

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

October 05, 2020

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Brian Petersen, Chair	Present
Corey Anderson	Present
Alan Davis	Present
Benjamin Prickett	Present
Shawn Taylor	Present
Brandon Bemis	Absent

STAFF PRESENT

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

FLAG SALUTE

Chair Petersen led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CALL FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts reported.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar included the approval of the meeting minutes for August 17, 2020. The motion was made by Commissioner Shawn Taylor, and seconded by Commissioner Benjamin Prickett, to approve the consent calendar. All were in favor, none were opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING

Imagine Hayden 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update –

Chair Petersen opened the hearing at 5:08pm

City Attorney Caitlin Kling recapped the details of the meeting. This is a staff-initiated Public Hearing, and will not be a “for, neutral or opposed” hearing. The Comprehensive Plan is required by Idaho State Code 67-6508 and 67-6509. Presentation will be an overview of the plan and each of the categories required by the Code. The plan will take us to the year 2040 and covers the goals and policy updates on Land Use Designations. She clarified Chair Petersen’s question, that a Written Decision will be brought to City Council based on the Staff recommendations and will include any other recommendations made

by the Commission tonight. There will be another Public Hearing in front of City Council. It will be properly noticed. Clarification was made on rebuttal, that if questions for Melissa or Staff were raised, they can be called back up. Chair Petersen stated to those present for Public Comment, the steps to testifying before the Commission. Ms. Kling also stated we have a one week notice requirement for those wishing to submit documentation, within the window is allowed, and one Public Comment was received today that will be part of the hearing and packet going forward to City Council.

Introduction: Melissa Cleveland, Community Development Director began her presentation stating the last update to the Comprehensive Plan was in 2008 and because this is a guide for the City, an update is essential. We are looking into the future of Hayden for the next 20 years. This is not a zoning ordinance, it is supposed to be long range and is required by State Code. Many elements are required to be included. Staff, PZC and City Council will use this guide for zone changes, code text amendments, special use permits, conditional use permits and other long-term planning with Transportation, Parks or other Municipal Services.

Staff Presentation: Ms. Cleveland led the presentation. Chapter 1 is our introduction and vision of the plan. The draft is aimed more at the differences between the 2008 version and what we would like to change. We are looking for that small-town feel with open space, while managing our growth, having efficient roadway systems and providing encouragement of a small business culture. Differences between the two plans are that this update is a more condensed plan with not as much detail. We have removed the semi-rural zone as we no longer hold that character. The plan shows our desire for strong K-12 schools, and added concentrating developments at nodes and transportation corridors. Input we've taken in includes Summer 2019 orientation interviews with local leaders in economic development, emergency services, health care, airport, recreation, development, real estate, local business, senior citizens and schools. Between October and December 2019, we had a Community Festival at Atlas Elementary, which was well attended, Social Media polling questions and a Community Survey, which was quite lengthy and had a good response rate. Also, the FAQs and overview presentation was available online for comment. Chapter 2 is our policy framework. Goals are broader, policies are statements that provide guidelines, actions are initiatives, projects or programs to put the policies into motion. As goals and policies have previously been discussed in workshops, she did not go into detail on those, but explained the reason behind the matrixes used is to cross-reference the goals, policies and actions. In the 2008 plan, there were many goals under each of the elements that were very similar. Instead of breaking each of the goals up into each element, now the goals are stated, and each element it falls under is referenced in one chart, along with the applicable policy and action references. When it was first posted online, there was a mix up with policy and action references, so it was revised and re-posted. The draft in the packets are the updated version. In Chapter 3, Ms. Cleveland takes us through Demographics. Tables indicate the population is expected to grow significantly and double over the next 20 years. Population estimates are from Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO), who create population estimates for every city in Kootenai County. The City feels it is important to stay consistent with what they have estimated for Hayden. City of Hayden is very similar to Kootenai County as a whole on many aspects (race, ethnicity, education levels and employment industries), except income, as we have many older citizens with a higher income. This is important to consider as we look at how we put these policies and actions into place. Chapter 4 covers Land Use. We will see an elimination of the Multi-family land use in Commercial areas, no duplexes in the R-1 land use area, and the Multi-family zone as a whole will be phased out. Residential-Suburban is still on our map and will see less-density housing. We will implement a Mixed Residential land use which will include Single-Family Residential, and 2-3-4 Family housing. The Mixed Use land use areas will see a combination of Multi-family Residential and Commercial. Commercial, Light-Industrial, Agricultural, and Recreational land uses will also be included. Ms. Cleveland presented and discussed the new Land Use Map and what each color represents. She stated they are thinking of not allowing Multi-family land use in Commercial areas and they want to protect the Residential SFR areas by not allowing duplexes in them. The planning boundary now extends

