned about Staff having the ability to easily calculate the square footage. Off street parking is another issue she had, and how the City would require additional parking for those ADUs. Ms. Phillips referred to a chart showing a parking requirement of one additional space is for any ADUs in Boise, CDA and Post Falls. Hayden also has this requirement, however the other three municipalities also require the owner of the home must reside at either of the two units. The discussion surrounding this type of requirement made it deemed to not be able to enforce this easily.

Chair Petersen stated he does not want two homes on one lot. 1,000 should be maximum as it is an accessory and not the primary structure. He would also like to look at applying percentages as well. Ms. Phillips stated Kootenai County has a rule that if the home is 400 square feet and they build an ADU of 800 square feet, they will flip the primary to the now-larger ADU.

Ms. Phillips went on to discuss landscaping and ground covers. Requests come in often for ground cover that is not irrigated by rock mulch, river rock, etc. She showed pictures of examples around Hayden where this type of landscape has been installed. She is requesting to remove the requirement for live ground cover and allow other types of landscaping as a standard. She also stated the City sees design builds for irrigation plans that never seem to get submitted with the Irrigation Construction Plans. It is proposed to add verbiage requiring these plans with submittals for site plan and subdivision construction at the time of landscape approval. Chair Petersen stated it does seem reasonable to ask for those plans at the time of application. These landscape standards will be moved to design drawings. Commissioner Howard asked how the examples presented were applied if these were not approved landscaping. Ms. Phillips indicated at the time of construction, live ground cover was planted, however as it died off, they replaced it with something they felt would be easier to maintain. She stated it was difficult to open a Code Enforcement case on something that looks nice. Commissioner Howard then stated she would simply like to see it stay nice and maintained without seeing a sea of rock. There no other issues voiced from the Commission.

Lighting plans was the next topic. Ms. Phillips presented slides with information showing applicability of two codes merged into one. All business, residential, and community driveways, sidewalks, and property luminaires should be installed with the idea of being a "good neighbor". Lighting provided for freeways, expressways, limited access roadways, and roads on which pedestrians, cyclists, and parked vehicles are generally present. The City is broken up into zones: highway illumination, high illumination intensity (high-traffic volume streets), moderate illumination intensity (less traffic, but collectors of the City), Central Business District, residential illumination all property not listed. Moderate and Highway illumination shall be placed at intersections and where blocks are longer than 1800' an additional light shall be placed in the middle of the block. Residential



illumination shall be placed at intersections and where no property frontage has a distance more than 300' from a light. For site specific requirements, the following would be in effect: the light source is not visible from off-site, glare and reflections are confined to the max extent feasible within boundaries of the site, each light fixture shall be directed downward and away from adjoin properties and right-of-way, and a minimum illumination of 0.2 foot-candles /sf is required, no lighting shall produce an illumination level greater than 1.0 foot candles on adjacent residential lots or parcels, no permanently installed lighting shall blink, flash or be of unusually high intensity or brightness, outdoor fixtures shall be limited to a maximum height of 15' or the height of the nearest building, whichever is less, and Photometric Plans shall be submitted which demonstrates compliance with these standards. Ms. Phillips then covered the proposed exceptions. For areas within "X" distance from the CDA Airport, approval of the proposed exception must be received from the CDA Airport, specialized signals, directions, and marker lighting associated with transportation, advertising signage or directional signage, lighting integral to equipment or instrumentation and installed by its manufacturer, theatrical purposes, including performance, stage, film production, and video production, athletic playing areas where lighting is equipped with hoods or louvers for glare control, temporary lighting, lighting for industrial production, material handling, transportation sites, and associated storage areas where lighting is equipped with hoods or louvers for glare control, theme elements in theme and amusement parks, roadway lighting required by governmental authorities, lighting used to highlight features of public monuments and registered landmark structures, and lighting of swimming pools and water features. Chair Petersen asked about the illumination zones and list of exceptions, and if these exceptions are what the City will accept. Ms. Phillips stated these will likely be a Staff Approval process, which may rise to the level mitigation with the PZC.

During the next meeting, other miscellaneous proposed changes will be brought forward, as well as follow up on workshop topics. She stated the proposed Title 11 draft should be available in early February. There have been an abundance of changes, so she asked the Commission if they would like to see those redline changes, or a clean copy. The Commission answered as follows: Chair Petersen, Vice-Chair Davis, and Commissioner Howard would like the clean copy, with Commissioner Howard adding she would like access to the redline copy to see what has changed.

Chair Petersen added that with this being the first meeting in January, we need to discuss the selection of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the 2021 year. Ms. Kling stated we can add this topic to the agenda for January 25, 2021 meeting. Both Chair Petersen and Vice-Chair Davis mentioned they are willing to continue in their current roles or step down, if another Commissioner would like to fulfill those spots.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 7:12pm.



Shannon Drappo, Commission Clerk