west of Huetter Road to include the shared tier areas, which it did not include in the prior Land Use Map. Reiterated this is not a Zone Map, but a Land Use Map. Some of the thoughts are how we will implement the Land Use into our code. It doesn't automatically change the zoning, we would still need to change code of a particular area.

Ms. Cleveland then clarified comments from Chair Petersen that this Land Use Map is still the same as the prior map, being that there is wiggle room between land uses for zoning. Also, while there are no lines on this map, if you look at each land use as a line, those lines are fuzzy. Ms. Kling interjected, stating that when a split zone request comes in, we can still take those into consideration and use this Land Use Map as the guide it is intended to be, confirming a use would or would not be permitted. Ms. Cleveland then showed both Land Use Maps, 2008 versus the draft map and indicated there aren't a ton of differences between the 2 maps, but reiterated this new map helps with clarity and knowing how to implement the residential densities. Neighborhood Nodes are another aspect of this map. They aren't construed to define a neighborhood, but propose there are some street intersections that small neighborhood oriented businesses might be appropriate. We would have to write code to implement these areas, and small businesses that serve the immediate area would require a special or conditional use permit. Central Business District (CBD) is similar to 2008 plan. It is a special part of our city that is at the center of the Downtown. Airport updated their plan in 2009 and we have worked closely with them regarding land use development and the airport. Another reason why we have certain areas as commercial as opposed to Residential is so homes are not in the runway protection area. She moves on to how our city is addressing growth while maintaining neighborhood integrity and character. Transportation improvements are key as well as providing quality mixed-housing for a range of income levels, maintaining open space with access to parks, and timely development of efficient, effective and environmentally sound sewer, water and other utilities. She concluded this chapter by stating our growth should be accompanied by the development of infrastructure, public services, utilities and preservation of open space and recreational facilities within the cities means.

The presentation continued with Chapter 5 which covers housing. Between the years of 2010-2018, median house prices have increased 18% and rent has increased 25%. One-third of homeowners and nearly one-half of renters are "cost burdened" and we have just a 3% vacancy rate for rental properties. Commissioner Prickett asked how the "cost burdened" statistic was found. Ms. Cleveland responded by stating this is a metric used by HUD. Donna Phillips, Senior Planner indicated the statistics can be found on page 29 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. Those spending more than 30% of their income on housing is considered "cost burdened." Commissioner Davis asked if there are any areas of the city where housing costs aren't rising. Ms. Cleveland stated the data came from the Census Bureau in 2018 and we have definitely seen a leap since then. Other areas of Hayden may see a much higher jump in median pricing, but there is a rise overall. Commissioner Taylor indicated the housing market was at its lowest in 2011, so it may not be a direct variable. Commissioner Davis continued that he would hate to see us using a national percentage when our percentage in our area could be much higher. Ms. Cleveland agreed and stated she would look into that. She continued, noting that another issue is that 80% of houses are Single Family Residences. We are missing those homes between the apartment and single-family residence homes, so we would like to see more middle-type housing built to make Hayden affordable for everyone. Chapter 6 was briefly covered and pertains to our Living and Natural Environment. It encompasses our groundwater/Aquifer, Hayden Lake, hazardous areas (wildfire, floods, steep slopes, toxic sites) and emergency preparedness. Chapter 7 deals with Transportation. This portion is just a summary as the plan will be updated at a later time, but shortly. Once it is completed, it will be available for the public. It addresses safety, multi-modal accommodation, traffic congestion. Also addresses public transportation through City Link and other transportation services, airport and the Huetter Bypass, which was discussed in the 2008 Comprehensive Plan, but goes into more detail in the update. Chapter 8 involves our Economic Development and addresses how we live and work. We are a "bedroom" community, meaning we reside in Hayden but work elsewhere. Interesting data found from the Census Bureau shows that only

751 people live and work in Hayden. We need more opportunity for our citizens to live and work in Hayden. Would like to see more Light Industrial and Commercial development to increase jobs in our city. We would also encourage our small businesses and implement those nodes discussed earlier. Ms. Cleveland then moved on to Chapter 9, which covers Hayden's Parks and Recreation. There are more details to come and are discussed in the Imagine Hayden document. Discusses existing parks, 2 new community parks and 12 new neighborhood parks needed by 2040. A Community Center is definitely something needed in our city and we are looking to expand Croffoot Park into a "Sports Complex". Other projects would be to convert Finucane Park to a neighborhood park, and to deal with the boat launch, beach & over-capacity issues at Honeysuckle Beach. Chapter 10 discusses Local Services, which includes commissions, city services, library, schools, KCSO, 3 fire districts & utilities. Chapter 11 covers our Community Design. It includes design standards and architectural design reviews for the CBD. We want this area to have that "downtown" feel. Subdivision standards, public art with the Arts Commission and Hayden Urban Renewal Agency (HURA), Wayfinding, and Landscape design are also aspects of this chapter.

Ms. Cleveland expressed that the Appendix A should be used for the action implementation. Actions should be crossed off and updated at least annually. Things that may not be working can be scratched and a new action added. Appendix B is used for maps: Future Land Use, Central Business District, Water District Service areas, etc. Appendix C is a summary of the Public Process and Appendix D is the history.

Since the plan has been out for review, we have received comments by staff including recommendations to add "Special Areas or Sites" to table 1-1, add CDA Area Economic Development Corporation (Job Plus) to Chapter 8, on Page 59 change "dedicate" to "reserve" under subdivisions, and add a map of the Lakeland and CDA School District boundaries to Appendix B. Public comments included that we should be more active in the preservation of Hayden Lake. A thought would be to have City staff attend Hayden Lake Watershed Association meetings.

She stated the following motions would be applicable for the commission:

- Recommend approval with staff recommended conditions
- Recommend approval without conditions
- Recommend not approving

Chair Petersen asked about the Transportation & Parks and Recreation Plans, and in the event the summaries included in this Comprehensive Plan change, how do they go forward with approving it. Both Ms. Cleveland and Ms. Kling stated they do not see that things will change so drastically that it would alter this Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Kling also stated that even though those particular plans wouldn't come through the Planning and Zoning Commission, they can if there was an issue surrounding what they entail. It was also discussed that what is accepted today is what will go to City Council. The recommendations would be inserted into the draft and then presented to Council. The Comprehensive Plan is then adopted by resolution. There were no other questions from the PZC Commissioners.

Public Comment:

Art Collins, who resides at 1214 Glenmore Court, Hayden, first walked up to Chair Peterson with a packet of information. Chair Petersen asked what was included and if it was any different than what was submitted to Ms. Cleveland last week. Mr. Collins said he is not sure (let it be known that after review of the document, it was noted to contain the same pages provided to Ms. Cleveland, with the exception of the final sheet, which included his work history as a City Planner. That document was added as a handout to the meeting). Art mentioned he has a lot of past experience with Comprehensive Plans. He knows the process. He doesn't come as an "SOB," but as someone who loves the city. He has met with Ms. Cleveland and she provided him a copy of the draft Comprehensive Plan. He spent a lot of time on the

packet. A few concerns he has are that this Comprehensive Plan is not a "we" document, and the draft is not friendly to citizens. He is sharing information that may make it more helpful for the citizens of Hayden. He gave an analogy of a house. You start with a foundation and floor joists. It has to be done perfectly or the house won't work. Then, you add the details, room by room, the sewer system and all the details that fit on the foundation. If the foundation is screwed up, the house won't work. The Comprehensive Plan is the foundation. Six people in attendance to tonight's meeting is ridiculous. Maybe the people don't care. He does want to applaud that a lot of citizen input was given over the summer. He recommends we do something similar with what was done during the Summer to Winter months in 2019 again, before this packet is sent to City Council, and with one that is friendlier. He is trying to do this the kind way. He loves this city. He comes to be helpful. He'll volunteer to write the Comprehensive Plan for nothing so the plan is in a better shape for the city. At this time, his 5 minutes of time was up and Chair Petersen asked Mr. Collins how much longer he has before wrapping up his comments. He said he could get it finished in 3 minutes. Chair Petersen allowed him the extra time. Mr. Collins continued by saying that we need to scrap the idea that we are small town. 36,000 is too conservative. We will be a major urban area. We need to wake up to that fact. Traffic congestion is horrible. I-90 is a parking lot. Hwy. 95 is a parking lot. We aren't only going to double the population if we build out where all of the Land Use is. We will be a major city. It is all over with. Goal is idyllic? He disagrees. The state law says if goals are idyllic, they can be achieved. We say goals are not quantifiable. He disagrees. It's state law. He knows the state law. The future Land Use Map is a Zoning Map. He knows Ms. Cleveland says otherwise, but when you have lines on it, it's a zoning map. We need a visually general plan without fuzzy lines. A Comprehensive Plan should have a distance between goals and policies and this doesn't have it. This is a problem and we are communicating the wrong thing to the citizens. All of this information is in the packet he provided and he would like his packet submitted with the Staff Recommendations. When he met with Ms. Cleveland, they disagreed on some parts and that's okay. He would like the same opportunity to meet with PZC to go over the line items 1 by 1. Traffic congestion is awful now and it's only going to get worse.

Jeramie Terzulli who resides at 17235 W. Kathleen, Hauser has lived in Hayden for 15 years. The only reason he left was due to an opportunity for acreage for hobby farming. He still works in Hayden. He agrees with Mr. Collins that traffic will be a huge issue. He understands we have ITD to work with as well and we don't have full control here. Mr. Terzulli believes the City needs to aggressively pursue the land acquisition for Huetter Bypass for the Ramsey Bypass. The vague and ambiguous terms can be whittled down so the town isn't burdened by the traffic. He goes on to say that the Comprehensive Plan is not the most important document. The Code is most important document we have. The Comprehensive Plan is a guide. Mr. Terzulli disagrees with Mr. Collins regarding the image of the Comprehensive Plan as a foundation and that it can't be fixed once it is poured. Foundations can be fixed. We can get there with the Comprehensive Plan. He is a developer and Real Estate Agent, and wants to speak more on the Land Use. Full disclosure. He has a few teenage kids and if his kids decide to come back home after college, they won't be able to afford a home here in Hayden with the way things are now. The action items are good, although again, vague and ambiguous, but who will implement them? Our City Staff is capable. They are intelligent. But they are over-worked, under-manned and underpaid. He knows Donna Phillips has had a revolving door in her department. How can these be implemented under those circumstances? He's worked with City of Hayden on numerous occasions and suggests we out-source some of the plan review, hire additional employees and pay them what they're worth. He goes on to say that Rob Wight does the best he can, but he's one guy. It's a great plan and idea but if we don't have the people to implement it, if we can't re-work the code, we can't solve the housing crisis. If out-of-state newcomers can afford to move in with inflated prices and we have limited inventory, there's a problem. If through code we can incentivize the cottage-style homes, townhomes, etc. for his kids and those in that category, we need to do that. We also have to amend codes with connectivity. Park dedications aren't what we need, just because it's in code. Can we make the developer pay a fee in order to use the pocket park land for additional lots to build on and use that fee for other capital projects? Perhaps we take a

subdivision and instead of frontage improvements, widen the road when there's farm land on both sides. Why can't we do a dulled-down version of that, take some money from him and use that on projects? There is a lot we can do. Our staff is ready to do it but needs help. He likes the idea of the neighborhood nodes. He's having a meeting with a developer tomorrow that wants to intensify the density of an area. You don't need him in here again for another zone map amendment, talking about what we can and can't do. If we can loosen restrictions up-front, we can move forward with the "cottage-style" housing. He suggests cleaning up the vagueness and moving action items to "aggressive" rather than "mid-term" or "short-term," as this is an immediate need. Mr. Terzulli appreciates the opportunity to present his comments. He agrees with Mr. Collins that everyone wants to complain but nobody is here for the meeting. He's always willing to meet anytime to discuss or have more workshops.

Connie Kreuger spoke on the phone, representing Brenny Ross. He submitted a letter requesting a revision of the land use map designation for a parcel he currently owns at 2040 W Hayden Avenue, AIN # 110833. He is looking for a possible recommendation from PZC to change this parcel to a Land Use of Mixed Use. Mr. Ross has done his due diligence and has had a pre-development meeting with the City of Hayden on September 16, 2020 for a multi-family development. With the new Land Use Map, the property would be changed to Commercial land use, but he feels it would be appropriate to designate this property as Mixed Use from the start. On the map included on the letter provided by Ms. Kreuger on the day of the meeting (and entered as an additional handout prior to the meeting), the property has black star, showing it would border a Mixed Use land use. Having this designation will provide the benefit of having Commercial development as part of the Multi-Family development.

Chair Petersen asked if anyone else on the phone would like to make a comment and no answer was given.

There were no questions from PZC for any of the commenters.

Chair Petersen called the Public Hearing to close at 6:13 pm.

Commission Discussion:

Chair Petersen was offered clarification from Ms. Cleveland regarding the process of moving the Land Use designation from Commercial to Mixed Use. Ms. Cleveland stated that this is currently under the zone of Multi-Family Residential. It will be a process to get the Code and Comprehensive Plan approved to get these lots from Multi-Family to Commercial. If they were to come in today, we wouldn't have an issue. She reiterated that these Land Uses are "fuzzy" and that if staff felt it was precluding them to run with the project, we could do Comprehensive Plan or Zone Map Amendment. It would be an additional expense. Ms. Cleveland said it wouldn't take much time at all to change that parcel to Mixed Use on the future Land Use Map.

Deliberation:

Commissioner Davis is fine to recommend the Comprehensive Plan to City Council as briefed by the City.

Commissioner Anderson agrees and thinks the Staff Recommendation of additional information is a great idea.

Commissioner Taylor stated he is good to recommend to City Council as-is. He thinks the idea of us as a small town is pretty nebulous, and thinks we are way past that, but it feels good to have it in there.

Commissioner Prickett agrees with Commissioner Taylor and has nothing else to add.

Chair Petersen had a couple of comments pertaining to this hearing. Land use is complicated and controversial and affects everybody. He is surprised at lack of participation tonight but knows it is not unusual. They generally hear about things as people have projects come up next door to them. The Comprehensive Plan is a vision statement and a living document. Try as hard as the City and Staff may, it

won't be perfect. We'll come back and change it as necessary. We aren't inviting people to come, they're coming. We drive on the same streets and it's crowded and seems to get worse every day. Transportation is expensive and it's hard to tell where to spend the money until it's too late. In terms of hiring more staff, it's a great idea but that takes more tax dollars, which people aren't willing to spend. We aren't the Commission to make that decision. He commends Ms. Kling, Ms. Cleveland and Ms. Phillips for their hard work and feels okay to recommend the Comprehensive Plan to Council with the Staff Recommendations, adding to grant the lot from the last comment to Mixed Use.

Motion:

Commissioner Taylor moved to approve Comprehensive Plan as presented with Staff Recommendations and to include AIN# 110833 as Mixed Use Designation in the future Land Use Map. Commissioner Prickett seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Davis:	Yes
Commissioner Prickett:	Yes
Commissioner Taylor:	Yes
Chair Petersen:	Yes

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

Foy Zone Map Amendment, PZE-20-0177, Public Hearing Opened at 6:30 pm.

Introduction: Donna Phillips, Sr. Planner explained that this Zone Map Amendment began with Elizabeth Allen, City Planner, who has since left the City. Ms. Phillips took over. On August 20, 2020 an application was received from David Foy (prospective owner of the site) on behalf of Walter M. Sims Intervivos Trust (seller), requesting approval of a zone map amendment from Residential-Suburban (R-S) to Light Industrial (L-I) of one lot that is approximately 8.76 acres in size. The property is split zoned with the northern 2.65 acres of the property zoned Light Industrial and the remainder of the site (6.118 acres) is zoned Residential-Suburban. The lot is west of N. Government Way, and east of N. Highway 95, more commonly known as 12115 N Government Way, with frontage on both N. Government Way and N. Highway 95. Structures on the property include a residence with accessory structures, and a well with associated easements to Pineview Estates Water District, as well as other easements of record.

Chair Petersen asked if there was any ex-parte communication. None of the Commissioners indicated so.

Applicant Presentation: Rich Overlin with NorthWest Contracting is the General Contractor for the project. The property falls under impact zone of airport. The southern part of the lot falls under residential zoning and would not be a good place to have residential zoning. The intentions of the lot are to make a self-storage complex. The lot currently has a large metal building on property and they are contemplating what to do with that. Their thoughts are to possibly turn that building into an office with additional internal storage. A dilapidated double-wide is also on the land, which would be removed from the property. They are proposing to keep natural trees and vegetation along N. Government Way. The Fire Department and power company have already made comments on their project and will have access coming from the north, from the Fire Department property, and a road will be paved to Government Way. A current easement for a well is already connected to the land. They are proposing self-storage units that are presentable to the community, making it pleasing to Hayden and the land put to good use.

Staff Presentation: Ms. Phillips brought commission considerations to attention, being additional studies, recommend conditions for the City Council's consideration. The Staff did not see a need for additional studies. Each time they have had a pre-development meeting for this project, they have sent them back to the airport to determine what they can or can't build. This has to do with the inner and outer critical zones. The use they are proposing only fits in the upper one-third of the property unless a Zone Amendment is approved. Existing conditions of the land are of the Single Family Dwelling accessory which is allowed in the Residential-Suburban zone but not in the Light Industrial zone. Conversations between Ms. Phillips and Ms. Kling were had before the meeting to consider the impacts of the City making a change to a zone. If that were the case, the Single Family Dwelling would stay but be non-conforming use. However, in all of our subdivision codes, it states non-conforming use can't be created by the applicant. If the amendment passes and the house stays as existing structure, we would allow a non-conforming use. For this reason, a condition from staff was made, that a Zoning Amendment Agreement be made stating that at the time of the development, the existing residence must be converted to office, or a structure allowed as conforming use for Light Industrial, or it must be removed. The third consideration states amendments to the zoning map and zone text shall be in accordance with the future land use map and the goals and policies found in the Hayden Comprehensive Plan. The area shows up as a low-impact, Light Industrial / Low Commercial Zone and the text will mirror the future land use map. Commission Consideration number four shall align with zone district's purpose and intent. A Residential-Suburban Zone is a land use classification suitable for single family dwelling units on larger lots and agricultural uses only. The Light-Industrial Zone is suitable for manufacturing, processing, fabrication, assemblage, freight handling or similar operations of a non-nuisance character. The purpose of the L-I Zone is to encourage the development of manufacturing and wholesale businesses that are clean, quiet and free of noise, odor, dust and smoke. The lots to the north and south of this property are zoned L-I. The project site has 690' of frontage on N Government Way and 692' on Highway 95. There is no access to Highway 95, and future development shall be required to follow the transportation plan, corridor plans, or adopted studies and/or tech memos as the required development. After noticing the surrounding public agencies, Avondale Irrigation District stated they do not currently service that lot, but would be happy to annex the property. Upon further review and research, it was determined that an Easement was established with Pineview Estates Water. This is the only piece of land outside of Pineview Estates that is serviced by Pineview Estates Water and they are currently working with the owner of the property and the fire department to determine how to serve them as Light Industrial versus Residential. Sewer is within the H-1 sewer basin and future development shall construct in accordance with the adopted City Sewer Master Plan. Additionally, the subject property shall meet the requirements of NLFPD at the time of development. 18 Agency Notices were sent and the following responses were received:

- HARSB – No comments

- Coeur d'Alene Airport – No comment and requested an aviation easement

- Avondale Irrigation District – Can be annexed and served

- Pineview Estates Water – Water agreement

- Northern Lakes Fire Protection District – Provided comment regarding requirement at the time of development

Public Comment was received by 1 individual on our standard form, who stated opposition, but without further comments. Ms. Phillips stated an overview of the Hayden City Codes and Idaho State Codes that fall under a Zone Map Amendment and what the Standards of Approval are for adopting the ordinance amendment.

At this time, there are no questions from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Public Comment: There were no citizens in attendance (in person or via phone) for public comment.

Chair Peterson called the Public Hearing to close at 6:46 pm.

Commission Deliberation: Commissioner Prickett approves the Zone Change with conditions from staff. Commissioner Taylor stated it is logical to make the entire lot Light Industrial in that area. Chair Petersen supports the Amendment with Staff Recommendations. Commissioner Davis agrees with Chair Petersen and believe it is a good use of the land. Commissioner Anderson had nothing to add and does not see residential use there anyway. He recommends we approve with staff recommendations.

Motion:

Commissioner Taylor moved to approve the Zone Map Amendment with the Staff Recommendations as presented. Commissioner Prickett seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Davis:	Yes
Commissioner Prickett:	Yes
Commissioner Taylor:	Yes
Chair Petersen:	Yes

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

REVIEW OF UP COMING MEETING CALENDAR, AND REPORT ON COUNCIL ACTION

Director's Review: Ms. Cleveland stated that Imagine Hayden still ongoing. She is close to the Park Plan completion. It should be finished this week, with the Transportation Plan following close behind. The Honeysuckle Park Agenda item for the next meeting will be removed, we will be workshopping codes. Michael Craemer stepped down from the Planning and Zoning Commission. As he was the Vice-Chair for PZC, we are looking for someone to fill his position. Ms. Cleveland recommends another contractor would be a good fit, as he brought good insight to the commission.

Planning and Zoning Commission:

City Council Actions: Marks Annexation Ordinance will be brought forward on 10/13/20.

WORKSHOP – Title 12, Subdivisions

Donna Phillips, Sr. Planner stated that we have had public requests for changes in Chapter 12 - Subdivision regulations. 1st change is regarding the Will Serve Letter as the 30-day window is hard for water jurisdictions to make. Once they are annexed by the Water District, why couldn't we take the Will Serve Letter presented at the time? 2nd change is regarding the Site Plan Code. We are currently pulling information from the Site Plan Code into the Subdivision Code, so it then applies to Subdivisions. 3rd change has to do with a question Chair Petersen has asked multiple times: why are we looking at Subdivisions when the Subdivision Code says when it meets the requirements of the Engineer's Memo, then it has met the requirements. While Elizabeth Allen was here, a 3-question survey was sent statewide asking how each city administers their minor subdivisions. Of the responses, 9 said Administratively, 3 have their PZC approve them, 5 said City Council approves, and 5 said both PZC and City Council approve them. Of Major subdivisions, we had 23 replies, 0 said Administratively, 6 have their PZC approve them, 4 said City Council approves, and 13 said both PZC and City Council approve them. Planned Unit Developments was the third question. The question here has to do with why we would have these developments come back for approval with each phase, if they are following the approved plans. If they aren't following that plan, then yes, they would need approval of course. Of the responses, 10 said they are determined through some sort of public hearing process, 2 via a split-approval process that wasn't explained in-depth, and have their PZC approve them, 5 said City Council approves, and 11 said both PZC and City Council approve them. Ms. Phillips started looking at codes of those who submitted,

and none asked for the Engineer's Memo. Rob Wright has seen the changes and approves it the way it is revised. He was going to try to make the meeting tonight, but with the workshop being last on the Agenda, he couldn't make it work. We took the requirement out of the Engineer's Memo since it is already received during the process, but it pushes the requirement back to PZE to make sure it has met the conditions for approval. We haven't changed the standards, just the process.

Chair Petersen would like to get more clarification on what the standard pertains to as it looks like it only states the infrastructure. Ms. Phillips state she will add that back in to be sure there is an understanding of what is proposing to be changed. Chair Petersen would also like more clarification on 12-3-4 F as to who the "responsible agency" is. Ms. Kling added that she agrees with Chair Petersen and is okay to strike the words "to the satisfaction of the City and the responsible agency."

Ms. Phillips continued the discussion and led into the removal of the requirement for dedication of park land of 50 acres or more. Ms. Kling interjected that this piece isn't working for us right now. It does not foreclose on annexations, and is just for a subdivision requirement. Density bonuses as mentioned earlier have been discussed. The goal is to move away from the dedication and go towards fees. There hasn't been consistency and the City can use the impact fees for future large City parks. More discussion on inconsistency and dedicated park land was held between Ms. Kling, Ms. Phillips and Commissioner Taylor. Ms. Kling would like to hear ideas, comments, etc. from the public and PZC. Impact fees will be tackled later.

Regarding boundary line adjustments, Ms. Phillips proceeded to show potential scenarios with drawings on the white board. What we have had in the past and what we want to get away from, is a BLA which then becomes a subdivision. Applicants are trying to reduce the cost on their end as this process is all done administratively. It is very time consuming and doesn't help with our infrastructure. The 2nd drawing she demonstrated is one that comes from the City of Coeur d'Alene, which we are modeled after. After contacting a surveyor, it makes more sense to allow for "line bending." We want to eliminate the number of deflection points that can move with a BLA. Right now we are at two points, which doesn't make sense. Discussion ensued between PZC and Ms. Phillips and Ms. Cleveland about having some sort of limitation to the number of points.

Additionally, it was determined by PZC that having 3 public hearings for our first meeting in November would be okay.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.



Shannon Drappo, Commission Clerk